

## UNDP Check list to be used for projects when submitted to the GEF for CEO endorsement/approval

### **Philippines Project: Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in the Philippines (ABS Project): UNDP PIMS 6275**

**Implementing Partner: Department of Environment and Natural Resources – Biodiversity Management Bureau (DENR-BMB)**

#### **Background:**

Reference is made to the OAI Audit report in relation to UNDP's management of GEF-supported projects (issued on 1 December 2020). Any actions undertaken in relation to the project shall require strict adherence to all recommendations and associated management actions plans set out in the OAI report. Pursuant to the decisions of the GEF Council during the 59th GEF Council meeting, UNDP is required by GEF Council, at the time of seeking CEO Endorsement/approval, to demonstrate that this project design meets all of the 2020 OAI audit recommendations as a prerequisite for further consideration and review by the GEF Secretariat. The project proposal will also be subject to 2<sup>nd</sup> review and approval by Council as a condition for CEO endorsement/approval. Consequently (and contrary to earlier practices), please note that funding is not assured unless and until these preconditions have been met and duly confirmed and submitted to the GEF Secretariat.

Project address all concerns raised in the OAI report, based on below assessment.			UNDP Assessment	
			YES	NO
			√	
<b>UNDP to indicate Yes or No and provide additional information:</b>	Yes	No	<b>Additional information</b> See Governance and Management Arrangements, Section VII, pages 55 to 57, as well as Annexes 24a, 24b and 24c of the ProDoc.	
<b>Internal Control Framework (ICF)</b>				
Please indicate when the Internal Control Framework of your Country Office has been validated by the Regional Bureau. Indicate when this will be reviewed again.	√		<b>Date of ICF review by RBX:</b> 03 May 2021  <b>Future date of ICF review:</b> 03 November 2021	
<b>Country Office (CO) Capacities</b>				
Please clarify if the CO is equipped to provide proper implementation (oversight) and financial management of the project in line with	√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CO is properly equipped to provide oversight and financial management services to this Project.</li> <li>From 2013 to 2020, a total of nine GEF projects worth USD27,733,492 have been implemented with UNDP CO support.</li> </ul>	

UNDP rules and regulations and GEF policies?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As of January 2021, UNDP CO is implementing four ongoing GEF projects worth USD17,089,500. USD12,260,241 will be added to the ongoing GEF portfolio of UNDP CO when GEF 5886 commences implementation. This will translate to USD29,349,741 ongoing GEF portfolio.</li> <li>• By December 2020, five GEF projects closed with a total amount of USD20,178,248. Refer to Annex 1 for details of GEF Projects implemented by CO.</li> <li>• Majority of Projects with completed Terminal Evaluation implemented by UNDP CO had moderately satisfactory to satisfactory rating for over-all quality of project outcomes and over-all project results. Refer to Annex 1 for Project-specific details.</li> <li>• Among the closed and ongoing GEF-funded projects (10 projects in total), 4 projects (GEF Project IDs 4810, 5271, 5767 and 5393) have requested for no-cost extension once while 1 project (GEF Project ID 5405) requested for no cost extension twice due to COVID-19.</li> <li>• The CO has learned lessons from the rich implementation of the GEF portfolio and took decisive actions to address all recommendations of the previous HACT audits. The actions include (i) revisiting of risk rating of Implementing Partners, This involved assessment of results of FY 2019 and FY2020 HACT audits and recent spot checks; (ii) increased number of spot checks for IPs with high and moderate risk on programme management, organizational structure and staffing, accounting policies and procedures, fixed assets and inventory management, financial management and reporting, and procurement; (iii) strengthened QA and review process through updated and expanded Funding and Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) form checklist and Programme Monitoring Guide and Reporting Templates; (iv) Developed a HACT Handbook for use by UNDP staff and partners, with capacity building training done in mid April 21; (v) Development of a HACT assurance plan tracker to complement the HACT SharePoint Site; (vi) issuance of circular memorandum on RPA and LVG business processes to ensure the proper selection of RPs and grantees based on POPP requirements; and (vii) the engagement of a Risk Management Advisor to support the monitoring of compliance to HACT guidelines.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These efforts have led to unmodified audit opinions for the 6 GEF IPs that underwent the FY 2020 HACT Financial Audit exercise.</li> <li>• UNDP CO staff will ensure being abreast of any modification on UNDP and GEF policies.</li> <li>• A whole of Country Office approach will be put forward in undertaking oversight management of the project. The Climate Action Programme will be primarily responsible for ensuring that the Implementing Partner delivers the target Project outputs with quality and on a timely manner in the most efficient use of GEF resources as laid out in the Project Document. The Operations, Finance and, Results and Quality Teams will be closely working together with the Climate Action Programme on providing oversight to the Project in terms of quality results and financial management.</li> <li>• Additionally, Quality Assurance (QA) Report will be annually generated for this Project. This QA Report will be presented and confirmed by the Project Board to ensure that oversight management is provided more strongly not only by UNDP CO but also at the Project Board level.</li> <li>• Project risks will be discussed among UNDP CO, IP and Project Team at least quarterly to ensure that these risks are addressed, and mitigation and escalation measures are applied, as needed.</li> <li>• Capacity-building activities related to compliance with HACT provisions and GEF policies will be carried-out by the Country Office to ensure that the Implementing Partner is updated with the required processes and tools related with HACT and GEF policies.</li> <li>• A Project-specific Manual of Operations will be developed for this Project. This Manual of Operations will provide guidance on administrative, financial and implementation protocols and procedures that are consistent with the government's system, HACT and GEF policies.</li> </ul> <p>In the past, UNDP CO has successfully supported the government in the formulation of its Wealth Creation Programme designed to address the barriers to realization of benefits from sustainable use of its genetic resources. It conducted assessments, engaged with a broad range of stakeholders, and developed a roadmap for a whole of government approach to the realization of these long-term goals. The initiative was funded from TRAC resources.</p>
Please provide evidence of CO capacities including the	✓	List names of staff who will provide oversight covered by the GEF Fee

<p>list of subject matter experts to support oversight and provide execution support/procurement (when the latter has been approved by GEF)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Floradema Eleazar, EnP, Team Leader, Climate Action Programme Team</li> <li>- Ericson Faeldan, Programme Assistant, Climate Action Programme Team</li> </ul> <p>Additional CO staff not covered by GEF fee but also providing oversight include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dr. Selva Ramachandran, Resident Representative</li> <li>- Mr. Enrico Gaveglia, Deputy Resident Representative</li> <li>- Maria Theresa V. Espino-Yap, EnP, Programme Analyst, Climate Action Programme Team</li> <li>- Marian Valera-Co, Results-Based Management Analyst, Results and Quality Team</li> </ul> <p>List names of staff who will provide execution support covered by PMC and other UNDP corporate resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Muktadir Abdul, Finance Associate</li> <li>- Valerie Leilita Mae Ong, Finance Analyst</li> <li>- Samantha Gunasekera, Operations Manager</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE:</b> As requested by the Implementing Partner (IP), given the IP's moderate Adjusted Risk Rating, and in line with the Harmonized Approach for Cash Transfer (HACT) framework of UNDP, the CO will process direct payments for expenditures indicated in the Project Work Plan. Also note that, as per UNDP POPP, this is considered full National Implementation Modality, as national systems will be used to procure 100% goods and services for the project and UNDP will only process the required payments on behalf of the IP. This request has been approved by GEF SEC.</p> <p>The provision of execution support services will be led by the Operations Team which will provide oversight to processing of direct payments requested by the IP. The Results and Quality, and Finance Teams will be reviewing the supporting documents that will trigger processing of direct payment requests.</p> <p>Finally, please note that the 'third option analysis' done by the GoP suggests that UNDP's cost of execution support service (estimated at 1% of the project budget, noting that UNDP recovers these costs based on fees per administrative service provided as defined by their Universal Price List) is the most economical relative to the costs/fees charged by other international or national organizations. For example, other UN agencies charge an</p>
---	--	--

			average of 6-8% of the project budget for PMC; international NGOs, charge and overhead of 5-25% depending on the nature of the project and source of funding; while local NGOs require 5-10% PMC.
Has the CO put in place the necessary protocols to conduct annual field missions (monitoring visits) for project oversight support?	√		<p>A project M&amp;E Plan has been laid out in the Project Document. Specifically, project oversight will be undertaken through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation of UNDP CO in Project Board meetings where strategic directions on delivery of committed outputs will be set;</li> <li>• Conduct of quarterly meetings, at the minimum, among UNDP CO, IP and Project Management Unit, to discuss quarterly targets and accomplishments vis-à-vis the Annual Work Plan (AWP);</li> <li>• Participation of UNDP CO in Project yearly assessment and planning;</li> <li>• Conduct of Annual Partners' Meeting to discuss HACT and GEF policies as well as emerging concerns and issues in Project implementation;</li> <li>• Conduct of necessary audit exercises and spot checks, i.e., two spot checks per year and once a year financial audit, based on the IP's risk rating; and</li> <li>• Participation of UNDP CO in annual and/or semi-annual programme visits.</li> <li>• Field missions will be conducted semi-annually with BTORs submitted and discussed with UNDP Senior Management, IP and Project Team to thresh out emerging issues and concerns. These will allow to oversee project performance, identify and address potential risks and issues, to design response mechanisms.</li> <li>• Conduct of midterm review and terminal evaluation</li> </ul> <p>The Country Office has issued Programme Monitoring Guide and Template to be followed for annual and/or semi-annual field missions for more effective project oversight support.</p> <p>As provided in the UNDP ProDoc template, budget for field visits of the CO are covered by the GEF agency fee.</p>
Please indicate when the latest internal OAI audit of the Country Office took place? Were there any qualifications and are there any outstanding	√		<p>Date last OAI Country Office audit: 2-13 September 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualification of 2019 CO audit: Partially Satisfactory/Some improvements needed</li> </ul>

<p>recommendations? Is there an Action Plan in place?</p> <p>Please indicate if any other audits (BOA, DIM audits, special audits, etc.) have taken place in relation to the CO during the last 3 years.</p>			<p>List outstanding audit recommendations: no outstanding DIM, NIM or CO audit recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the last 3 years, the following audits have taken place in the CO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) 2087 CO Audit – September 2019; unqualified audit rating; no pending audit recommendation</li> <li>(ii) 2104 DIM Audit for Proj No 94900 (BUB) –May 2019; unqualified audit rating; no pending audit recommendation</li> <li>(iii) 2105 DIM Audit for Proj No 95022 (DepEd) – May 2019; unqualified audit rating; no pending audit recommendation</li> <li>(iv) 2106 DIM Audit for Proj No 107421 (SPAN) – May 2019; unqualified audit rating; no pending audit recommendation</li> <li>(v) 1959 DIM Audit for Proj No 95022 (DepEd) – May 2018; unqualified audit rating; no pending audit recommendation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>A CO-wide action plan (HACT improvement plan) has been developed and is being completed together with the internal control review action plan. Specific HACT-related action items are included in both plans, with a target completion date of Q2 2021.</p>
Has Prodoc clearly outlined roles and responsibilities of UNDP Country Offices and implementing partners for the oversight of this project	√		For details, please refer to Section VII, 'Governance and Management Arrangements', of the ProDoc.
Has Prodoc clearly outlined roles and responsibilities of the project boards?	√		For details, please refer to Section VII, 'Governance and Management Arrangements', of the ProDoc.
<b>Oversight and execution</b>			
Where execution support services have been agreed with GEF Secretariat, Specify if the LOA with the Government to provide CO support has been duly completed, cleared by BPPS, and signed by the relevant parties and included as Annex to the UNDP-GEF project document before signature by the Implementing		√	<p>The Implementing Partner, which is the Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB) of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), will lead the implementation of the Project.</p> <p>The request for UNDP to provide execution support services have been expressed by the Implementing Partner and the OFP through the letters provided in Annexes 2 and 3. Specifically, the Implementing Partner indicated the following as justification for seeking approval of execution support for UNDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DENR-BMB considers that UNDP is the most suitable Implementing Agency for this Project. Considering</li> </ul>

<p>Partner, Government Coordinating Agency and UNDP. Please provide the link to the LOA. Also, please indicate what provisions have been taken to ensure that a proper separation of functions between staff providing oversight of the Implementing Partner executing the project and execution on behalf of the Implementing Partner is in place at the CO level.</p>			<p>the long-lasting partnership of the IP with UNDP, including for example, on the development of the Philippines Wealth Creation Program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNDP's cost of execution support service is the most economical given the costs charged by other organizations.</li> <li>- On local Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), the technical capacity of existing NGOs is inadequate to provide the execution support services necessary for project implementation.</li> <li>- Overextended delays in project implementation are expected to happen if resources will go through the National Treasury using the single account framework. Following the HACT framework, cash advance can only be released quarterly by CO to the Implementing Partner. This will require one to two months of processing of funds from CO to the National Treasury to the Implementing Partner every time cash advance is downloaded quarterly. Since no procurement of goods and services can be processed without certification of available resources from the National Treasury, this will entail longer period of realizing Project implementation activities.</li> </ul>
<p>Have governance structures, staffing and/or operational measures been put in place in this specific project to ensure proper oversight of this project and effective separation between oversight and execution?</p>	<p>√</p>		<p><b>The Implementing Partner.</b> The DENR-BMB will serve as the Implementing Partner for this Project. BMB, as the Implementing Partner is responsible for executing this project.</p> <p><b>The Project Board.</b> The Project Board (also called Project Steering Committee) is responsible for taking corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. In order to ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability, Project Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. It will provide overall direction and oversight in the delivery of project outcomes. Through a consensus decision-making process, the Project Board will provide guidance to the National Project Manager on critical management decisions, including recommendations for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions, and addressing any project level grievances. Specifically, the Project Board will be composed of the four National Competent Authorities identified in compliance with the Philippines' commitment to the Nagoya Protocol, including BMB as the IP, the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources and the National Commission on Indigenous</p>



		<p>Peoples as well as the National Economic and Development Authority, a senior beneficiary and UNDP as the Development Partner. To note, the Project Board will ensure that its members do not have conflict of interest with procurement-related undertakings through signing a no conflict of interest declaration.</p> <p><b>Site-Level TWG.</b> Site-level TWGs in Regions 3 and 5 will be formed to ensure that site-level approach is well-coordinated following the Project-wide interventions and strategies. Collaboration among Regional DENR, DA, NCIP, DA-BFAR, DOST, the Regional Development Council (RDC) of NEDA, key Provincial Local Government Units (PLGUs), municipal LGU representatives and private sector representatives.</p> <p><b>Responsible Parties.</b> For Regions 3 and 5, the Responsible Partners will be identified by the IP to assist in the Project implementation activities. Potential responsible partners are Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), academic institutions and research consortia. Specific implementation activities will form part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will be signed by BMB and each Responsible Partner. Engagement of the Responsible Partners, through development of Terms of Reference (TOR) and following the government's selection and due diligence processes of the IP, will be contingent on the appropriate work packages as well as their current and ongoing initiatives.</p> <p><b>Project Management Unit.</b> The Project's PMU will develop project-level annual workplans with Responsible Partners. These annual workplans will be reviewed and endorsed by the National Project Director for approval by the Project Board. Responsible Partners are to prepare reports for review, endorsement and approval by the National Project Director.</p> <p>The National Project Management Unit will be based in the Wildlife Resources Division of BMB, reporting to the National Project Director, i.e., the BMB Director, and will be composed of a full-time Project staff to ensure effective and efficient day to day Project operations. The PMU will support the BMB Director on the Project's day to day operations. Specifically, the PMU will be in-charge of the following: (i) preparation of agenda and documentation of Project Board meetings, including consolidation of TWG recommendation on key concerns and issues; (ii) preparation and facilitation of approvals of Work and</p>
--	--	--



		<p>Financial Plans, Terms of References (TORs), facilitation of discussions of partnership agreements and contracts and deployment of consultants; and (iii) monitoring and facilitation of evaluation and learning.</p> <p>The PMU will be headed by a National Project Manager and will consist of full-time staff, including: (i) Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation Officer; (ii) Stakeholder Engagement and Gender Specialist; (iii) Enterprise Development Specialist; (iv) Communications Officer; and (iv) Administrative and Finance Specialist. The PMU will also engage short-term/interim Consultants, including, a Policy Specialist, Environmental and Social Safeguard Specialist and an ABS technical expert, who will assist the PMU and National Project Director on key technical concerns which are beyond the Scope of Work (SOW) of the PMU staff. Additional staff and Consultants can also be engaged as deemed necessary and in consultation with UNDP and DENR Central Office and subject to fund availability.</p> <p>To note, since this Project will be undertaken through the National Implementation Modality, recruitment of PMU staff, Consultants and Responsible Parties will follow the Republic Act 9184 or the National Procurement Law of the Philippines.</p> <p><b>UNDP.</b> UNDP is accountable to the GEF for the implementation of this project. This includes oversight of project execution to ensure that the project is being carried out in accordance with agreed standards and provisions. UNDP is responsible for delivering GEF project cycle management services comprising project approval and start-up, project supervision and oversight, and project completion and evaluation. UNDP is also responsible for the Project Assurance role of the Project Board/Steering Committee. To ensure sufficient oversight of the Project, UNDP will comply with the letter of Delegation of Authority (DOA) by using a three-tier corporate oversight structure, i.e., involving (i) the Country Office, (ii) The RBAP Regional Bureau, to ensure compliance with UNDP Regulations and rules, and (iii) BPPS-NCE, to provide technical oversight and ensure compliance with GEF policies and processes.</p> <p>As requested by the Implementing Partner and supported by the OFP, and as approved by the GEF, UNDP will provide execution support services through the direct payment modality following UNDP HACT framework. Emphasis on the separation of oversight and execution functions is put</p>
--	--	---

			forward as provided in list of subject matter experts to support oversight and provide execution support.
<b>Implementing Partner Capacities</b>			
Please indicate the risk rating outlined in the Partner Capacity Assessment Tool (PCAT) and HACT/ micro assessments. Indicate the year the HACT assessment was undertaken.	√		<p>PCAT was undertaken in 2021, giving a rating of low risk</p> <p>HACT: year undertaken and risk rating Micro-assessment completed in February 2019 has a Low risk rating. Current Adjusted Risk Rating (2021): Moderate</p> <p>The IP is included in the CO's FY 2020 HACT audit plan. The HACT financial audit exercise has been completed and results for the IP have been provided below.</p> <p>The FY 2020 NIM/HACT audit resulted in an Unmodified audit opinion, with no High or Medium risks issues identified</p> <p>On top of this, a spot check was conducted for the IP last January 2021. No High or Medium risk issues were raised.</p>
Please indicate the date of the most recent HACT/NIM audits have been conducted of the selected Implementing Partner. What measures have been put in place to respond to the audit findings? When available, provide a link to the management response	√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date of the most recent HACT/NIM audits: February 2020 for 2019 transactions and February 2021 for 2020 transactions.</li> <li>• In the last three years, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Out of the three projects audited in 2017, only 1 Project had qualified opinion while the two were given unqualified opinion.</li> <li>- In 2018, out of the three projects audited, 1 had unqualified opinion, 1 with adverse opinion and 1 had qualified opinion.</li> <li>- In 2019, out of three projects audited, two were given qualified opinion while 1 had unqualified opinion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Measures put in place and implemented to respond to audit findings concerning the Implementing Partner include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Discussion of the audit findings with the Implementing Partner to identify ways forward for ongoing and pipeline GEF-UNDP projects conducted last September 10, 2020. One of the concrete steps identified is the development of the Operations Manual for pipeline GEF-UNDP projects, including this one. The project specific Operations Manual will help provide step by step procedure on ensuring compliance with POPP, HACT and GEF policy provisions.</li> <li>(ii) Conduct of monthly review of NEX advances</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

			<p>(iii) Issuance of programme monitoring visit guide and template last November 2020.</p> <p>(iv) Issuance of guidance on drafting and approval of AWP) last August 11, 2020</p> <p>(v) Conduct of capacity-building activities on POPP compliance last April 2020</p> <p>(vi) Drafting of HACT Assurance Plan for the Implementing Partner</p> <p>Link to the Management Response: <a href="#">HACT improvement plan</a></p> <p>The risk rating of the IP and HACT appropriate HACT modality will be revisited in 2022 to explore possibility of upgrading the risk rating to low. For the FY 2020 HACT financial audit, the Implementing Partner received an unmodified opinion for the following: (i) Special Purpose Statement of Expenses; (ii) Special Purpose Statement of Assets and Equipment; and (iii) Special Purpose Statement of Cash Position. The Implementing Partner has also been given the following rates in the different audit areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reporting compliance: Satisfactory</li> <li>- Human resources: Satisfactory</li> <li>- Finance: Partially satisfactory</li> <li>- Procurement: Satisfactory</li> <li>- Asset management: Satisfactory</li> <li>- Cash management: Satisfactory</li> <li>- General administration: Satisfactory</li> </ul>
Are there any outstanding HACT/NIM audit recommendations that haven't been addressed? What is the Net Financial Misstatement?		v	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All HACT/NIM recommendations have been addressed.</li> <li>• As regards to Net Financial Misstatement for the HACT/NIM audit (for 2019 transactions), the audit identified USD41,894 as Net Financial Misstatements (NFM). The CO commissioned an independent review exercise that resulted in lowering the USD41,894 to USD9,411.56 only as worth of expenses with incomplete supporting documents or were not aligned to the approved work plan. UNDP CO sent an official letter to the IP on the recovery of USD9,411.56. The Biodiversity Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (BMB DENR) submitted a response letter. The explanations and documentation provided by DENR BMB on the expenditure of USD9,411 has provided adequate assurance that the expenditure is valid and in line with project outcomes. OIA is currently reviewing the case.</li> </ul>

			The FY 2020 NIM/HACT audit resulted in an Unmodified audit opinion, with no High or Medium risks issues identified.
Please specify what capacities the office has in place to conduct periodic spot checks and monitoring of the IP's capacities	√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CO HACT focal person will take the lead in ensuring that HACT guidelines are strictly followed by the IP for this Project. More specifically, external parties available on global and local LTAs will be engaged to conduct spot checks and IP capacity assessment.</li> <li>Conduct of quarterly financial monitoring has also been put in place. This is to ensure that resource utilization of the project is in line with the AWP's and Project Documents.</li> <li>Spot checks and audits are also scheduled and carried-out per HACT Assurance Plan per Implementing partner. These spot checks have been provided with resources in the Project budget.</li> </ul>
Has the capacity assessment for implementing partners, including a strengthening of the focus within the capacity assessment tools of procurement capabilities, been done and documented in the ProDoc?	√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the Inception Workshop, emphasis will be placed on the development of a HACT Assurance Plan which will support laying-out of regular trainings and spot checks needed.</li> <li>The Micro-Assessment Report of the Implementing Partner is provided as one of the Annexes of the Project Document was conducted in February 2019</li> </ul>
<b>Procurement</b>			
Has the procurement plan been elaborated and validated in coordination with the operation team/procurement unit? Please include the minutes of the validation meeting.	√		Procurement Plan has been developed and Operations Team has been made aware of this. However, this Procurement Plan will be implemented by the IP. Thus, goods and services will be procured by the IP and paid by UNDP CO through direct payment modality following the HACT framework.
Does the UNDP office have an established protocol to identify and manage conflict of interest in general, and more specifically those arising in procurement decision-making processes at project level?	√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP will provide execution support for this project exclusively through direct payment of goods and services procured by the IP.</li> <li>For the Implementing Partner, the Procurement Law or Republic Act 9184 provisions will be followed. Notably Article 47.2. of the Act which states that "[...] All bidders also found to have conflicting interests with each other shall be disqualified to participate in the procurement at hand, without prejudice to the imposition of appropriate administrative, civil, and criminal sanctions [...]". Furthermore, the Implementing Partner's procurement process is also subject to annual audit exercise undertaken by the Commission on Audit which is the State's highest audit organization.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Procurement Plans are approved with the Annual Work Plans of each Project. The Procurement Team, together with the Results and Quality Team (RQT), provide quality check on the Annual Procurement Plans before the Annual Work Plans are signed by the Implementing Partners, the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and the CO.</li> <li>Conflict of interests are managed through strict compliance with the Internal Control Framework, segregation of duties, formation and approval of Evaluation Committee as guided by POPP, signing of declaration of confidentiality by all non-UNDP Evaluation Committee members, including representatives from the Implementing Partners.</li> </ul>
<b>Risk Management</b>			
Has the CO conducted a proper risk analysis based on the project document? Does the risk register fully align with the risks outlined in the project document	√		<p>There is a detailed risk register annexed to the project document which fully describes the risks identified in the project as well as the corresponding management actions to mitigate those risks. Furthermore, a detailed SESP review has been carried out and a ESMF has been developed during PPG.</p> <p>Risks and corresponding mitigation measures will also be discussed during Project Board meetings to ensure that key stakeholders are properly informed, and guidance is sought for informed decision-making.</p> <p>Additionally, interventions towards addressing these risks will be one aspect of Project implementation that will be looked into during Mid-Term and Terminal evaluation, management responses drafted and its implementation carried-out and sustained by the IP.</p> <p>Please refer to ProDoc's Annex 4. SESP and Annex 5. UNDP Risk Register.</p>
List the frequency the risks will be monitored, and by whom. Explain how risks are monitored by the CO.	√		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risks will be monitored quarterly and annually through the Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs), Annual Progress Reports (APRs) and Project Implementation Reports (PIRs). Programme visits will also be used to identify potential risks and mitigation strategy, to be discussed with the IP, the NCE team, and the project board, as needed.</li> <li>Monitoring of the Project risks will be performed by Project Management Unit (PMU), specifically the Project Manager and the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp; E) Officer to be recruited and Implementing</li> </ul>

			<p>Partners. The UNDP CO will conduct regular dialogues with the PMU and Implementing Partner on Project risks and will be providing guidance on how these risks can be mitigated to have negative impacts on Project implementation. Quality Assurance (QA) Reports are also generated annually by the Country Office to ensure that risks are processed and consolidated for more effective mitigation measures put in place. In line with adaptive management principles, if amendments or additions to the Project's activities are required to further reduce identified risks. Such amendments or additions will be reviewed by the Project Board for approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On top of this, compliance with corporate standards on Risk monitoring is overseen by the BRH Management Advisory Services Team.</li> </ul>
Has risk assessment and management been done with identified mitigating measures documented in the Prodoc?	√		<p>Eight potential SES risks have been identified during PPG, six as moderate and two as low. Eighteen additional risks under different categories were identified and included in the UNDP ATLAS Risk register, eleven as moderate and seven as low. All potential risks at this stage have been duly identified and have been scoped in time and scale with a reasonable degree of certainty. For each risk that can be avoided, reduced, or mitigated through project design, appropriate measures have been taken and reflected in the Project Document. Hence, the project risks exist, but these will be managed within proposed project activities, standard best practices.</p>
<b>Cofinance</b>			
Please indicate how the CO will monitor and report back on the realization of co-financing included in the UNDP GEF Project Document	√		<p>The PMU will track and monitor co-financing for the Project. The IP will document and provide updates on co-financing in Quarterly Progress Reports. This will be quality assured by UNDP CO in its oversight role function and tabled as an agenda item during Project Board meetings. The UNDP CO, IP and PMU Country Office will monitor and report back on co-financing during PIR reporting, Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation periods.</p>
<b>Time tracking</b>			
Please specify if you currently have a system in place to trace time dedicated to providing oversight of this project and separately execution support.	√		<p>From 1 April 2021, the Philippines Country Office reports the staff time allocated to oversight support services provided to the GEF portfolio via the PIMS+ time-tracking system.</p>

Signature/Clearance: Selva Ramachandran, UNDP Resident Representative, UNDP Country Office in the Philippines



04-May-2021

Signature/Clearance: Christophe Bahuet, Deputy Regional Director for Asia and the Pacific and Director of the Bangkok Regional Hub



05-May-2021

Signature/Clearance: Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, Executive Coordinator & Director Global Environmental Finance/ UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support

Pradeep Kurukulasuriya

07-May-2021

GJ

IG

ML