

# Securing Long-Term Sustainability of Multi-functional Landscapes in Critical River Basins of the Philippines

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10532

**Countries**

Philippines

**Project Name**

Securing Long-Term Sustainability of Multi-functional Landscapes in Critical River Basins of the Philippines

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

3/22/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/10/2020

**Program Manager**

Paul Hartman

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### 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

3/30/2020

Yes, the project is aligned with relevant BD and LD FA elements.

Cleared

## **Agency Response**

### **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**

3/30/2020

1. For component 1, it is not clear that the activity to create an enabling environment (a single Joint Administrative Order on LDN) is sufficient to achieve the goal of 'realization of the National Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target'. Please clarify how this would be the case in the narrative or expand this activity in Table B.
2. Given the resources dedicated to the project, targeting five river basins seems highly ambitious, particularly given the size and description of the basins as indicated in Annex G. Please ensure that the ability to undertake meaningful engagement at the field level is aligned with the available resources and explain how this is the case.
3. Please spell out acronyms the first time that they are used in the narrative.
4. While Payment for Ecosystem Services seems to be a highly important project strategy, it is also a very complex one to implement. Very little information is provided as to why it's thought the PES activities planned have an opportunity to be successful in the selected river basins.

04/09/20

The role of the JAO as a prerequisite that is supplemented by planning and on-the-ground management necessary to realize the LDN target is now clear. A clearer explanation has also been provided on the role of PES in the project as well as a clearer rationale as to why it is thought to be a useful strategy in the CDORB.

Cleared

## Agency Response

04/07/2020 UNDP:

1) The importance of the Joint Administrative Orders in the Philippines is outlined on page number 13 and in footnote # 26. The issuing of Joint Administrative Orders is not sufficient to achieve project outputs, outcomes or objectives, but they are essential requisites, as they provide the involved institutions with directions, as to their mandates etc. The JAOs also instruct the different entities about their areas of responsibilities. Thus, with the JAOs in place, the project's aim to integrate Biodiversity-Friendly Agricultural Practices (BDFAP) and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices into planning and on-the-ground management will be completed through a guided government coordination and approach (at all levels). To clarify this, new texts, highlighted in yellow, have been added on page number 14.

2). The GEF and Co-financing investment of the proposed project will be almost exclusively focused on activities implemented within the Cagayan de Oro River Basin (CDORB) area. However, some actions, mainly under Component 1, will be implemented at national level, and under the same component training will be provided to relevant Government entities and other stakeholders from the five river basins. This important activity was included outside of the CDORB because the trainings will kickstart the planning process in the five river basins, consequently, the ensuring the upscaling and replication of the GEF projects in five priority basins. In addition, strategic workplans towards enhancing the river basin management plans will be approved expediting the planning processes in these basins. For the reason rightly pointed out on the review comment, the main focus of the project is on the CDORB to find the right balance between available project resources and scope. It should be noted that the inclusion of *Annex G* in the PIF as an illustration of the upscaling potential of the proposed project.

3) Thank you for drawing attention to this, acronyms have been spelled out on the first use.

4) Schemes related to Payment for Ecosystem Services are not new to the Philippines and local engagement in these has occurred in many different parts of the country. As mentioned on page number 25 of the PIF the private sector partners Del Monte Philippines and Unifrutti are implementing PES Schemes in the Bukidnon province in which CDORB is also located. As noted on page number 17 the proposed project will, with regard to its PES work, draw lessons learned from previous and ongoing small-scale PES initiatives in CDORB. This sentence has now been expanded to include .... *as well as from elsewhere in the Philippines*....

Although the Philippines' experience in PES, at least in the CDORB area, is based on small-scale "input-based" interventions, they have nonetheless been successful in the sense that the schemes have buyer and seller acceptance and buy-in, and that they are being implemented based on established protocols and agreed terms. As such, the PES work done so far provides for ample examples of the successful trust building exercises needed to set up PES Schemes. The next step, and which is the one the proposed project will pursue, is how to broaden the scope of the PES schemes and make them into a valuable tool in watershed management.

To further clarify this, new texts, highlighted in yellow, are added on page number 20 and page number 22 of the PIF.

### 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

3/30/2020

It is unclear whether the investments of the national government in the river basins (into the Mt. Kitanglad and M. into Protected Areas, for Forest Land Use Planning, Integrated Watershed Management Planning, River Basin Management Council Office (RBCO) and National Greening Program of DENR) are new investments mobilized that wouldn't otherwise occur. It would seem that many of these investment are the government's responsibility and would be part of recurring costs. If this is the case they should be noted as in-kind co-financing in Table C.

04/09/20

The agency has verified that the types of investment mobilized in Table C is accurate.

Cleared

### Agency Response

04/07/2020 UNDP:

Through consultations with the project proponents, it is verified that the co-financing contributions listed on Table C *Indicative Sources of Co-financing for the Project* are investments mobilized. Additional information under subheading "Fund Source", in the co-financier column, is added on Table C. Investment mobilized are not part of the recurring expenditure, rather they are resources allotted as part of the government financed projects, with definite start and end dates, which will contribute towards the proposed GEF project's objective.

**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

3/30/2020

Yes, the proposed financing in Table D is in line with GEF policies.

Cleared

## **Agency Response**

The STAR allocation?

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

## **Agency Response**

The focal area allocation?

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

3/30/2020

We note in the the LOE that the OPF has requested to apply the marginal adjustments of US\$1,729,270 from Biodiversity (BD) to Land Degradation (LD) STAR Allocation.

## **Agency Response**

n/a

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

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

## **Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

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

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

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**

3/30/2020

Yes, the PPG requested is within the allowable cap.

Cleared

**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**

3/30/2020

The core indicators are calculated using acceptable guidelines.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

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**

3/30/2020

Yes, the project is properly tagged with appropriate keywords.

Cleared

**Agency Response****Part II – Project Justification**

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

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

3/30/2020

The project description does a reasonably good job explaining the global environmental problems including root causes and barriers. However some questions remain



1. Most of the tropical forest in the landscape is in 2 the PAs, which are also where the greatest environmental benefits are located. Are these PAs under threat? If so, it's not clear how the project activities will be addressing these threats. Please clarify
2. As 5,000 hectares of forest lands outside the PAs (3% of the basin area) were lost due to deforestation for agriculture land use, it appears that these lands are the target of the main interventions of the project. Yet, it's not clear what the global importance of this land is, as opposed to PAs where the importance is clear?

04/09/20

The indirect benefits to the protected areas of project activities have been clarified, as has the importance of the forest lands outside of the PAs where the bulk of the sub-national initiatives will take place. During the PPG phase, we request further examination and justification of the overall global environmental importance of the target area for intervention, including more clearly linking how proposed activities will generate biodiversity benefits across the landscape.

Cleared

### Agency Response

04/07/2020 UNDP:

The threats to PAs within the project site are those commonly observed in most PAs around the world. For example, illegal hunting, illegal collection of Non-Timber Forest Products, including collection of firewood and ornamental plants, encroachment, to name a few. These are also the same issues observed within CDORB. For example, in Mount Kitanglad Range National Park, historically hunting and illegally cutting trees to meet the household necessity and to supplement the income are attributed as primary threats. Studies have showed that augmenting the income through multi-cropping practices can significantly reduce the threats to the PAs.

Measures to curb this issues directly have been taken over the past years through the implementation of a number of conservation focused projects working with the Protected Areas (i.e. New Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project (NewCAPP) 2010-2015; Biodiversity and Watersheds Improved for Stronger Economy and Ecosystems Resilience (B+Wiser) 2012-2018; and Integrated Natural Resources and Environmental Management (INREM) 2014-2019).

The project will work in the broader productive landscape focusing improving the agricultural farming practices and making them more sustainable and biodiversity sensitive, this will indirectly reduce the threats to the protected areas found within the CDORB. The project activities, which has focus on the communities living outside the PAs and production landscapes, will reduce threats indirectly to PAs primarily in two ways: a) creating the biodiversity friendly environment in the production landscapes in the surrounding areas that will result in stronger and wider area network for animals (mammals, birds, insects, etc.) forage and movement; and b) through its activities the project will reduce threats to the PAs by improving productivity and sustainability in the landscape as a result of BDFAP and SLM practices. For example, as part of the BDFAP Practices, farmers will be encouraged to use organic fertilizers and biological methods of the pest and herb controls. Such changes in use would benefit the PAs also, improved water quality, river ecosystem health and ecosystem services to species inhabiting the PAs.

In another example, the proposed project's focus on use of local and traditional crops, as well as multi-cropping, will also facilitate an improvement of the wildlife habitat in the productive landscape and created an improved network of the wildlife movement within surrounding areas of the PAs. Multi-cropping system will allow farmers to higher income source general and utilization of the land in sustainable manner.

Similarly, the project's engagement with the IP communities, which are having farming plots within the PAs Buffer Zones and on Ancestral Domain lands, is expected to result in an increase in income generation which in turn would lessen the potential reliance on illegal harvesting of natural resources from within the PAs and/or the Buffer Zones.

The respective PAs are within the management of DENR Region X. For each of them there is a Protected Area Office operating via annual budget allocation, and a Protected Area Management Board (PAMB) which is the PA's policy decision making body. In addition to the annual budget allocations, the Provincial Local Government Unit (PLGU) of Bukidnon and some of the adjacent municipalities also provide financial resources to the PAs annually, as do private entities, like UniFrutti, and Hineleban Foundation operating in Mt. Kitanglad PA.

2) The global importance of the 5,000 ha is that restoration will contribute to the Philippines Voluntary LDN targets, UNCCD. Please refer to the Philippines LDN target here. The Philippines plan to demonstrate the role of LDN at the river basin level as model for the 18 major river basins in the country and CDORB is one of 18 river basins selected for the LDN target. The global environmental benefits of the 5,000 ha restoration will result in a) improved forest ecosystem goods and services and b) GHG benefits from the carbon sequestration over the 20-year period.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

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

3/30/2020

Baseline projects are described. Please address the points below:

1. A better description of the baseline that the project will add to (not just existing initiatives) is required in section 2. This would help to establish what would be the "business as-usual" scenario without the project that will later will help to clarify the alternative scenario and incremental reasoning of the project. We understand that some of this is captured in section 5, but it should be better represented in section 2.
2. The agency should investigate whether the GEF 6 "Integrated Approach in the Management of Major Biodiversity Corridors Project"(9584), or the FAO "Enhancing Biodiversity, Maintaining Ecosystem Flows, Enhancing Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Land Management and the Restoration of Degraded Forestlands" (9554) might serve as suitable baseline projects.

04/09/20

The baseline description has been strengthened and is now clearer.

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

04/07/2020 UNDP:

1) To further clarify the “business as-usual” scenario without the project interventions new text, highlighted in yellow, has been included under section 2 Baseline scenario and associated projects page number 13.

2) As per the suggestions, the projects mentioned in the comment have been added to the PIF. For the UNDP/GEF 6 project "Integrated Approach in the Management of Major Biodiversity Corridors Project"(9584) particularly Component 3 and its output 3.2 could provide for synergies, as could some of the planning processes under Component 1 (output 1.2). For the FAO/GEF project "Enhancing Biodiversity, Maintaining Ecosystem Flows, Enhancing Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Land Management and the Restoration of Degraded Forestlands" (9554) linkages do occur with regard to the project’s work on PES (output 2.5) but also with regard to the planning processes explored under output 2.2 and its focus on harmonizing restoration plans with local and regional development and land use plans. The entries are provided, highlighted in yellow, in the table on page number 13.

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

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

3/30/2020

The proposed alternative scenario is adequate but it should also build on the baseline of what would happen without the GEF described in section 2.

04/09/20

The alternative scenario description has been improved.

Cleared

#### **Agency Response**

04/07/2020 UNDP:

An introductory paragraph creating a relevant link to the project’s baseline. has been introduced to the PIF, through a new text insertion, highlighted in yellow, on page number 14.

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

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

3/30/2020

Yes, it is explained that the project is aligned with the GEF-7 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy objective 1 and will support the GEF-7 Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy objective 1.

Cleared

### **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**

3/30/2020

The incremental reasoning is well described but an opening paragraph should explain how it builds on the alternative scenario. Additionally:

1. While building the technical expertise of staff engaged in management of river basins is certainly a positive in terms of supporting proper Land Use Planning, is it just lack of training causing bad planning or is it also political will, vested interests, etc that are barriers? How will these be addressed by the project?
2. Similarly, with the regard to the decline of agrobiodiversity farming systems and local varieties/traditional crops, training is once again helpful but it is mentioned earlier in the narrative that “the shift toward more income-oriented crops [is] dictated by market forces without regard for sustainability.” How will this significant challenge be addressed?

04/09/20

The additional language provided on the political will of the government and how the project will build on this to support project goals, including land use planning is sufficient. The explanation of the project's approach to decreasing the income gap between the use of income-oriented crops and local crops in traditional agrobiodiversity systems is clarifying.

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

04/07/2020 UNDP:

1) While political will, vested interests, etc. have been strong barriers in the past and there are still some legacies within Government regarding this today, the degree to which these are apparent is on the decrease. The Philippines have in recent years experienced its fair share of natural disasters stemming from typhoons, especially typhoon Haiyan, which have produced devastating floods leading to high material and human costs. As mentioned in the PIF the CDORB, it was hit by two major flooding events in 2011 and 2012.

This have led to a common understanding within the Government of the Philippines that tackling typhoon induced floods has to be done via cross sectoral planning. It is also recognized that common approaches to watershed management addressing issues like land degradation, unsustainable agricultural practices and reduction in biodiversity and the ecosystem services they provide, are needed. The proposed project is one example of this general understanding and for instance the project's engagement in the approval of Joint Administrative Orders, a push stemming from the post recent typhoons political will and emphasized through various government departments, underlines this. A text to bring this aspect into the PIF is added, highlighted in yellow, on page number 14.

2) While it is true that farmers have over time moved away from their traditional farming methods to pursue more income-oriented crops, a main driver is that such crops increase farmers' income. The proposed project will through its activities take several steps towards eliminating or decreasing the income gap between the use of income-oriented crops and local crops in traditional agrobiodiversity systems. It will also demonstrate the financial and socioeconomic benefits of implementing BDFAP SLM practices in the farming systems. Output 2.3 *Markets and marketing strategies developed for at least three specialty products from traditional agrobiodiversity systems* will assist stakeholders in skills and technology development, enterprise development, organizational management, financial management, access to finance, market linkages and product promotion, as well as improving capacities of communities to use value-adding technologies and processes concerning traditional crops.

Furthermore, under output 2.4 *Five SLM and BDFAP related payment for ecosystem services and/or other incentive schemes developed and implemented*, the project will create mechanisms for financial incentives for respective IP and farming communities in engaging in BDFAP and SLM sustainable agricultural practices as well as will engage in the utilization of local and traditional crops in their farming systems. A text to bring this aspect into the PIF has been added, highlighted in yellow, on page number 14.

**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**

3/30/2020

Both the restoration and GHG benefits appear relatively low in the context of the GEF TF and co-financing investment that would be dedicated to the project.

04/09/20

An explanation of the how the restoration benefits estimate was derived is sufficient. We encourage further review of this estimate during PPG phase. The correction to the EXACT tool estimate has led to a more reasonable GHG estimate.

Cleared

## Agency Response

04/07/2020 UNDP:

On Restoration benefits, the total area is estimated through extensive stakeholder consultation and using the Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis on readily available geodata. According to analysis results, this is the land available for restoration in the basin. However, the estimates will be revisited during the PPG phase, during which more recent data will be analyzed, to identify additional land that may be available for restoration.

The EX-ACT estimate is revised, the following changes are made to the estimates:

1. The new total estimate for 20-year period is 3,418,697 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq. Estimated benefit realization at approximately 1.01 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq./\$. Changes made on the Table F and in the body of the PIF where relevant.
2. Annex F Core Indicator Sheet updated with the new estimates
3. Annex H updated with the new estimate details.

The new estimation entailed revisiting the improved agricultural practices areas (EXACT Section 3.1.2). The original estimates did not accurately capture total areas planned for the improvement agricultural practices. The errors are corrected to accurately estimate tCO<sub>2</sub>eq.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/30/2020

The potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up are adequately described for the PIF stage. We encourage further development of these in the PPG phase.

A preliminary geo-reference and project maps are supplied.

Cleared

## 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

A preliminary geo-reference and project maps are supplied.

### Agency Response

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

3/30/2020

The project description doesn't specifically detail stakeholder engagement to date but indicates a plan will be developed during the project design stage. It would be helpful for the agency to clarify with whom it has engaged thus far.

04/09/20

The PIF now better details stakeholder engagement.

Cleared

### Agency Response

04/07/2020 UNDP:

As part of the current formulation process a Technical Working Group (TWG) was established in September 2019 to provide input to and review the overall formulation. Members of the TWG are relevant departments from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, Department of Agriculture, the Philippine Statistics Authority and Civil Society Organization (CSO) partners represented by the Samdhana Institute and Haribon Foundation. In addition, a series of consultations were held during 2019 to seek comments, advise and input to the project concept and overall scope. (see highlighted text added to pages number 22-23).

A table presenting the timing and the parties consulted has also been included in *Annex B*, as has a table of the TWG members.

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**

3/30/2020

While we understand that the gender analysis will occur during PPG phase, the information provided on gender is very general and not reflective of the specific context in the five basins. We request more information on gender considerations with regard to the local context of the project.

04/09/20

Further details have been provided on the gender context in the target landscape

Cleared

**Agency Response**

04/07/2020 UNDP:

Gender related information has been included in the PIF providing for additional national and local context noting that while the Philippines is one of the ten most gender equal countries in the world, only 33% of those employed in the agriculture, forestry and fishing sectors in Region X where CDORB is located are women (see highlighted text added to page number 23).

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

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

3/30/2020

Discussion of private sector companies that will be engaged by the project is strong and involvement of these actors will be a critical to its success.



Cleared

## **Agency Response**

### **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**

3/30/2020

Risks, including climate change, are laid out, as is a initial description of mitigation measures that will be further developed during the project design.

Cleared

## **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**

3/30/2020

An institutional arrangement, including a project board and PMU, are outlined. A description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-Financed projects and other initiatives is missing.

04/09/20

The mechanism through which coordination with relevant GEF financed project has now been specified

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

04/07/2020 UNDP:

The project will be using the Department of Agriculture's internal and external corporation and coordination setup both nationally and internationally to ensure coordination and synergies with projects and programs relevant to the proposed project. The scope of the project/program cooperation and the avenues for interactions and potential cooperation, including the coordination mechanisms, will be outlined during the PPG phase. (see highlighted text added to pages number 18 and 26).

**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**

3/30/2020

The project has cited alignment with the country's national strategies and plans, including the revised PBSAP, the Philippine's 2018 Voluntary Land Degradation Neutrality targets, and Aichi Targets.

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

**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**

3/30/2020

The plan for knowledge management that has been described is in line with GEF requirements and will help contribute to impact.

Cleared

### **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**

3/30/2020

Yes, the project has been endorsed by the Philippines GEF OFP, whose name and position were checked against the GEF database.

Cleared

### **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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

### Agency Response

1. The Agency fee in the portal is missing in Part I. Project Information. As per table D, the agency fee is \$311,030 USD. Please indicate this fee amount in Part I as well.

04/17/2020 UNDP:

Thank you for flagging this error. The agency fee of 311,030 USD is now entered on Part I Project Information section of the portal.

2. Through the LoE, the OFP allocated 150,000 USD of PPG from the LD FA. However, Table E in the Portal indicates a 50% split of the PPG between the LD and BD FAs. Please ensure that PPG FA allocation in Table E in the portal and the LoE are aligned.

Thank you for pointing this inconsistency. On Table E, Page 6 of the PIF, PPG "Programming of Funds" is now edited to show only "LD". On the portal, total of 150,000 USD is entered only as LD FA, which is aligned with the amount on the LoE.

3. On Environmental and Social Safeguards, please provide the completed UNDP Social and Environmental Screening (SESP) Checklist, or more indicative information that is in line with the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards. Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project, as well measures to address these, should be detailed.

The latest version of the SESP checklist, cleared by UNDP safeguards team, is uploaded to the portal.

### GEFSEC 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

3/30/2020

No, the PIF isn't recommended for technical clearance. Please address the comments.

04/09/20

No. Please address the following comments:

1. The Agency fee in the portal is missing in Part I. Project Information. As per table D, the agency fee is \$311,030 USD. Please indicate this fee amount in Part I as well.
2. Through the LoE, the OFP allocated 150.000 USD of PPG from the LD FA. However, Table E in the Portal indicates a 50% split of the PPG between the LD and BD FAs. Please ensure that PPG FA allocation in Table E in the portal and the LoE are aligned.
3. On Environmental and Social Safeguards, please provide the completed UNDP Social and Environmental Screening (SESP) Checklist, or more indicative information that is in line with the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards. Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project, as well measures to address these, should be detailed.

04/20/20

Yes, the PIF is recommended for technical clearance. Requested corrections have been made and the latest version of the SESP checklist, detailing Environmental and Social Safeguards for the project, has been uploaded to the portal.

#### **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**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

#### PIF Recommendation to CEO

#### Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

**OBJECTIVE AND KEY INTERVENTIONS:** Through the “Securing Long-Term Sustainability of Multi-functional Landscapes in Critical River Basins of the Philippines (10532), the UNDP seeks \$3,273,990 in GEF financing. This project aims to create an enabling environment for the realization of the Philippines National Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target, and to mainstream biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices (BDFAP) in the Cagayan de Oro River Basin (CDORB). The project is structured around three components: (1) National LDN and BDFAP policy created and capacity for implementation strengthened; (2) Demonstration of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices and BDFAP; and (3) Awareness-raising, knowledge management, and M&E. Project interventions will ensure sustainable land use in the farmed areas of important Protected Area buffer zones. This will be done through capacity building and training focused on Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and biodiversity-friendly agricultural Practices (e.g. use and preservation of indigenous/traditional crop varieties), and enhancement and valuation of ecosystems goods and services in targeted productive landscape. GEF financing of the project is estimated to leverage \$24.5m in co-financing.

**CONTEXT, BASELINE, INCREMENTAL REASONING:** More than a fifth of the Cagayan de Oro River Basin’s land area is made up of two protected areas: Mt. Kitanglad Range Natural Park and Mt. Kalatungan. Both of these are important KBAs and designated ASEAN heritage parks for their unique biological diversity. Mt. Kitanglad supports substantial populations of many montane forest specialists (eg. Mindanao Lorikeet, Mindanao Racquet-tail, Mindanao Scops-owl, Slaty-backed Jungle-flycatcher, Red-eared Parrotfinch and Apo Myna) and harbors an important population of Philippine Eagle. Mt Kitanglad range is rich in gymnosperms and tree ferns, and more than 300 species of flora used by the indigenous people for herbal medicine. The basin is ancestral home to four (Talaandig, Manobo, Higanonon, and Bukidnon) tribes of indigenous peoples with claims of ancestral domain.

The basin also hosts vast areas of corporate plantations of banana and pineapple for the country’s primary horticulture exporters – Del Monte Philippines, Dole & Uni Fruitti. Past aggressive expansion of corporate agriculture into fertile lands drove migrant farmers and small holders into fragile infertile slopes. Continuous tillage on

these slopes, slash-and-burn agriculture, timber poaching, forest fires, and wildlife hunting aggravated rural poverty, biodiversity loss, fragmentation of habitats and ecosystems, and contributed to GHG emissions. Erosion of soils has caused mudflows, flooding and inundation of downstream farms and settlements.

The project will build on baseline work of related projects implemented in CDORB. In the baseline scenario national plans and programs are in place, but lack of coordination and defined responsibilities between government actors hinders effective implementation of LDN priorities and the BDFAP Framework. Land and river basin plans will continue to be developed without understanding trade-offs nor considering the value of ecosystem services. Small-holder farmers will continue focusing on monocrops and cash-crops as they do not have knowledge of the benefits nor necessary training in mixed cropping, SLM, BDFAP and agrobiodiversity conservation interventions.

The GEF incremental investment will create an enabling environment supporting LDN priorities/targets and BDFAP implementation, ensure conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity that would otherwise be lost or decline, and conserve important agrobiodiversity in the production landscape. At the national level, the project will facilitate the creation of the legal and regulatory framework for the implementation of both LDN priorities/targets and the BDFAP Framework. At sub-national level the project will improve the technical capacity of basin planners and managers to use decision-support tools and methods for integrated landscape planning, and increase the awareness/capacity of river basin managers and national agency staff to support the scaling up of integrated landscape management approaches. The project will also generate incentives in form of ecosystem service payments to support wide-scale adoption of SLM practices, BDFAP, and preserving the use of traditional agrobiodiversity systems in vast tracts of croplands.

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:** The project supports the revised PBSAP (2015-2028), specifically the agrobiodiversity interventions of: i) Increase the number of in situ and ex-situ sites that conserve and propagate diverse indigenous species and varieties; ii) Increase the number of communities practicing heritage agriculture that adopts dynamic conservation programs and sustains important traditional varieties; iii) Integrate conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity in PA plans as well as plans for conservation areas outside the PA system; and iv) Incorporate agrobiodiversity concerns in enhanced CLUPs and other LGU programs. The project also supports the attainment of the Philippine's 2018 Voluntary Land Degradation Neutrality targets and the National biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices Framework. Finally, the project contributes to Aichi Targets 2, 4, 5, 7, 13, 14, 15, 18 and 19.

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT BENEFITS:** GEBs resulting from the project include 53,159ha of landscapes under improved practices, 5,000ha of land restored, and 3.4 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e mitigated. The project will target nearly 75,000 direct beneficiaries, including at least 1,000 households from indigenous people (IP) communities engaged in growing selected local varieties and traditional crops.