



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\***  
**THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS**

|  |  |                              |                  |
|--|--|------------------------------|------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 4338   |                              |                  |
| Country/Region:                            | Philippines  |                              |                  |
| Project Title:                             | SGP Community-based Protected Areas and Biodiversity Landscapes Generate Local and Global Benefits |                              |                  |
| GEF Agency:                                | UNDP   | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 4517 (UNDP)      |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | GEF Trust Fund   | GEF Focal Area (s):          | Multi Focal Area |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-1; BD-2;  |                              |                  |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$0  | Project Grant:               | \$4,500,000      |
| Co-financing:                              | \$4,600,000  | Total Project Cost:          | \$9,100,000      |
| PIF Approval:                              |  | Council Approval/Expected:   |                  |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |  | Expected Project Start Date: |                  |
| Program Manager:                           | Danielius Pivoriunas   | Agency Contact Person:       | Joseph D'Cruz    |

| Review Criteria                | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Eligibility                    | 1. Is the participating country eligible?   | Philippines are eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|                                | 2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | Not applicable. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|                                | 3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?  | Yes, endorsed. Cleared 9/28/2010  |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?      | UNDP and its offices are the global implementers of the SGP and have been supporting the previous SGP programme in the Philippines for the past 18 years. Thus UNDP has the expertise, operational capacity and network of partnerships necessary to implement this project, which will build on the success of the previous SGP. Cleared 9/28/2010 |  |

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

|                       |   |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
|                       | 5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?   | Yes. Cleared 9/28/2010  |  |
|                       | 6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?  | Yes, the project first into Agency's program in the country. However, additional information should be provided on proposed implementation arrangements, number of staff to be used for project implementation and etc. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011 |  |
| Resource Availability | 7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):  |   |  |
|                       | • the STAR allocation?  | Yes, resources are available. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|                       | • the focal area allocation?  | Yes, BD allocation. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|                       | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?   |   |  |
|                       | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?   |   |  |
|                       | • focal area set-aside?   | N/A. Cleared 9/28/2010  |  |
| Project Consistency   | 8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?  | The project is aligned to focal area results framework, however, further details on biodiversity and capacity development indicators should be provided. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011  |  |
|                       | 9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?  | Yes, identified. However, capacity development objectives are not identified although they are listed in Part II. section A. Please provide further clarification. 9/28/20210<br>Clarification provided. Cleared 02/08/2011                                       |  |
|                       | 10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA? | Yes consistent. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|                       | 11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?                                  | No, information is not provided. Please provide. 9/28/2010<br>Provided, however, details on tools and to be used should be provided during endorsement stage. Cleared 02/08/2011  |  |

|                |  |  |  |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| Project Design | 12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?   | <p>A number of GEF projects have included community-based initiatives in priority BD sites. Please add and assess (lessons learned from success and failures) all the past GEF (22) and other projects that are relevant to this project in order to integrate the lessons learned in the design and avoid duplication. For example, this aspect was included in the GEF-4 UNDP project Expanding &amp; Diversifying the National System of Protected Areas of which the implementation is ongoing, and in 4 sites of the GEF/WB National Program Support for Environment and Natural Resources.</p> <p>Please also provide selection criteria for the selection of priority sites.<br/>Please provide baseline on capacity of civil society and community based organizations. 9/28/2010<br/>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011</p> |  |
|                | 13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?                                   | Yes, sufficiently. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|                | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?   | Yes, sufficiently sound, however details on implementation arrangements of the project, i.e. who when and how will select projects and etc. should be provided. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011  |  |
|                | 15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem? | Yes, appropriate. However, para 19 and 20 does not correspond to objectives of the project. Please provide additional clarification. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011   |  |
|                | 16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?                          | Yes, appropriate. Cleared 9/28/2010  |  |
|                | 17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of   | Not provided. Please provide. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011  |  |

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  | the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?  |   |  |
|  | 18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)? | Yes, provided. However, further details and data should be provide for example on employment opportunities created and generating income for communities and CSOs the project will provide should be estimated. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011   |  |
|  | 19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?   | Yes, considered and addressed properly. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|  | 20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)           | Yes, it does. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|  | 21. Is the provided documentation consistent?   | Yes, consistent. However, details on implementation arrangements should be provided, including visibility of the GEF. Is is also not clear how the project is going to monitor and evaluate projects supported. Please provide clarification. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011             |  |
|  | 22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?                                 | Not identified. Please provide details. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011   |  |
|  | 23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?  | Yes, consistent in most of cases. However, further clarification needs to be provided in relation to other projects that have been implemented by the WB and other agencies in area of PA, and especially if they had a support to community initiatives. 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011 |  |
|  | 24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?  | Not provided. Please provide. Please also provide details and arrangements to   |  |

|                                   |   |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                   |   | ensure visibility of the GEF funding.<br>9/28/2010<br>Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011   |  |
|                                   | 25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?  |  |  |
|                                   | 26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?  |  |  |
| Project Financing                 | 27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?   | Yes, somewhat appropriate. However, further information should be provided on costs related to monitoring and evaluation of projects funded. It is also not clear why other eligible focal areas are not considered and it was agreed by the Steering Committee. Please provide further details. Please also make changes to agency fee ensuring that they would be at 4% level. 9/28/2010 Details provided. Agency fee agreed at 8% level. Cleared 02/08/2011 |  |
|                                   | 28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle? | Yes, somewhat appropriate. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
|                                   | 29. Is co-financing confirmed?  | Not confirmed and not required. Cleared 9/28/2010  |  |
|                                   | 30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?   | Yes, adequate. Cleared 9/28/2010   |  |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?  | Not provided. Please provide 9/28/2010<br>Provided. Please provide detailed cost estimates for M&E expenses programmed during endorsement stage of the project. Cleared 02/08/2011   |  |
|                                   | 32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?   |  |  |

|   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Agency Responses                            | 33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:   |  |  |
|   | • STAP?   |  |  |
|   | • Convention Secretariat?   |  |  |
|   | • Council comments?   |  |  |
|   | • Other GEF Agencies?   |  |  |
| Secretariat Recommendation                  |   |  |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage                 | <b>34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>   | Not recommended yet. Further information and clarification is requested. 9/28/2010<br><br>The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance. 02/08/2011 |  |
|   | 35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  |  |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |  |  |
|   | <b>37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>   |  |  |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   | September 29, 2010   |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  | February 08, 2011  |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  |  |

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.