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Basic Information

GEF ID
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Project Title
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Agency ID
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GEF Focal Area(s)
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Program Manager
Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey
Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes. The Project is aligned with the SGP strategic directions approved for GEF-7 and with the Biodiversity FA elements.

Cleared 11/6/2018

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Cleared 11/6/2018

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please provide a more complete description of how co-financing was identified and how investment mobilized meets the definition.

To review this, please refer to the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines.

The relevant Policy requirement at PIF stage is the following:

"Agencies provide indicative information regarding the expected amounts, sources and types of Co-Financing, and the sub-set of such Co-Financing that meets the definition of Investment Mobilized (IM)". IM is defined as the "sub-set of co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures."

Please explain.

11/06/2018

Revised:
FURTHER REVISION REQUESTED:

The description field describes the process whereby investment mobilized was identified. In addition, please describe the definition/approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

4/24/2019

Revised. Cleared 04/29/2019

Agency Response

Co-Financing is sourced from three groups of co-financiers - (1) Philippine Government Agencies such as the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Department of Agriculture (DA) and the Department of Finance (DOF); (2) Civil Society Organisations which have complementary conservation and social mobilisation programs in the priority sites and (3) Civil Society Grantees which shall be providing the mandatory counterpart co-financing through non-cash in-kind support.

For the CSOs with programs in the same sites, UNDP OPF7 funding will be complemented by additional funds (US$ 800,000) and recurrent costs (US$ 2,800,000). For recurrent costs this amount represents funds/monies already invested by the CSO Co-Financier for their existing work in the area covering both program and administrative/personnel costs. For the CSO grantees, these recurrent costs are mostly human resource, local materials and other support provided by or sourced by the CSO grantee. The amount of US$2,500,000 as recurrent costs and US$500,000 investment mobilised is based on the UNDP SGP5 figures of 50% counter-part contributions. The amounts from non-grantee CSOs (Foundation for the Philippine Environment and Forest Foundation of the Philippines) were negotiated by involving them in the entire planning process for OPF7.

For the Philippine Government contribution of US$1,800,000, these amounts were negotiated with the relevant government agency point person.

All amounts, while negotiated or based on prior phase figures (counterpart contributions), shall be confirmed at CEO Endorsement.

GEF Resource Availability
4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**
Yes.

Cleared 11/6/2018

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**
Yes

Cleared 11/06/2018

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Cleared 11/6/2018

Agency Response
Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please indicate how the beneficiaries were calculated (8,000 men and 8,000 women?)

11/06/2018
Provided. Cleared 12/08/2018

12/07/2018 Additional comment: Please indicate if the methodology used for calculating the targets for the indicators included in Table F is aligned with the methodologies of the GEF=7 Results Framework (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.54.11.Rev_02_Results.pdf).

If there's no complete alignment, then please revise the targets.

Revised.

FURTHER REVISION REQUESTED:

As per the new GEF results guidelines, all GEF projects are required to submit an estimate of their expected results at the PIF stage. While we understand the PIF-stage results may change, the estimate of expected results is required at PIF submission. Please provide your best estimated core indicators, as per the Guidelines.

4/24/2019
Agency Response

29 April 2019:

Given that the nature of SGP Country Programmes with their focus on participatory landscape strategy development, that includes the identification of individual community-based grant projects within these landscapes, it is difficult at this stage of project development to identify targets for the relevant indicators with any precision. While the indicators for this project are not expected to change, the targets will be carefully calculated during the PPG-financed Project Preparation Stage using the corresponding GEF-7 methodology. These indicators were derived based on the past decades of experience with SGP grants; knowledge of the target landscapes where SGP is active; knowledge of the landscape resilience strategy which targets focal-area specific outcomes, and knowledge of the developing pipeline of community-based proposals from conversations, draft proposals, and other informal means. Using these factors, the Core Indicator targets are estimated and then questioned and vetted by UNDP GEF staff.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Cleared 11/06/2018

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers
2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Agency Response
Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes - with BD FA strategy

Cleared 11/06/2018

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Cleared 11/06/2018

Agency Response
6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

12/08/2018 Please see reference to indicators and methodology above

FURTHER REVISION REQUESTED:

As per the new GEF results guidelines, all GEF projects are required to submit an estimate of their expected results at the PIF stage. While we understand the PIF-stage results may change, the estimate of expected results is required at PIF submission. Please provide your best estimated core indicators, as per the Guidelines.

4/24/2019

revised cleared 04/29/2019

Agency Response 23/01/2019: Response to comment 12/08/2018 re Indicators, above: Given that the nature of SGP Country Programmes with their focus on participatory landscape strategy development, that includes the identification of individual community-based grant projects within these landscapes, it is difficult at this stage of project development to identify targets for the relevant indicators with any precision. While the indicators for this project are not expected to change, the targets will be carefully calculated during the PPG-financed Project Preparation Stage using the corresponding GEF-7 methodology. Note that, as such, Table F and the Core Indicator Annex have been revised to reflect this by using the term “TBD”. The figures for number of beneficiaries have been estimated initially based on knowledge of likely grantees living in the different landscapes but these figures will only be confirmed during project preparation.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Cleared 11/06/2018

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project’s/program’s intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. At CEO Endorsement stage, please provide more precise geo-referenced information.

11/06/2018

Agency Response

More detailed maps and geo-referenced information will be provided at CEO Endorsement.

Stakeholders
Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. However, please remove the check on the box: If none of the above, please explain why:

Revised.

Cleared 02/11/2019

Agency Response

Done.

Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes
Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes. at CEO Endorsement stage, please provide more details about private sector engagement and their role in the project.

11/06/2018

Agency Response
More detail will be provided on private sector engagement at CEO Endorsement.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Cleared 11/06/2018

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Cleared 11/06/2018

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities
Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Cleared 11/06/2018

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Cleared 11/06/2018

Agency Response
Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes. Letter dated September 21, 2018

Cleared 11/06/2018

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance. PPG is also recommended for clearance.

05/02/2019

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Dates</th>
<th>PIF Review</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Review</td>
<td>11/6/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review (as necessary)</td>
<td>12/8/2018</td>
<td>1/29/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review (as necessary)</td>
<td>2/11/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review (as necessary)</td>
<td>4/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review (as necessary)</td>
<td>4/29/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>