

Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in the Philippines

GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project – GEF - 7

Basic Information

GEF ID: 10079

Countries: Philippines

Project Title: Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in the Philippines

GEF Agency(ies): UNDP

Agency ID: UNDP: 6275

GEF Focal Area(s): Biodiversity

Program Manager: Mark Zimsky

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-19-20

Yes. BD-3-9 Further development of biodiversity policy and institutional frameworks through the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and benefit sharing.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-19-20

Yes,. The outputs of the three components are sufficient to achieve the expected outcomes and the objective the project. The outcomes are: 1) Strengthened national regulatory frameworks and clarified institutional mechanisms for ABS that are in compliance with the Nagoya Protocol; 2) Enhanced

understanding of the ABS regime and the value of traditional knowledge associated with genetic and biological resources for improved policy making and on the ground conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable sharing of benefits; and 3) At least one ABS Agreement negotiated and finalized that demonstrate PIC and MAT and with clear provision on fair and equitable benefit sharing.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from P IF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-19-20

Yes. The LoC from DOST-PCAARRD in the amount of Php 46M is equivalent to the amount entered in the Portal of \$907,692. Please provide the exchange rate used.

Please separate in the Portal the co-financing of these two local Government Units so there is one line per letter.

Recipient

Local Government Units (Province of Albay and Sorsogon)

Country

Government

Please highlight in the LoC the amounts that add-up to \$6,527,247 in the LoC from Academic and Research Institutions (Central Luzon State University and Sorsogon State College). The figures in the LoC suggest there is co-financing in-kind and that is not reflected in the Portal.

Separate the co-financing of Herbanext Laboratories, Inc. and Pharmalytics Corporation so each co-financier has the corresponding lines for their contribution in-kind and Investment mobilized.

9/17/2020

Please address all the issues in the cofinance letters listed below:

- 1- Co-financing Co-financing from (i) Department of Agriculture Regional Office No. 5, (ii) Province of Albay and (iii) province of Sorsogon is indicated in the letter as “public finance” but is currently listed as “grant”, please change the type of financing for these two entries.

Recipient Country Government	Department of Agriculture Regional Office No. 5	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,752,600
Recipient Country Government	Department of Science and Technology – Philippine Council for Agriculture, Aquatic and Natural Resources Research and Development	Grant	Investment mobilized	907,692
Recipient Country Government	Local Government Unit – Province of Albay	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000
Recipient Country Government	Department of Agriculture Regional Office No. 5	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,752,600
Recipient Country Government	Department of Science and Technology – Philippine Council for Agriculture, Aquatic and Natural Resources Research and Development	Grant	Investment mobilized	907,692
Recipient Country Government	Local Government Unit – Province of Albay	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000
Recipient Country Government	Local Government Unit – Province of Sorsogon	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000
Recipient Country Government	Local Government Unit – Province of Sorsogon	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000

I am pleased to confirm that the Provincial Government of Albay is fully committed to support the implementation of said project. As part of our commitment, the Provincial Government of Albay will provide co-financing through **Public Investment** with the equivalent amount of ONE MILLION US DOLLARS (USD1,000,000.00). This will be earmarked from our local fund.

I am pleased to confirm that the Provincial Government of Albay is fully committed to support the implementation of said project. As part of our commitment, the Provincial Government of Albay will provide co-financing through **Public Investment** with the equivalent amount of ONE MILLION US DOLLARS (USD1,000,000.00). This will be earmarked from our local fund.

I am pleased to confirm that the Provincial Government of Sorsogon is fully committed to support the implementation of said project. As part of our commitment, the Provincial Government will provide co-financing through Public Investment with the equivalent amount of ONE MILLION US DOLLARS (USD1,000,000.00). This will be earmarked from our local fund.

I am pleased to confirm that the Provincial Government of Sorsogon is fully committed to support the implementation of said project. As part of our commitment, the Provincial Government will provide co-financing through Public Investment with the equivalent amount of ONE MILLION US DOLLARS (USD1,000,000.00). This will be earmarked from our local fund.

Also on co-financing: Needs clarification on DOST Co-financing letter as it does not explicitly mention funding the GEF project but only expresses support. We understand that the 46 million pesos is the equivalent of the co-financing amount of \$907,692 as entered in the Portal. If this 46m pesos support 7 project components of the Pili Research and Development Center, please estimate how much is actually dedicated as a co-financing for the GEF project considering also that the project started implementation in 2019 and would go up to 2022.

The co-financing from Academic and Research institutions combines both Sorsogon State College (\$6m cofinancing) and the Central Luzon State University. However, the latter's co-financing does not present any amount, so it is difficult to trace where the \$527,274 difference is coming from, which is assumed to belong to CLSU. CLSU is not explicit in offering co-financing. Also, considering that the co-financing offered by Sorsogon State College (\$6m co-financing) is coming from a Program which run from FY 2019 and goes up to FY 2025, please estimate how much is actually dedicated as a co-financing for the GEF project.

Once all these corrections have been made, correct all budgets in the document.

10/19/2020

Table C in the portal still shows the "Public Investment" cofinancing as "Grant". Please revise accordingly to previous comments.

10/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 26/08/2020

Thank you for your comment, please note that the Exchange rate used is USD50.678

The co-financing of LGUs of Albay (investment mobilized USD1mm) and Sorsogon (investment mobilized USD1mm) has been separated in the portal as well as in the ProDoc and CER.

Please note that co-financing commitments from Central Luzon (investment mobilized USD527,247) State University and Sorsogon State College (investment mobilized USD6mm) are considered grant/investment mobilized which includes purchase of research equipment; research and development for conservation and drug development; and, exploration and germplasm collection, etc.

Finally, the break-down of co-financing for Pharmalytics and Herbanext has been included in the document package as follows:

Private Sector	Investment Mobilized, USD	In-Kind, USD	TOTAL, USD
Pharmalytics	95,813	38,419	134,232
Herbanext	174,000	52,200	226,200
Total	269,813	90,619	360,432

See CEOER, Table C, page number 4 and PRODOC, Financing Plan, page number 3 for details.

UNDP Response, 25/09/2020

1. As requested, co-financing types from the Department of Agriculture Regional Office No. 5, the Province of Albay, and the province of Sorsogon have been adjusted in the portal to “public investment”.
2. For DOST, please note that the total amount of the Project is indicated as co-financing commitment since the investment being made in research equipment and R&D will be directly relevant to the GEF funded project interventions throughout -and beyond- the implementation phase.
3. Items included for Central Luzon State University are the following:

Co-Financing Item	Investments mobilized
Research equipment (Please note that these are classified as grant because they are considered direct inputs to the planned R and D activities of the GEF funded project)	Php15,193,299
Research and Development for Conservation and Drug Development	Php4,684,169

Exploration and Germplasm Collection	Php7,000,000
Total, in Php (Official UN exchange rate used is USD50.678)	Php26,877,468
Total, in USD	USD527,247

Please see attached LOC of Central Luzon State University with amounts highlighted that add up to USD527,247.

Finally, for Sorsogon State University, the total amount of the budgetary requirements for the roadmap were included. The University's inputs for the specific species will be directly integrated into the roadmap being developed under output 3.2, the cost of output 3.2 is therefore considerably less for the Project given the over-all output of the University's roadmap.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-19-20

Yes. The amounts in Table D correspond with the figures on Tables A & B. Agency fee is 9.5%.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-19-20

Yes. see **ANNEX C**

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-19-20

Yes.

The number of hectares of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity increased from 10,000 at PIF stage to 41,662 at CEO Endorsement.

Cleared

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-19-20

Yes. As stated in the text, the threats, impacts, and barriers presented in the original PIF have been further refined and elaborated through consultations. The three main barriers are: Barrier 1: Inadequate and weak enforcement of policies, institutional and regulatory frameworks on ABS implementation; Barrier 2: Lack of awareness and weak capacity of key stakeholders on ABS implementation at the national and local level. Barrier 3: Absence of good practices on ABS implementation from the initial stage of bio-prospecting to research and development, product innovation and commercialization. These three barriers were address in the corresponding components of the alternative scenario

Cleared

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-19-20

Please elaborate on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects. Nothing was added since PIF approval.

9/10/2020

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 26/08/2020

Thank you for pointing out the missing baseline information. The information describing existing policies, institutional arrangements, current initiatives of ABS related agencies, existing value chain and local profiles related to the species are detailed extensively in Annex 7: Stakeholder Engagement, Annex 11: Situational Analysis, and Annex 12: Site Selection. The detail however is not easy to tease out or found readily.

Several paragraphs have therefore been added to the Section (2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects of the CEOER to summarize the baseline scenario and projects (page numbers 9-11).

PRODOC, Section IV. Results and Partnerships (page numbers 23 -28) has also been updated.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8-19-20

Yes. The proposed alternative scenario is adequate. Please clarify what the following outputs actually mean: 1.4 Access and Benefits Sharing National Road-map developed; 3.2 Strategic Road-map for the identification and creation of benefits based on genetic resource development. 3.3 Negotiate and implement ABS agreement modeling FPIC and PIC processes. Suggest using plain English to describe what will be achieved.

9/10/2020

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 26/08/2020

Outputs 1.4, 3.2, and 3.3. have been re-worded to better explain what will be achieved (See PRODOC Section IV, Results and Partnerships, pages 32, 39-41 for details)

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8-19-20

No. Not necessary.

Cleared

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8-19-20

Please present the true baseline of the project, that is the projects that will take place whether the GEF project is funded. Once the baseline is presented it would be possible to present a proper incremental reasoning. If there is not a significant Baseline, please link the main co-financing to the corresponding components in order to visualize the viability of the project.

9/10/2020

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 26/08/2020

The incremental reasoning, contribution from baseline, and co-financing has been reworked and included in CEOER Section 5 Incremental/additional cost reasoning (Pages 13-17) as well as the PRODOC Section IV (Pages 25-28).

Note that table 1 in both documents presents the financial figures of the baseline and co-finance for the project.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8-20-20

No further elaboration in GEB was provided or needed.

Cleared

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8-20-20

Innovation, sustainability and the potential for scaling uu were address in the corresponding item (7).

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/17/2020

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

The project included a detailed report on stakeholders' engagement during the design phase.

Cleared

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

The project provided the gender analysis.

Cleared

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

There is no Private Sector Engagement.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

Yes. There is a detailed Risk Analysis and Mitigation measures.

Cleared

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

Yes. The institutional arrangement for project implementation were described.

Cleared

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

Yes. The Knowledge Management Approach for the project was adequately elaborated. See Component 3.

Cleared

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8-20-20

Yes. See Annex 4: UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)

Cleared

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8-20-20

For the budgeted M&E Plan, see PRODOC Section VII Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan, and the Table in the CEO Endorsement in the Portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8-20-20

Cleared

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/10/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/10/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/17/2020

The USA Council Member provided comments but no response was provided. Please respond:

11. Philippines: Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in the Philippines (UNDP) (GEF Project Financing: \$4,384,000) GEF ID = 10079

✓ *United States Comments*

- Technical comments. Some project outputs seem poorly aligned with the stated project objectives. For example, the project seeks to strengthen the national framework for implementing access and benefit sharing but does not reference the Philippine Genetic Resources Access and Benefit Sharing bill (Senate Bill No. 2167) that has been filed in the Philippine Congress. Additionally, there is no mention in the proposal of the Philippine Natural Health Products Industry Roadmap (2014-2030). It is not clear whether the selection of sambong and pili will provide the best model for access and benefit sharing, or why these products were chosen.

11. Philippines: Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in the Philippines (UNDP) (GEF Project Financing: \$4,384,000) GEF ID = 10079

✓ *United States Comments*

- Technical comments. Some project outputs seem poorly aligned with the stated project objectives. For example, the project seeks to strengthen the national framework for implementing access and benefit sharing but does not reference the Philippine Genetic Resources Access and Benefit Sharing bill (Senate Bill No. 2167) that has been filed in the Philippine Congress. Additionally, there is no mention in the proposal of the Philippine Natural Health Products Industry Roadmap (2014-2030). It is not clear whether the selection of sambong and pili will provide the best model for access and benefit sharing, or why these products were chosen.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 25/09/2020

The technical comments from the United States were taken into account in the full proposal development. Please note that the project baseline was expanded during the PPG process and the Philippine Genetic Resources Access and Benefit Sharing bill (PGRAS) has been fully integrated into the proposal (See ProDoc page number 12 for details). The bill is also discussed in ProDoc Annex 11, Situational Analysis (page numbers 1-2 and 17). Overall, the bill is one part of a larger national framework including several other existing laws and regulations on ABS that have been thoroughly analyzed and integrated into the project design. The project has been designed to prioritize and build upon these as well as including policy measures to make it easier for the Philippines to meet NP core requirements.

In terms of the Philippine Natural Health Products Industry Roadmap (2014-203), this unfortunately is no longer an active program and since 2015 there has been no indication of any progress made. It has therefore not been included as part of the proposal.

Regarding the species selection, during the PPG, based on deliberations with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), the lead implementing agency in this ABS development program and numerous stakeholder meetings (see ProDoc Annex 7 for a summary of all stakeholder meetings and workshops), the species and site selected were Pili in Bicol and Banaba in Central Luzon. The selection was based on the following criteria: (1) the plant species being abundant and indigenous in the selected areas, while considering the possible effect on conservation status by the identified economic utilization; (2) the existing IKSP/TK, trade and other utilization in the market; (3) the available research and product development pointing to the potential of increasing the market value derived from such; and (4) the opportunity for greater local stakeholder inclusion in the value chain. Both species have existing industrial revenue streams derived from derivative food products. Additional detail on species selection is included in Annex 12, Site Selection.

Please note that the above response to the US comments has been added to the CEO ER (See page numbers 8, 36 to 38 for details).

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

Yes. See ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) in Portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

(i) UNDP Response, 25/09/2020

Engagement of the Project Chief Technical Advisor has been reduced to 9 months spread over 3 years. TOR for this post have also been revised (See ProDoc budget and budget notes 2, page number 67, and ProDoc Annex 6, page number 121 for details). The Project National Chief Advisor post has been removed from the ProDoc, budget and budget notes. Resources resulting from these modifications have been re-aligned to Budget Code 75700 (Trainings, Workshops and Conferences) for Components 1, 2 and 3.

(i) Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation costs in the ProDoc have been adjusted accordingly to align with M and E Plan, i.e., with a total amount of USD96,000, including travel costs in the amount of USD 6,000. (Refer to Section IX -Total Budget and Work Plan, Budget Notes 29 - 31, Budget Note 31, page 69 for details)

(ii) The reference to the M&E has been removed (Budget note 33).

UNDP 10/10/2020

(i) Engagement of the Project Chief Technical Advisor has been reduced to 9 months spread over 3 years. TOR for this post have also been revised (See ProDoc budget and budget notes 2, page number 67, and ProDoc Annex 6, page number 121 for details). The Project National Chief Advisor post has been removed from the ProDoc, budget and budget notes. Resources resulting from these modifications have been re-aligned to Budget Code 75700 (Trainings, Workshops and Conferences) for Components 1, 2 and 3.

(ii) Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation costs in the ProDoc have been adjusted accordingly to align with M and E Plan, i.e., with a total amount of USD96,000, including travel costs in the amount of USD 6,000. (Refer to Section IX -Total Budget and Work Plan, Budget Notes 29 -31, Budget Note 31, page 69 for details)


(iii) The reference to the M&E has been removed (Budget note 33).

UNDP 10/10/2020

The map of the project sites has been included in section 1b of the CER (see page 8 of the CER).

Please see **Annex E** and **PRODOC Annex 1**.

Figure 1 includes a map of all of Region 3 and Region 5, the regions where the pilot sites will be selected.



GEFSEC DECISION RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8-20-20

No. Please address outstanding issues and resubmit.

9/17/2020

No. Please address all issues above and resubmit.

The geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place, are provided on Annex E and PRODOC Annex 1.

However there is no map in section 1b. Please include a copy of that map in section 1b

Please revise budget based on all these comments:

1- On the budget (in ProDoc – pages 64 - 69):

- (i) Project National Technical Advisor and Project Chief Technical Advisor are long term staff (72 months each). When one reads the explanation in ProDoc, it is difficult to understand the added value of both positions. However, by reading the TORs still the duties and responsibilities don't seem to be commensurate to two full-time positions as some are repetitive, others are to be carried-out by other staff members (such as the Planning and Monitoring Evaluation Officer or the Communications Officer), and in the case of the TORs of the Project Chief Technical Advisor, they are not linked with the three components he/she supposedly will support. Please revise and clarify.

2	71300 Local Consultant: Policy Specialist will be mainly supporting delivery of outputs under Component 1. The Consultant will work closely with the Nagoya Protocol and ABS Expert. Specific duties among others include: (i) review and assess all relevant laws and policies to the project; (ii) develop a simplified, harmonized and linked ABS mechanism; (iii) draft relevant policies and model ABS agreement; (iv) develop a menu of options for benefit sharing under revised and updated rules and regulations on ABS; (v) lead in all activities related to ABS policy; (vi) lead in securing PIC/FPIC for the project. 60 months days 6 years [Year 1-4 = 12 months; Year 5-6 = 6 months] (USD 2800 per month) Total: USD 168,000; Project National Technical Advisor supporting all outputs under Component 1 (3 months per year for 6 years; USD2650 per month) Total: USD 47,700; Project Chief Technical Advisor supporting all outputs under Component 1 (3 months per year for 6 years; USD1600 per month) Total: USD 28,800;
---	--

11	71300 Local Consultants: Stakeholder Engagement and Gender Specialist will be mainly supporting delivery of outputs under Component 2. Specific duties among others include: (i) support all capacity development activities under Outcome 2 and 3; (ii) help in the conduct of KAP assessment, capacity assessment and identify training needs of all the stakeholders of the project in consultation with other technical staff; (iii) provide the gender lens by ensuring alignment and application to project implementation of applicable laws and standards. 72 months (engaged throughout the implementation duration) (USD 2800 per month); Total: USD 201,600; Project National Technical Advisor supporting all outputs under Component 2 (4 months per year for 6 years; USD2650 per month) Total: USD 63,600; Project Chief Technical Advisor supporting all outputs under Component 2 (4 months per year for 6 years; USD1600 per month) Total: USD 38,400; Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist supporting all outputs under Component 2 (4 months per year for 6 years; USD2200 per month) Total: USD 52,800; Communications Officer supporting all outputs under Component 2 (4 months per year for 6 years; USD2200 per month) Total: USD 52,800
----	--

20	71300 Local Consultant: Enterprise Development Specialist will be mainly supporting delivery of outputs under Component 3. The Consultant will assist in the development of viable ABS agreement(s) based on experience and mapping of best practices and risks from existing ABS agreements globally. Specific duties among others include: (i) coordinate with R&D institutions and monitor business development activities of participating stakeholders; (ii) qualify inclusion in private-public partnerships, regional investment plans, and community assistance programs that can supplement GR development in targeted regions; (iii) to guide and facilitate the preparation of a localized community resource management plan that would uphold the principles of conservation, responsible use & operations, inclusivity, and equitable sharing of benefits derived from GR development; (iv) lead in the finalization of an ABS agreement and the activities that will lead to its actualization. 64 months (engaged throughout the implementation duration) (USD 2800 per month); Total: USD 179,200; Environment and Social Safeguards Specialist will be working closely with the Project Manager in ensuring that the project is implementing the UNDP SES policy. The Consultant will provide overall guidance on developing/implementing the project safeguard related plans. 60 months days 6 years [Year 1-4 = 12 months; Year 5-6 = 6 months] (USD 2800 per month) Total: USD 168,000; ABS Research Expert. A Consultant may be engaged to assist and provide technical guidance to an ongoing research or product development. Total Contract Amount: 60,000; Project National Technical Advisor supporting all outputs under Component 3 (5 months per year for 6 years; USD2650 per month) Total: USD 79,500; Project Chief Technical Advisor supporting all outputs under Component 3 (5 months per year for 6 years; USD1600 per month) Total: USD 48,000; Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist supporting all outputs under Component 3 (5 months per year for 6 years; USD2200 per month) Total: USD 66,000; Communications Officer supporting all outputs under Component 3 (5 months per year for 6 years; USD2200 per month) Total: USD 66,000. Total: USD 666,700
----	---

(ii) Midterm Review and Terminal Evaluation costs in ProDoc (\$90,000) don't match the costs indicated in the M&E Plan (\$96,000) – please review and revise accordingly.

Component 4	
29	71200 International Consultant: Midterm review consultant (Total contract amount: USD25,000) and Terminal evaluation consultant (Total contract amount: USD25,000). Total: USD 50,000
30	71300 Local Consultant: Midterm review consultant (Total contract amount: USD20,000) and Terminal evaluation consultant (Total contract amount: USD20,000) Total: USD 40,000

GEF M&E requirements	Indicative costs (US\$)	Time frame
Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget:		
Inception Workshop	8,000	Within 60 days of CEO endorsement of this project.
Inception Report	None	Within 90 days of CEO endorsement of this project.
M&E of GEF Core Indicators and Project Results Framework	36,000	Annually and at mid-point and closure
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	None ¹⁴	Annually typically between June-August
Monitoring of ESMF	Covered above under monitoring of p roject results framework	On-going.
See ESMF Annex 8 and related management plans		
Supervision missions	None ^[1]	Annually
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR)	48,000	12 February 2024
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE)	48,000	11 August 2026
Total Indicative Cost	140,000	

(iii) Several activities charged to the PMC (box 33 in ProDoc) are part of the TOR of the Project Manager (i.e. Project management, technical, and administrative oversight and inputs of the Project Manager. This includes preparation of work plan and budget, ensuring alignment of activities in the approved workplan, risk management addressing bottlenecks and issues in implementing activities, partnership building - see below) – the double charge is non-acceptable. Also, all activities referred to the Monitoring and Evaluation of the project need to be charged to the M&E Plan, not to the PMC – please amend accordingly.

Project Management Cost	
33	71800 Contractual Services-Imp Partn: Project management, technical, and administrative oversight and inputs of the Project Manager. This includes preparation of work plan and budget, ensuring alignment of activities in the approved workplan, risk management addressing bottlenecks and issues in implementing activities, partnership building, participation and monitoring of activities, review of project progress and capturing the outputs and accomplishments of all outcomes in project reports (USD1,000 per month for 6 years). Total: USD72,000
34	72500 Supplies: Cost of office supplies amounting to USD300 per year for 6 years of implementation. Total: USD 1,800
35	72800 Information Technology Equipment: These are costs of IT equipment to be procured for use of project staff at the national level PMU (laptops, printer/scanner, LCD projector). Total: USD 5,000
36	74100 Professional Services: Financial NIM audit and spot-checks during the course of the project implementation; HACT Assessment for IP and/or partner agencies during Year 4 Total: USD 129,460

10/8/2020

No. The proponents overlooked this comment from the last review:

The geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place, are provided on Annex E and PRODOC Annex 1.

However there is no map in section 1b. Please include a copy of that map in section 1b

Please resubmit after the map has been included in section 1b.

10/19/2020

No. Please correct the errors in the portal with the classification of cofinancing. The co-financing documents explicitly mention that the co-financing is “Public Investment”, but still Table C in the portal still shows them as “Grant”.

10/21/2020

No. The same problem remains in the portal. (i) Province of Albay and (ii) province of Sorsogon is indicated in the letter as “public finance” but is currently listed as “grant” in the portal in Table C. , please change the type of financing to public investment so it is consistent with the cofinance letters. Please double check the portal before resubmitting.

2/1/2021

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project that responds to the recent audit findings.

UNDP 05/14/2021

The checklist has been included in the ProDoc package as Annex 23.

As discussed with the GEF Secretariat, the Institutional Arrangements / Governance and Management Arrangements, have been adjusted to reflect UNDP’s provision of limited execution support services associated with direct payments of goods and services procured by BMB-DENR, the Implementing Partner / Executing Agency (IP) for this project. This relates to the required management response to an elevated risk rating of the (IP) resulting from recent audit findings and spot checks.

Further details can be found in the Governance and Management Arrangements, Section VII of the ProDoc and the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section of the CEO-ER. 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 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. Finally, please note that the following annexures have been included in the resubmission package: a) letter from BMB-DENR to the GEF OFP in the Philippines (Annex 24a); b) letter from the OFP to the GEF Secretariat (Annex 24b); c) Letter of Agreement (LOA) between the UNDP and BMB-DENR requesting UNDP support services (Annex 24c), and; d) GEF audit checklist (Annex 23).