

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10079
Project Title		Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in the Philippines
Date of Screening		21-May-19
STAP member Screener		Rosie Cooney
STAP secretariat screener		Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor
		STAP welcomes this project entitled "Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in the Philippines" submitted by UNDP. Overall, this is a comprehensive and well-targeted project with a reasonable objective and well-defined components. Although the general project is sound, STAP has some specific concerns about the lack of coherent theory of change that should be addressed during PPG phase to increase the likelihood of overall success (see comments below). Finally, STAP recommends that the project proponents should reflect on the lessons learned and experience in other countries which have attempted to generate local benefits and biodiversity conservation outcomes with ABS. A useful recent review is https://www.ictsd.org/sites/default/files/research/access_to_genetic_resources_and_benefit_sharing_-_ruiz_final.pdf .
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	The objective of the project is as follows: "the Nagoya Protocol is implemented effectively in the Philippines by strengthening the national Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) framework, building national and local capacities and developing critical experience in ABS agreements".
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes in general. The three main Components involve 1) strengthening the national framework for implementing ABS in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol; 2) raising awareness and building capacity; and 3) demonstration of benefit-sharing agreements
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	In the long term, this project envisions enhanced understanding of the ABS regime and the value of traditional knowledge such that local communities, the government and the private sector make full use of the Philippines vast biodiversity and untapped potential, on an equitable basis of benefit-sharing, and in a way that incentivises <i>in-situ</i> conservation (although exactly how is unclear). In the short term, the project seeks to clarify the process and demonstrate success in order to lay the groundwork for scaling up.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	GEBs listed for this project include 1) fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and their associated TK; 2) BD conservation and sustainable use in 2 pilot areas; and 3) preservation of TK, innovations and practices of indigenous communities. All of these seem to fall out of the interventions outlined in the project. Not entirely clear; however, that the total hectares targeted for improved management to benefit biodiversity (10,000 ha) will necessarily result from the activities described in this project, particularly since it involves encouraging communities to farm the species involved rather than sustainably wild-harvest, which presumably could provide incentives for forest conversion to agriculture rather than conservation (although not enough information is provided to understand this).
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	See above
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	See above

Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe:		
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes. But note Barrier 1 not particularly well -titled - this is more about weak, inconsistent and uncoordinated application of policy frameworks and their enforcement than weak enforcement per se.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	N/A
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes in terms of the general situation regarding the existing situation and the laws and regulations relevant to this subject.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	In terms of the indicators (ha of area under improved management) this is a bit weak. In terms of the number of pilot projects, agreements, protocols, etc. it is much stronger.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	This project builds on several other related activities supported by the GEF, USAID, and others. Not clear that lessons learned from these projects are relevant or have been incorporated into this project apart from the fact that there are significant gaps in policies and capacity building related to ABS that this project hopes to fill. Given the general global failure of ABS to deliver on its perceived initial promise, learning lessons from successful and failed efforts globally is really important here - what has been effective in overcoming roadblocks and securing local benefits and incentives elsewhere? There are very few examples of this really worked - where has it worked and what has made the difference?
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	

3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	There is no explicit TOC; however, the general idea is to enhance awareness of the economic potential associated with biodiversity in the Philippines through capacity building, pilots, etc. in the hopes that local communities, the private sector, researchers and others will make the effort to engage in this process for financial gain and in a way that also preserves the country's biodiversity. But the links to <i>in-situ</i> biodiversity conservation are not clearly articulated. Given that some forms of use of genetic resources do not require any on-going wild harvest (and the project explicitly supports farming rather than wild harvest), how will such use of genetic resources incentivise ongoing biodiversity conservation? A clear TOC would help in articulating the logic of this project, particularly in terms of in-situ biodiversity conservation. The relationship in component 3 between farming of the species and the BMPs is unclear - will they be wild harvesting or farming? And what is the rationale for either? In relation to Sambong, it appears a patent already exists and products are in commercial production - so what is the role of securing FPIC (this does not appear to be possible)? And how can this be a candidate for best-practice if the genetic resources are already being used without FPIC? Or this an attempt to turn a poor situation into a best-practice situation? Further, the text seems to indicate this is currently only wild-harvested - is the project seeking to establish farming of this species? Why? Why not use protocols for wild-harvesting (e.g. the FairWild standard)? More information is needed on the approach taken here and the rationale for this approach. In the Global Benefits set out on p51 in the table, it is hard to see how the project will lead to the outcome "Most importantly, the interrelationship between plant genetic resources and traditional knowledge will become more widely appreciated, all of which will strengthen the management of the protected areas system". What is the TOC for how this will lead to strengthening of PA management?
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	See above
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	See above
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Not necessarily. This is a complex issue with many underlying assumptions. If the pilot isn't successful, for example, how will the project succeed in making the case that the Philippines should invest time and resources into building capacity, strengthening the legal framework, etc.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	In theory, yes.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes. GEF financing is \$4.3 m and the effort required under this project is reasonable.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, in terms of ha preserved (GEF indicator)
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Not necessarily.

	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Not stated
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	The entire concept of ABS is innovative; however, this particular project doesn't include any additional innovations in terms of design, financing, etc.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Scaling up is predicated on expanding markets and mainstreaming this process
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	transformational change
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		map is included but no geo-referencing
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Stakeholders have been identified
	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	Roles identified but difficult to read in GEF Portal
3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Gender is discussed
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	

<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>The risks are reasonably comprehensive and none are outside of the project's control. However, it is hard to see how the mitigation measures in the first risk really reduce this risk - this is an economic assessment for the companies involved. Further, there may be a need to highlight the risk that communities may not provide FPIC in the case of the two selected case examples in component 3, which would mean these examples could not progress as planned.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>There is no mention of the general political climate or other issues that may impact overall success. Seems like an oversight but hard to know.</p>
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? 	<p>Not discussed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>This project builds on other GEF and non-GEF projects and efforts in-country, but the implementation of ABS has been going on globally for some years, and to promote a successful initiative here it is necessary to learn from what has worked and what has not globally.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>Recognition but little about lessons learned</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p>	
	<p>Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?</p>	
<p>8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>KM activities are standard (posters, meetings, workshops, etc.)</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	
<p>STAP advisory response</p>	<p>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</p>	
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.</p>	

	* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>“STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”</i>	
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:	
	(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;	
	(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.	
	The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.	
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:	
	(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.	