



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND**

GEF ID:	9554		
Country/Region:	Philippines		
Project Title:	Enhancing biodiversity, maintaining ecosystem flows, enhancing carbon stocks through sustainable land management and the restoration of degraded forestlands		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,639,726
Co-financing:	\$49,408,334	Total Project Cost:	\$52,048,060
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Paul Hartman	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>The project is in line with the identified GEF-6 strategy: BD P9 and LD2 P3.</p> <p>Further information is required on the specific linkage to SFM3.</p> <p>We suggest FAO to closely link and coordinate this project with the Programmatic Approach on The Restoration Initiative of IUCN/FAO</p>	<p>February 24, 2017</p> <p>The PIF is closely aligned with the GEF SFM-3 Focal Area Objective to support forest restoration at scale. At the local and regional levels, the work targets restoration of 72,560 ha of degraded forest land, with project developed SFM technical guidance, incentives and models to inform the prioritization and sustainable management of an additional 2,170,234 degraded hectares in the CAR</p>

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>/UNEP ‘ only in this way it makes sense and can stand alone as a small project.</p> <p>Linkage to related Aichi targets have been identified.</p> <p>March 7, 2017 Linkages to SFM3 and the Restoration Initiative have been further elucidated.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>and E. Mindanao. These local and regional SFM benefits underscore Philippine national and global commitments to reversing the loss of ecosystem services within degraded forest landscapes. SFM in the project has been carefully considered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and leverage multiple environment benefits, ranging from: improved forest management and restoration; the improved maintenance and protection of ecosystem services for sustainable flows and improved livelihood opportunities for communities (e.g. including but not limited to PES and testing of public-private incentives); the improved protection of critical biodiversity and habitat (via close collaboration with UNDP sister project), to; complimentary strategies enhancing gender and social participation, building climate resilience, and reducing poverty. (Please refer to Section 3.5, ‘Global Environment Benefits,’ items 71-75). • Align and coordinate with the programmatic approach of The Restoration Initiative (TRI). Following project consultations with the TRI, project logframe and components have been modified slightly to emphasize these synergies. (Please refer to ‘Coordination,’ item 90).
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country’s national strategies	Yes, conformity with NBSAP, NAP, and other key national policies,	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	including the National Greening Program have been recognized. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Not sufficient.</p> <p>Key drivers of degradation of forest and land is recognized as agriculture practice. However the project is focused on restoration, and not necessary on how to prevent further degradation by agriculture and other production practices. While we recognize that this element will be covered by the sister GEF project that is developed by UNDP, it is not very clear how these two projects will work together and address issues in a coherent manner.</p> <p>The PM suggests that the GEF Agencies (FAO and UNDP) and government to review the two projects again, and see how they could be combined or enhance coordination. Project design could be much strengthened if the land management planning and the restoration efforts are clearly linked.</p> <p>Please review and revise the two PIFs accordingly in coordination with UNDP..</p>	<p>February 24, 2017</p> <p>The FAO supported GEF project is designed to contribute to the restoration and wider agro-ecosystem management aspects of land use planning that will be led by the UNDP-GEF project. The FAO and UNDP led GEF sister project were designed simultaneously, and in close consultationâ€™discussions are ongoing, and further collaboration is planned. Coordination is expected to be enhanced further at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the national and policy making level, where both projects have agreed to work with the same/joint project steering committee; • the projects will also share the same/joint coordinating committees at sites in which both projects operate. In addition, the projects have already planned practical steps to ensure further development of strong synergies. These include, by example: • A joint PPG inception workshop at national level, and also at site levels. • Identification of joint capacity building exercises. • In addition, both projects will benefit from use of some common tools

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 7, 2017</p> <p>The discussion of coordination between the FAO and UNDP projects has been strengthened. We are encourage to hear of steps to be taken that will further synergies between the two projects. Please ensure that the results of these are explicitly discussed at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>â€ such as FAO's Collect Earth tool (e.g. to analyze land-use changes in target landscapes and/ or nationally using available satellite images).</p> <p>The use of common tools, training and methodologies will be further identified, discussed and detailed during full project proposal development.</p>
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Please refer to comments under item 3 above and review the project design.</p> <p>Incremental reasoning to use GEF financing to ensure multiple global environmental benefits through restoration initiative is well recognized.</p> <p>March 7, 2017</p> <p>The incremental reasoning of the project vis-Ã -vis the government's large investment into reforestation through the National Greening Program has been made more sound.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>February 24, 2017</p> <p>As outlined above, incremental changes are considered in project design and are leveraged further through the close coordination being developed with the UNDP sister project. As also mentioned, the project's design ensures leveraging of SFM to produce multiple environment co-benefits, including reversing Land Degradation trends with core project targeting improved land management and the restoration of forests and ecosystem services; LULUCF activities in the Climate Change Mitigation focal area, and; effective mainstreaming of biodiversity, ecosystem protection and sustainable use within the productive landscape.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>As noted above under item 3, it seems that the land use planning and management component is missing in the overall project design.</p>	<p>February 24, 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As restoration priorities continue to be identified in consultation with government, communities, and other stakeholders, this project will directly

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Coordination with the sister UNDP/GEF project needs to be further clarified. How is it intended to coordinate? Please also review possibility to combine considering the strong thematic and site linkage, which could potentially strengthen the over results and impact.</p> <p>Linkage between this project and REDD+ initiative also requires further elaboration.</p> <p>The 3 components that are identified are relevant.</p> <p>Numbers between table B and table 7/text does not match: i.e. number of ha restored. Moreover, the restoration coverage target looks very limited for the budget. Please review further.</p> <p>The GEFSEC requires tCO2e mitigation estimates with the PIF. Please provide the estimate with clear information on how it was calculated.</p> <p>March 7, 2017 It has been clarified that the project will focus on restoration and capacity building to the landscapes and that landuse planning will be undertaken by the UNDP project. Coordination has also been explained.</p>	<p>contribute restoration and capacity building to the wider agro-ecosystem management aspects of land use planning led by the UNDP/BMB project. Please refer to planned coordination mechanisms outlined in point 3, above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re: linkage between this project and the REDD+ initiative: Please refer to revised PIF, Section 3.5, Coordination, point 86. • The projected number of hectares to be restored under the initiative and by region has been further clarified in consultation with the Forest Management Bureau, and degraded area coverage clarified within the revised PIF. • Please find tCO2e mitigation estimates as highlighted within Table F, "Project target contributions to GEBs". These initial estimates were developed in consultation with FMB, and utilizing FAO's EX-Ante Carbon balance tool (attached). These represent conservative estimates based on initial assessments denoting at least 'moderate' degradation is both sites, and yet include FMB data re: land use change impacts (e.g. from deforestation and afforestation). As such, lower Tier 1 carbon density/ha potentials were

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>The project's support for REDD+ initiatives of the government has been expanded on and is now clear.</p> <p>The target for number of hectares restored is now more in line with the project investment.</p> <p>Carbon mitigation estimates have been provided but the information on how it was calculated using the EX-Act tool isn't clear. According to the file submitted showing results generated through use of the EX-Act tool, the project will restore 2 million ha in 20 years; however, based on paragraph 71 of the PIF only 72,560 hectares will be restored. In the use of the tool there appears to be no differentiation between grassland restoration, reduction of forest degradation, reforestation, and agroforestry practices, although these are mentioned in the project description.</p> <p>We ask that you apply the EX-ACT tool in a way that generates an estimate for the project that is more accurate, justifiable, and conservative and that a clearer rationale for your findings is provided, including references where needed.</p>	<p>utilized. Higher Tier values supported by improved/hectare specific data will be further pinpointed and assessed in PPG.</p> <p>March 27, 2017</p> <p>The revised FAO EX-Ante Carbon balance tool is attached.</p> <p>Initial restoration estimates based on the breakdown by land-use category of the to be directly impacted 72,650 ha. are outlined, below. Detailed information on actual name, municipality and barangay locations will be further defined (i.e. by target CAR and E. Mindanao regions), and alongside the anticipated National Greening Programme Strategy (2017-2028). That strategy is expected to be released soon, and will be available to the project's PPG phase.</p> <p>Total direct GHG benefits to be generated by the project are now estimated at -3.6 million tCO₂e, over 20 years (a timeframe commonly used in GHG accounting to take into consideration long term impacts on carbon stocks e.g. from land use change).</p> <p>The majority of direct GHG benefits will be generated by increasing carbon stock</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 30, 2017</p> <p>A revised carbon calculation has been provided that is better elucidated through revision of the EX-Act tool. We understood that these numbers are based on early estimates and will be further clarified during the PPG and through review of the National Greening Programme Strategy after its release. We ask that at CEO endorsement more details are provided through use of the Ex-ACT tool on exact areas to be targeted, amount of forest/grassland to be restored, precise types agro-forestry and area where it will be planted, etc. Cleared</p>	<p>storage in soils (60%), biomass (36%), and to a lower extent from the reduction of current GHG emission levels from crop residue burning (4%).</p> <p>Comparing project components, the greatest share of GHG benefits on 72,560 ha.'s will be generated by forest rehabilitation (-1.7 million tCO₂e), followed by grassland rehabilitation (-1.2 million tCO₂e) and improved crop production/agro-ecosystems with GHG mitigation benefits of -0.7 million tCO₂e.</p> <p>As an important but indirect target, the project is designed to inform and positively impact forest area under the National Greening Programme (ca. 2.2 million ha's), and to generate multiple environment benefits through sustainable forest management.</p> <p>These values, as well as site specific location names in target regions is under discussion with government and FMB, and will be further pinpointed and described in PPG (alongside release of NGP targets for the project regions).</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Gender - adequate at this stage, however, considering the relevance, please note that relevant gender plan will be developed by the time of CEO endorsement based on the gender	<p>February 24, 2017</p> <p>Gender, CSO's, IPs and other stakeholder needs will be further assessed and addressed in PPG. The role of the private sector is further</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>analysis conducted during the PPG stage.</p> <p>CSOs - considering active role of CSOs in forest sector in Philippines, close consultation and coordination is expected. Clear roles of some of the key NGOs are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>IPs - Relevance and involvement is well recognized. Considering strong linkage, close consultation during the PPG phase and an Indigenous peoples plan is expected at the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Private sector - please further clarify role of private sector in this restoration initiative.</p> <p>March 7, 2017 Engagement of the private sector is now adequately described. Cleared</p>	<p>clarified in Section 2, Stakeholders, point 81-82..</p>
<p>Availability of Resources</p>	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>Yes, for BD and LD resources.</p> <p>On SFM incentive resource, due to scarce remaining resource, the amount identified (\$1m) can not be committed until at the time of work</p>	<p>February 24, 2017 Noted.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		program inclusion.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	refer above	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	na	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	na	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	Refer above on SFM resources and take note on the scarcity.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>No, please resubmit a revised PIF by addressing above comments.</p> <p>March 7, 2017 No, please address comment in box 5.</p> <p>March 30, 2017 Yes, comments have been adequately addressed and the PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review		February 24, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council • Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.