

TERMINAL EVALUATION

of the

PARTNERSHIPS FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION:
MAINSTREAMING IN LOCAL AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPES
(BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS PROJECT)

June 2017

Evaluation Team Members

Ronaldo R. Gutierrez

Policy and Institutional Evaluation Expert/Report Author

Elpidio V. Peria

Biodiversity Mainstreaming Expert/Contributing Author

OPENING PAGE

Title	Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming In Local Agricultural Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project)
UNDP-GEF Project ID No.	00074945
Evaluation Time Frame	October - November 2016
Date of Report	10 February 2017
Region and Countries Included in the Project	Asia/Philippines
GEF Operational Program/ Strategic Program	Capacity-Building
Implementing Partner Other Project Partners	Department of Environment and Natural Resources – Protected Areas & Wildlife Bureau (DENR-PAWB) ¹ Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), Conservation International – Philippines, Haribon Foundation, Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc. (PBCFI), Lake Mainit Development Alliance (LMDA), Philippine Eagle Foundation (PEF), and Fauna and Flora International (FFI)
Evaluation Team Members	Ronaldo R. Gutierrez Elpidio V. Peria

Disclaimer

The analysis and recommendations contained in this document represent the opinions of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Biodiversity Partnerships Project, the Philippine Government, the United Nations Development Programme, Global Environmental Facility or any other person or entity.

¹ Now referred to as the Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB).

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
Project Summary Table	5
Table 1. Project Summary	5
Brief Project Description	5
Evaluation Rating Table.....	8
Table 2. Evaluation Rating.....	8
Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons	8
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	12
1. INTRODUCTION	15
Purpose of the Evaluation	15
Scope and Methodology	15
Structure of the Evaluation Report	16
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	17
Project Start and Duration	17
Problems that the Project Sought to Address	17
Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project	18
Baseline Indicators Established	18
Table 3. Baseline Indicators.....	19
Main Stakeholders	21
Expected Results	22
Unexpected Results.....	23
3. FINDINGS	24
3.1 Project Design/Formulation	24
Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic/strategy; Indicators)	24
Assumptions and Risks.....	25
Table 4. Risks and Mitigation Strategies.....	25
Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design	27
Planned Stakeholder participation.....	28
Replication approach	28

UNDP comparative advantage	29
Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector	29
Management arrangements	30
3.2 Project Implementation	30
Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)	30
Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)	31
Feedback from M&E activities used in adaptive management	32
Project Finance.....	33
Table 5. BPP Financing	33
Monitoring and evaluation.....	34
Implementing Agency (UNDP) Execution	36
Executing Agency Execution.....	36
Overall Project Implementation/Execution, Coordination and Operational Issues.....	36
3.3 Project Results.....	37
Overall results (attainment of objectives).....	37
Relevance	56
Effectiveness	57
Efficiency	58
Country ownership.....	58
Mainstreaming.....	59
Sustainability.....	68
Impact	69
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons.....	70
Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project	70
Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.....	70
Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives.....	71
Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.....	71
Best Practices	71
Worst Practices	71
5. ANNEXES	72
Annex A. TOR.....	72
Annex B. Itinerary.....	73

Annex C. List of Persons Interviewed	75
Annex D. List of Resource Persons	78
Annex E. List of Documents Reviewed	80
Annex F. List of DRAFT Documents Reviewed	85
Annex G. Evaluation Question Matrix	87
Annex H. Audit Trail.....	94
Annex I. Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form	138

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Summary Table

Table 1. Project Summary

Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming In Local Agricultural Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project)				
PIMS No.	2904		At Endorsement (in USD)	At Completion (in USD)
GEF Project ID	3859			
UNDP Project ID	00074945	GEF Financing	4,500,000	4,339,689
Country	Philippines	UNDP	301,404	900,589
Region	Asia Pacific	Government	10,264,598	9,433,936
Focal Area	To mainstream biodiversity conservation in production landscapes/ seascapes and sectors Strategic Program under Strategic Objective Two: Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity	Others	1,956,059	1,485,184
		Total Co-Financing	12,522,061	11,819,709
		Total Project Cost	17,022,061	16,159,398
				(as of Dec 2016)
Operational Program	Biodiversity	ProDoc Signature Project Start Date/Inception Workshop		September 2010 December 2011
Executing Entity	UNDP	Closing Date	Proposed: August 2016	Actual: June 2017
Other Partners	NEDA, DA, DILG, DTI, NCIP, DOT, PCW, HLURB, League of Provinces, Cities and Municipalities, CI-Philippines, Haribon Foundation, FFI, PEF, LMDA, PBCFI, UP ISSI, Province of Quirino, CSU, ISU			

Brief Project Description

The Philippines is considered as one of the world's most biologically rich countries. It is one of only two countries in the world that is considered both a megadiversity site and a global conservation hotspot, the other being Madagascar.

The NIPAS Act under R.A. 7586 has been the primary government response to protect Philippine biodiversity. Unfortunately, since the time of its enactment in 1992, only 13 protected areas have been officially established, with more than a hundred still awaiting congressional enactment as full-pledged NIPAS sites.² In the meantime, divergent national policies on agriculture, industry and other aspects of the national economy have adversely

² Regarded as "initial components" under the NIPAS Act.

affected the country's biodiversity resulting in incompatible activities like mining or mono-crop plantations being put up next to protected areas.

At the local level where the importance of biodiversity is more keenly felt, LGUs responsible for managing these landscapes within their respective territorial jurisdictions are hampered by capacity constraints. Biodiversity concerns are rarely integrated in the local development planning and provide no relief for unsustainable land-use practices.

These discordant policies at both the national and local levels have been partly blamed for the fragmentation that now characterizes Philippine forests. The Project was conceived to address this situation of (i) inadequate policies, systems, tools and capacities at the national level; (ii) weak capacities of LGUs and lack of tools to mainstream biodiversity; and relatedly, (iii) failure to integrate biodiversity concerns in the local development planning process. Using an integrated approach, it aimed to strengthen enabling policies at the national level, enhance capacities of LGUs, and demonstrate these in pilot sites. More specifically, it targeted the following major outcomes and expected outputs:

1. National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU level biodiversity conservation efforts;
 - 1.1 Policy and tools for biodiversity impact assessments of national agricultural and natural resource policies, plans and programmes adopted by DA and DENR
 - 1.2 National-level policy, program and technical capacity to support biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices
 - 1.3 Enhanced national-level system for regulation of trade in wild plant and animal resources
 - 1.4 Policies to encourage investments in biodiversity-friendly business opportunities
 - 1.5 National-level systems for knowledge management
2. LGUs encompassing 1.6 million hectares in five key biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures; and
 - 2.1 Tools, guidelines and methods developed to mainstream biodiversity in local development policy making, planning, budgeting, M&E
 - 2.2 Toolkits and implementation capacity for application of SEAs, as well as landscape and seascape level natural resource management, across multiple LGUs
 - 2.3 LGU-level policy framework and technical capacity to support biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices in critical eco-regions
 - 2.4 Strengthened local regulation of trade in wild plant and animal resources

- 2.5 Regulatory structures and incentive systems to encourage the development of biodiversity-friendly businesses, including investor codes of conduct, established at the LGU level
- 2.6 Intra-LGU data and knowledge-sharing and advocacy network to synthesize and project lessons learned into national policy- and decision-making
3. Systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering at least 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro and Mindanao).
 - 3.1 Biodiversity-friendly projects, programmes and policies achieved via impact assessments incorporated into LGU planning process.
 - 3.2 Transboundary integrated planning achieved via the implementation of toolkits
 - 3.3 Biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices (eg. use of indigenous crop varieties), achieved via enhanced and extended standards and associated certification processes
 - 3.4 Improved regulations and enforcement of wild animal and plant gathering and trade, achieved via strengthening of permitting system and implementation of trade regulation
 - 3.5 Biodiversity-friendly investment programs promoted in selected sites
 - 3.6 Incentive systems and innovative financing programs to reduce destructive activities by PA/KBA dependent communities
 - 3.7 Data and knowledge management to underpin preceding themes.

Eight (8) KBAs were identified as pilot sites for this project, namely: the Northeastern Cagayan Key Biodiversity Area (NECKBA), Quirino Protected Landscape (QPL), Mt. Siburan Key Biodiversity Area (MSKBA), Malampaya Sound Protected Landscape and Seascape (MSPLS), Central Panay Mountains (CPM), Northern Negros National Park (NNNP), Lake Mainit Key Biodiversity Area (LMKBA) and Mt. Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary (MHRWS).

The Project was signed in September 2010 to be implemented over five (5) years. However, it took more than a year to commence implementation. It was managed by the DENR-BMB and the overall planned cost was US\$17.022 million with US\$4.5 million from GEF and co-financing worth US\$12.522 (UNDP: US\$0.301 million; Philippine Government: US\$10.265 million; Others: US\$1.956 million).

Evaluation Rating Table³

Table 2. Evaluation Rating

Criteria	Rating
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
Overall quality of M&E	S
M&E design at start up	S
M&E Plan Implementation	MS
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	MS
Implementing Agency (UNDP) Execution	MS
Executing Agency (DENR-BMB) Execution	MU
Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	MS
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	R
Effectiveness	MS
Efficiency	MU
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U)	
Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	ML
Financial Resources	ML
Socio-economic	ML
Institutional Framework and Governance	ML
Environmental	ML
Overall Project Results	MS

Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

The *Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project)* (hereinafter, the “Project” or “BPP”) was an ambitious undertaking that sought to integrate biodiversity values in the Philippine policy and institutional settings that exert significant, albeit indirect, influence on Philippine forests. To the extent that the project has managed to integrate biodiversity in the preparation/updating of land-use plans of LGUs with the adoption of this policy by the pertinent agency, it achieved a solid and

³ The Evaluation Team included an additional criterion on Mainstreaming with the Project rated as MODERATE (out of possible ratings of STRONG, MODERATE or WEAK mainstreaming).

undeniable gain. The benefits from this integration are far-reaching and will provide a very valuable template for other LGUs to follow in the sustainable management of their forests and natural resources.

Similarly, it has managed to engage the DA in an ongoing dialogue to integrate biodiversity considerations in its national agricultural policies. While it did not achieve the desired policy outcome in the form of a DA-DENR joint administrative order, and experiences on the ground for biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices (BDFAPs) remain a work in progress, an institutional mechanism for interagency dialogue has been set in place and local BDFAP start-ups have commenced.

On the other hand, BPP failed to achieve a similar outcome in the other thematic areas it identified for action, namely, environmental impacts, enterprise, wildlife enforcement and the setting-up of a biodiversity knowledge management system. It should be made clear that concrete steps had been taken towards these directions. However, these efforts were meager in providing relevant experience and learnings to be the basis of national policies and programmes. Moreover, the decision taken in the course of the project to implement these thematic areas in isolation of the others defeated the very purpose for which the project was conceived—to foster partnerships with different agencies and determine how policies, programmes and activities from seemingly unrelated programs interact and thus prevent the fragmentation of the forests brought about by divergent and conflicting policies.

In the end, the same threats to biodiversity plaguing the sites at the start of the project continue to do so and it remains to be seen if BPP's successes in biodiversity integration with land-use and agriculture will make a dent on this complex problem. Overall, the project is rated only as MODERATELY SATISFACTORY.

One lesson that can be immediately gleaned from the major accomplishment of the BPP is that the land-use planning process presents a highly valuable and continuing entry point to introduce biodiversity values to LGUs. This cyclical process (whether new or for revision) is legally mandated and is sometimes done perfunctorily especially in the treatment of public/forest lands, which from a conservation perspective, often coincides with KBAs. By proactively assisting LGUs in the planning process, the DENR has a window of opportunity to integrate biodiversity in the land-use planning process and affect all the other plans that depend on it.

The following are the project recommendations:

Design Level

1. Formulation of projects should be more realistic and less overly ambitious especially when the target outcome is in the nature of policy change at the national level. Alternative

courses of action should also be incorporated so as not to be tied down by the same forces that have caused the policy inaction in the first place.

2. There should be a healthy balance between innovation and scale on the one hand, and learning from experience and consolidating gains, on the other. Innovation requires time and resources to manifest gains while consolidation builds on social capital developed by previous projects.
3. Means for cross-learning should be included as a key component in projects consisting of sites at varying stages of development so as to allow regular sharing of experiences and ideas.

Implementation Level

4. Identify arrangements beforehand to address complications attendant with working with the government as local responsible party (e.g., budgetary constraints, protocol, staffing, etc.). For instance, include UNDP-work in the IPCR of project staff who are eventually absorbed by the agency, and institute fund management seminars to the finance staff of the local field offices to familiarize them with the different accounting processes.
5. Document the role of women in conservation and how the project empowers women.
6. Augment the MTE & TE with regular monitoring to elicit more evidence and timely and relevant recommendations for the project.
7. Project Board members should have a bigger role in M&E.

Follow-up Level

8. Explore commonalities with organic agriculture to move BDFAP forward.
9. Study how the present EIA system can be tweaked to be more BD-focused, instead of pursuing BDSEA.
10. Work with DILG on how BD can be integrated in its LGU recognition system (e.g., Performance Challenge Fund) in order to improve further the quality of land-use plans.
11. Mandate DENR technical assistance to LGUs on CLUPs, not just FLUPs.
12. In KBAs that overlap with ancestral domains, document the process of ADSDPP integration with CLUPs.
13. Instead of bigger transboundary plans, go back to basics by initiating BD-integration in the land-use plans of KBAs that did not fully benefit from the project (i.e., Antique and Cagayan provinces).
14. Link BDFE with BDFAP by studying the possibility of giving fiscal and non-fiscal incentives to agricultural activities that do not use pesticides, GMOs, among others. Pilot-test in QPL.

15. Continue the process of mainstreaming through constant application and strengthening of the foundations of the project thematic areas, including increasing budgetary commitments by LGUs.
16. Instead of the usual enumeration of endangered species, identify the relevance of biodiversity to the other agencies and include these in the knowledge materials to be produced.
17. Popularize the process of biodiversity-integration in CLUPs by translating the process in more easily understandable terms using knowledge materials to be produced so other LGUs can easily follow.
18. Conduct sensitivity training beforehand for some agencies when working with local communities and IPs.

Future Directions

19. Instead of BDFEs, explore the possibility of formulating fiscal incentives or fundraising schemes that are directed towards forest protection, tree planting, etc. The funds can serve as much-needed capital for BD-friendly livelihoods (BDFLs) which can benefit IPs and POs alike and tied directly with conservation (e.g. financing of ICCAs by IPs).

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADF	Antique Development Foundation
ADSDPP	Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan
BD	Biological Diversity
BDFAP	Biodiversity-Friendly Agricultural Practice
BDFE	Biodiversity-Friendly Enterprise
BDSEA	Biodiversity-Friendly Strategic Environmental Assessment
BMB	Biodiversity Management Bureau
BPP	Biodiversity Partnerships Project
CI	Conservation International-Philippines
CPM	Central Panay Mountains
CLUP	Comprehensive Land-Use Plan
DA	Department of Agriculture
DCP	Design Center of the Philippines
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DILG	Department of Interior and Local Government
DOT	Department of Tourism
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ENRO	Environment and Natural Resources Office/r
EPATLEA	Eco-Park Agri-Tourism Livelihood Enterprise Association
FFI	Flora and Fauna International
FLUP	Forest Land-Use Plan
GEF	Global Environmental Facility

GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
HLURB	Housing and Land-Use Regulatory Board
ICCA	Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas
IP	Indigenous People
IPCR	Individual Performance Commitment Review
ITPGRFA	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
KBA	Key Biodiversity Area
KMS	Knowledge Management System
LATAGG	Lumad Almaciga Tappers Association of Gov. Generoso
LIIC	Local Investment and Incentive Code
LGU	Local Government Unit
LMDA	Lake Mainit Development Alliance
LMKBA	Lake Mainit Key Biodiversity Area
LPSC	Local Project Steering Committee
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MASREDECA	Mataga-ay Sustainable Resources Development and Conservation Association
MENRO	Municipal Environment and Natural Resources Office/r
MHRWS	Mt. Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary
MPMC	Malampaya Pancol Multipurpose Cooperative
MSKBA	Mt. Siburan Key Biodiversity Area
MSPLS	Malampaya Sound Protected Landscape and Seascape
MTE	Midterm Evaluation
NECKBA	Northeastern Cagayan Key Biodiversity Area
NewCAPP	“Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas in the Philippines” project

NGO	Non-Government Organization
NIPAS	National Integrated Protected Areas System
NNNP	Northern Negros National Park
PA	Protected Area
PAFISFA	Patag Farmers Integrated Social Forestry Association
PAMB	Protected Area Management Board
PASu	Protected Area Superintendent
PBCFI	Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc.
PEF	Philippine Eagle Foundation
PEMO	Provincial Environmental Management Office
PENRO	Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office/r
PMU	Project Management Unit
PO	People's Organization
QPL	Quirino Protected Landscape
RA	Republic Act
SIKAP	Samahang Inaasahan ng mga Katutubo sa Alimanguan, Palawan
SJVPA	San Jose Producers Association
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TIGMAMUGON	Tigbobolo Mangunguma, Mangingisda, Mamumugon Association/ Tigbobolo Bamboocraft Association
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VISFFA	Victorias Integrated Social Forestry & Farmers Association
WB	World Bank

1. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Evaluation

Per TOR, the objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of results of the BPP, to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits therefrom, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation determined if and how the results were achieved, studied the facilitating and hindering factors that affected project implementation, and identified best and worst practices that may be helpful to similar projects in the future.

Scope and Methodology

The focus of the evaluation is the BPP, assessing the same using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined in the *UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects*. It followed a participatory and consultative approach, engaging closely with the project stakeholders in order to arrive at an evidence-based conclusion that is reliable, credible and useful. Furthermore, human rights and gender perspectives were integrated into the methodology and tools used, taking into account the important role of the environment in poverty alleviation.

The relevant areas of the project were evaluated according to performance criteria using UNDP/GEF guidelines. In addition, a separate ratings criterion was developed for biodiversity mainstreaming that was adopted from gender mainstreaming in order to highlight this aspect of the project. The sources of information came from both primary and secondary data.

As regards specific methodologies, the following tools and methods were used:

- Document review & analysis – This involved the examination of various documents related to the project, a list of which can be found in Annex E.
- Key informant interviews – This involved meetings with various stakeholders who directly or indirectly participated in the project. Key actors included UN officials, government officials, PMU staff, POs, IPs and local actors. The interviews were done either individually or as a group, in person or online (Skype or email), and were based on a list of subjects that was deemed representative of the stakeholders based on the recommendations from the PMU. In instances where the Evaluation Team deemed that more information was needed based on the interviews, the team sought to contact these key informants with the PMU's assistance.
- Site visits – Given the geographic distribution of the project sites, field visits were conducted by the team to obtain local data and to be able to interview locally-based stakeholders. Except for MSKBA and MSPLS, all areas were visited allowing direct

observation and personal exchanges to take place particularly with the local expected beneficiaries of the project.

Because of the evaluation time constraints and the wide area to be covered even within the individual sites, the field visits and interviews were not as exhaustive as the Evaluation Team would have wanted. In addition, on a number of occasions, many of the personnel who were directly involved in the BPP were no longer available by the time the evaluation was conducted and the Evaluation Team had to rely on the PMU to identify suitable persons who would be qualified to speak on the project accomplishments. Lastly, in several instances, respondents who had previously confirmed cancelled at the last minute⁴ further restricting the local data gathering efforts. In the case of Mt. Siburan and Malampaya Sound, efforts to find a common time for interviews proved futile given the initial timetable for the evaluation.

These notwithstanding, the Evaluation Team tried to be as flexible as possible to accommodate the changes in itinerary so as to give the stakeholders the opportunity to have a proper and fair evaluation. The list of interviewees (Annexes C and D) and the itinerary of the site visits (Annex B) are listed in the end of this report.

Finally, in accordance with the TOR and UNDP evaluation guidelines, the first draft of this report was submitted for comment by the proper parties and a clarificatory meeting was held last May 3, 2017 to augment data that was identified as insufficient or lacking, or to clarify issues that were raised therein. This final report has since been revised to take into account said comments while maintaining the independence and objectivity required for the evaluation process.

Structure of the Evaluation Report

The report follows the format provided in the TOR which begins with an executive summary, an introductory portion and project description and development context. The evaluation findings and requisite ratings are contained in the succeeding chapter and is subdivided into observations on the design of the project, its implementation and results. The last chapter delves into the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from the project.

⁴ These included the PENRO of Victorias City for NNNP, the DENR Regional Director for Region II and the PENROs of Cagayan and Isabela for NECKBA, some barangay officials for QPL, the farmer's organization in Mainit for LMKBA, and the Mayor of Governor Generoso for MHRWS.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

Project Start and Duration

The project entitled *Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming In Local Agricultural Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project)*, also referred to as “BPP”, was signed in September 2010. However, its inception workshop was held only after a year in November 2011. The project had a five-year duration and was extended for another ten months. It will have an actual operational closing date by end of June 2017.

Problems that the Project Sought to Address

The Philippines is one of only two countries that is both a megadiversity site and a global conservation hotspot. Against the policy backdrop of the NIPAS Act which was passed by the Philippine Congress in 1992, the Philippines has managed to cover only 240 areas representing some 35% of the identified KBAs in the country. Of these, only 13 sites have graduated into full-blown legally-established protected area status.

In the meantime, incompatible policies have allowed the conversion of large swaths of land for mining, agricultural plantations, industrial parks and residential areas, among others. These, in turn, have resulted in forest fragmentation that threaten many important areas of the country for biodiversity.

At the local level, despite the significant legal leeway granted to LGUs, they are unable to properly manage the natural resources found within their territorial jurisdictions partly because of national policies incompatible with biodiversity conservation, and in part, because of lack of technical skills and experience from which they can draw lessons in properly formulating their land-use plans that meet the requirements of biodiversity for a more sustainable development.

The project identified three barriers that prevent the goal of arresting forest fragmentation. These are (a) the national policy barriers which are incompatible with or inadequate to support LGU landscape-level biodiversity conservation efforts; (b) technical and capacity barriers that prevent LGUs from mainstreaming biodiversity at the local level; and (c) knowledge barriers that prevent LGUs from learning based on well-documented site-level examples how partnerships can address landscape-level threats and foster biodiversity and sustainable use values.

BPP sought to address these barriers using an integrated approach that aimed to establish partnerships with different agencies of government responsible for many of the land-use policies incompatible with biodiversity conservation. It targeted three general outcomes, namely:

- National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU level biodiversity conservation efforts;

- LGUs encompassing 1.6 million hectares in five key biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures; and
- Systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering at least 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro and Mindanao).

Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

The proposed project has been designed to be consistent with Biodiversity Strategic Objective 2 on mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into production systems and sectors. Within said objective, the project will respond to Strategic Program 4 on “Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity”. The project will strengthen policy and regulatory frameworks at both the local level, as well as within a key sector at the national level, i.e., agriculture. Lessons learned from local level demonstrations will also be used to improve policy and decision-making frameworks at the national level.

The Project also responds to Strategic Program 5 on “Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services.” At the national level, it will work with partner agencies to strengthen the certification system for biodiversity-friendly products. At the local level, it will support LGUs in promoting the integration of biodiversity and sustainable resource management businesses in their investor codes of conduct, among others.

Having identified the critical role of LGUs as an effective entry point for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation, the immediate objective of this Project was to demonstrate how LGUs, with enhanced capacities, and working together with local and national partners, can plan and manage economic activities and growth in ways that meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives in critical eco-regions by accomplishing the three main outcomes of: (a) national-level systems, policies, tools and capacities in place to support LGU level biodiversity conservation efforts; (b) LGUs encompassing at least 1.6 million hectares in five key biogeographic regions having the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures; and (c) systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering at least 700,000 hectares across five biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro and Mindanao).

Baseline Indicators Established

The Project Document (ProDoc) established the baseline indicators for BPP which took into account the issues involved and contained the objectively verifiable indicators for the expected outputs. These are indicated in the following table:

Table 3. Baseline Indicators

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline
Objective: To demonstrate how Local Government Units (LGUs), with enhanced capacities, and working together with local and national partners, can plan and manage economic activities and growth in ways that meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives in critical biogeographic regions	Populations of at least three critically endangered species in three demonstration sites	Expected to decrease by at least 10% by end-project
	Extent of habitat fragmentation in unprotected PAs/KBAs in eight demonstration sites	Expected to increase by at least 10% by end project
	Extent of remaining natural habitat within PAs in five biogeographic regions	Expected to decrease by at least 10% in PAs in project sites by end-project
	Number of hectares in production landscapes/ waterscapes under sustainable management	No increase during the period
Outcome 1: National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU-level biodiversity conservation efforts	Agencies with policies and associated capacity to conduct biodiversity impact assessment of sectoral policies and plans	<i>None</i>
	Programmes and policies to support BDFAP in critical landscapes	No agrobiodiversity programs in AFMA plan National Action Plan for Sustainable Land management (NAP-SLM) do not include agrobiodiversity projects in buffer zones of PAs and KBAs Standards and certification schemes limited to organic agricultural production Activities to promote conservation and utilization of indigenous crops
	Systems and procedures for implementation of new regulations of trade in wild plant and animal resources	<i>None</i>
	Policies to encourage investments in biodiversity friendly business	<i>None</i>
	National biodiversity information system	PAWB biodiversity information system has limited data and

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline
		information that can be shared with LGUs, conservation NGOs and other development agencies.
Outcome 2: LGUs encompassing at least 1.6 million has. in five biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures	LGUs with tools and capacities for mainstreaming biodiversity in local development policy making, planning, budgeting and M&E systems	<i>None</i>
	LGUs with toolkits and implementation capacity for application of SEAs, as well as landscape level natural resource management, across multiple and individual LGUs	<i>None</i>
	LGU development expenditures for identifiably BD-friendly programmes and investments	<p>Only LGUs in NNNP and MSPLS have annual budget allocations for biodiversity friendly projects amounting to US \$55,562</p> <p>Other LGUs in the project sites do not have regular budget allotment to support biodiversity conservation</p> <p>Budget support to biodiversity related initiatives is negligible and sporadic</p>
	LGUs in critical biogeographic regions with policy framework and technical capacity to support biodiversity friendly agricultural practices	<i>None</i>
	LGUs in critical biogeographic regions with local regulations and capacity to implement policies on wildlife trade	<i>None</i>
	LGUs with regulatory structures and incentive systems to encourage the development of biodiversity-friendly businesses, including investor codes of conduct	<i>None</i>
	Mechanisms and capacities for intra-LGU knowledge sharing on mainstreaming biodiversity	Mechanisms exist for intra LGU sharing on environment programs and performance but not on biodiversity
	Outcome 3: Systems, policies, tools and capacities	LGU development plans at project sites complying with SEA approach,

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline
for landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering at least 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro, Mindanao)	as well as landscape level natural resources management	PA management plans and FLUPs not integrated in CLUPs
	Inter LGU cooperation in planning and regulation of natural resource use	Municipal and City LGUs plan separately and do not coordinate and harmonize their plans. Provincial Land Use Committees oversee and approves municipal and city land use plans. LGUs within PAs or KBAs do not jointly adopt any economic PES instruments
	New conservation areas established	<i>None</i>
	Farmers adopting biodiversity friendly practices	No increase over project period
	Pressures from overharvesting of wild resources	Expected to increase over total area of KBAs/PAs in project sites by 10% each year
	Private investments in biodiversity friendly business in selected project sites	<i>None</i>
	Communities receiving incentives for shifting to sustainable practices	<i>None</i>
Data and knowledge management systems to support local initiatives	Some LGUs have isolated data and knowledge management systems but not linked to national system Insufficient data to adequately monitor status and trends in biodiversity and impacts of development programs	

Main Stakeholders

As its title suggests, the project's main strategy for achieving its outcomes was based primarily on partnerships forged and hopefully, maintained even after its end of term. The DENR through the BMB (erstwhile PAWB) was the primary agency responsible for building these partnerships with other agencies of the government, namely, the DA, DILG, DTI, DOT and LGUs, together with the academe, NGOs, local communities, IP groups and other members of civil society.

Under this Project, LGUs took the front row as beneficiaries of the capacity enhancement in the different thematic areas of the Project, and mainstreaming support.

Expected Results

The Project was conceived to address the situation of: (i) inadequate policies, systems, tools and capacities at the national level; (ii) weak capacities of LGUs and lack of tools to mainstream biodiversity; and relatedly, (iii) failure to integrate biodiversity concerns in the local development planning process. Using an integrated approach, it aimed to strengthen enabling policies at the national level, enhance capacities of LGUs, and demonstrate these in pilot sites, targeting the following major outcomes and expected outputs:

1. National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU level biodiversity conservation efforts;
 - 1.1 Policy and tools for biodiversity impact assessments of national agricultural and natural resource policies, plans and programmes adopted by DA and DENR
 - 1.2 National-level policy, program and technical capacity to support biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices
 - 1.3 Enhanced national-level system for regulation of trade in wild plant and animal resources
 - 1.4 Policies to encourage investments in biodiversity-friendly business opportunities
 - 1.5 National-level systems for knowledge management
2. LGUs encompassing 1.6 million hectares in five key biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures; and
 - 2.1 Tools, guidelines and methods developed to mainstream biodiversity in local development policy making, planning, budgeting, M&E
 - 2.2 Toolkits and implementation capacity for application of SEAs, as well as landscape and seascape level natural resource management, across multiple LGUs
 - 2.3 LGU-level policy framework and technical capacity to support biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices in critical eco-regions
 - 2.4 Strengthened local regulation of trade in wild plant and animal resources
 - 2.5 Regulatory structures and incentive systems to encourage the development of biodiversity-friendly businesses, including investor codes of conduct, established at the LGU level
 - 2.6 Intra-LGU data and knowledge-sharing and advocacy network to synthesize and project lessons learned into national policy- and decision-making
3. Systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering at least 700,000

hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro and Mindanao).

- 3.1 Biodiversity-friendly projects, programmes and policies achieved via impact assessments incorporated into LGU planning process.
- 3.2 Transboundary integrated planning achieved via the implementation of toolkits
- 3.3 Biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices (eg. use of indigenous crop varieties), achieved via enhanced and extended standards and associated certification processes
- 3.4 Improved regulations and enforcement of wild animal and plant gathering and trade, achieved via strengthening of permitting system and implementation of trade regulation
- 3.5 Biodiversity-friendly investment programs promoted in selected sites
- 3.6 Incentive systems and innovative financing programs to reduce destructive activities by PA/KBA dependent communities
- 3.7 Data and knowledge management to underpin preceding themes.

Unexpected Results

In terms of unexpected results, the HLURB promulgated the Framework and Methods for Biodiversity Mainstreaming in the Local Planning and Process of Local Government Units (LGUs) last July 2013, effectively adopting biodiversity considerations in the land-use planning process (new or revised) of all LGUs nationwide. The agency was not one of those specifically targeted under Outcome 1.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Project Design/Formulation

The overall project design to build partnerships and capacitate LGUs to more effectively manage their natural resources is a much-needed intervention in environmental management. Oftentimes, LGUs take a backseat to national agencies and other conservation groups in resource management even if their role is equally significant owing to their jurisdiction over territories comprising KBAs. The project tried to address the shortfall among LGUs in terms of capacity, and the effort to underscore the biodiversity aspect behind the seemingly unrelated thematic sectors (i.e., agriculture, enterprise, etc.) was very laudable, if not groundbreaking.

However, the Evaluation Team also finds the project to be overly ambitious in terms of desired policy outcomes and geographic coverage given the existing policy environment at the DENR and the national government. The project managed to prove that this inertia, which had long plagued the NIPAS Act, remains strong and has proven to be quite daunting. The project strategy then to come up with new policies that depended on the cooperation of the DENR leadership, and to anchor the subsequent LGU interventions thereupon, proved stifling and prevented the project from achieving its full potential.

At the local level, there was a major logistical hurdle to be overcome in the number of LGUs that the project had to work with at start-up and the actual available budget. Even if only 20% of these LGUs were required to deliver the results expected of the project (and an even lesser number in some of the outputs), still, this was easier said than done. Initial engagements had to be made and identifying which ones could deliver the anticipated results was a hit-or-miss proposition especially when the project straddled two national elections and the political environment could quickly change with each electoral exercise.

It was disclosed that BPP was a result of several smaller project proposals that were consolidated to meet GEF requirements for upscaling and innovation. This action came at the expense of project coherence as the different interventions seemed strained (e.g., wildlife enforcement vis-à-vis land-use policies or local investments) and presented difficulties in implementation. As will be discussed later, the overly broad geographic and thematic coverage rendered it vulnerable to the unexpected risks that plagued the project and compelled the Project Board to make difficult decisions which dampened the impact of the project.

Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic/strategy; Indicators)

In terms of the results framework, the Evaluation Team finds the same as generally appropriate and provided adequate basis for determining results. Two considerations however need to be taken into account. First are the earlier comments on the overall problems of the project design as discussed above.

Second is with regard to some of the main indicators and targets of the project. One of these pertains to the population of at least 3 critically endangered species in 3 demonstration sites, and its corresponding target of no decline in said populations. This indicator and target do not have any direct connection with the interventions considering that the project is more focused on policy enactments and harmonization at the national and LGU levels. Any change in these indicators would require further explanation in terms of attribution to the project. For instance, during the term of the BPP, a Philippine eagle released in the wild in one of the sites was shot dead and this happened notwithstanding the stringent conservation policies already in place at the said site (i.e., MHRWS). Similarly, the interventions in Mt. Siburan were not as intensive to say that the project directly contributed to the increase or decrease of the population of the tamaraw (the target species).

Similarly, with regard to forest fragmentation, this indicator is tricky. Forests can be fragmented naturally (e.g., separated by a ridge) or as a result of policy instruments adverse to the environment (e.g., declaring a portion of a forest as mineral lands or reclassifying the same as agricultural lands). There is no baseline data on how much of the sites are fragmented and the reasons for such. Neither is there a tool available to analyze such fragmentation. As a result, whatever data/maps are generated by the project is not very helpful in understanding whether or not the project helped in arresting the fragmentation. The Evaluation Team is not in a position to identify what would be a better metric for this indicator but certainly, the current indicator and targets are too vague.

Assumptions and Risks

The ProDoc identified the following risks and their corresponding levels of threat (M=medium; L=low) and mitigation strategies:

Table 4. Risks and Mitigation Strategies

Risk	Rate	Mitigation Strategy
Pressure for natural resource extraction and land-use conversion increases beyond the background rate	M	A common system-wide risk continues to be political pressure to allow mining, logging or other concessions within critical biodiversity areas, or for conversion of these areas for other land uses. During the proposed project, engagement with local communities will ensure that the link between local community development and sustainable management is maintained. At the national level, policy advice and advocacy will continue as part of the broader process of policy engagement for incorporating conservation considerations into resource extraction decision-making. The adoption of policy impact assessment on biodiversity will enable DA and DENR, including LGUs to ensure that future policies, plans and programs are screened for their impacts on biodiversity.

Risk	Rate	Mitigation Strategy
Sectoral agencies and institutions outside the agricultural sector will be unable to adequately incorporate biodiversity considerations into their systems and processes	M	All major sectoral institutions in the Philippines have sustainable use of natural resources as a part of their mandate. The barrier preventing them from fully achieving this mandate has been a lack of capacity, and a lack of incentives to prioritise conservation. By demonstrating to these line agencies (through the agricultural sector) that mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into their policies and decision-making is both feasible and cost-effective, the project will help to ensure that all relevant line institutions better manage the impact of their activities on the natural resource base.
Long-term climate change leads to changes in the biodiversity composition and resource value of critical biodiversity areas, reducing the value of conservation vs. exploitation	L	By strengthening the capacities of sectoral and local governance systems to clearly understand and assess the trade-offs between conservation and resource extraction, the project will help ensure that any future evolution of the natural resource base is identified and accounted for in decision-making. Existing key biodiversity areas may eventually decline in conservation value and their use may have to be reconsidered. Equally, other areas may become critical to conservation, e.g. if they become final refugia for important ecosystem types. By strengthening assessment and decision-making capacities, the project will ensure that governance systems are able to adapt to such changes and continue to aim for optimal tradeoffs.

The project was able to correctly identify the risk from a policy environment that leaned more heavily in favor of resource extractive activities over biodiversity conservation. Despite this, it still found itself handcuffed by DENR inaction over policy initiatives developed under the project, proving the inadequacy of the stated mitigation strategy. The suggested policy on impact assessment on biodiversity in fact was one of the major casualties. In this type of risks, the better strategy is to generate a body of experience and case studies that will substantiate that taking a certain policy direction is more beneficial than the alternative of not taking any.

An actual risk that the ProDoc did not identify although preexisting was the DENR rationalization program which ensued during the course of the project term. As will be discussed later, this played a significant role in the failure of the project to deliver certain target outcomes in some sites especially where the local implementing partner was a local DENR office. It needs to be stated though that in some sites, the rationalization program was anticipated. Nonetheless, the contingency measures to deal with this risk (e.g., catch-up plan, updating of rationalized personnel) were not enough to stem the diminution of interest and redirection of efforts at the DENR field level.

Lastly, despite similar experience in the past, the risk of currency fluctuation resulting in lower budget in pesos was still not accounted for and the implementing partners did not have an established criteria or standard operating response for this contingency. The PMU and local partners raised the issue of significant budget cuts owing to the peso appreciation at the start and middle part of the project. A reassessment of project targets would have been desirable under this circumstance. While it may be argued that the project is currently benefiting from a peso depreciation (i.e., budget windfall) at the tail-end of the project, this is something that could not have been easily foreseen then. It is suggested that the UNDP develop a financial criteria based on currency fluctuation that would trigger a reassessment of targets every time a certain percentage of currency exchange is breached.

Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

The ProDoc indicates that the BPP will build upon the lessons learned from completed projects supported by GEF and other donors, namely:

- The WB/GEF-supported *Conservation of Priority Protected Areas in the Philippines (CPPAP)* which was completed in 2002; which underscored the importance of incorporating the concerns of communities along the edges of KBAs to the success of conserving biodiversity;
- The EU-supported *National Integrated Protected Areas Project (NIPAP)* which was completed in 2003, gave attention to the role played by LGUs in protected area planning and management;
- The ongoing UNDP-GEF *Samar Island Biodiversity Project* continues to provide valuable lessons on the significance of mainstreaming biodiversity considerations in local development planning. The local policies adopted through the local legislative councils effectively provided the mantle of protection to the entire PA and its surrounding landscape against incompatible economic activities such as logging and mining; and
- The *Strengthening Coordination for Effective Environmental Management (STREEM)* and *Expanding and diversifying the national system of terrestrial Protected Areas* projects implemented by UNDP.

Another GEF-funded project that was implemented concurrently with BPP and was recently terminated was *Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas in the Philippines* or NewCAPP. It aimed to recognize alternative governance types and establish new conservation areas managed by LGUs, IPs and local communities. The projects are actually complementary and NewCAPP and BPP worked synergistically in MHRWS, using a modality developed in NewCAPP (i.e., LCA or LGU conserved area) by way of ordinances to expand the geographic coverage of Mt. Hamiguitan beyond the congressionally-delineated boundaries.

Evidently, the significant role given by BPP to LGUs in conservation, its active push to develop partnerships with other non-conservation agencies of the government, and the deliberate effort to mainstream, are all indicative of the incorporation of lessons from other projects. It is a recurring lesson from previous engagements that conservation does not operate in a vacuum and that policies of other government agencies can impact biodiversity. It is precisely against this backdrop that the BPP was conceived.

In addition, the bigger role given to DENR field offices was an offshoot of lessons from previous projects where their non-participation in implementation was cited as a problem in ensuring sustainability beyond project term.

Planned Stakeholder participation

A broad-based stakeholder participation was inherent in the design of the BPP. Unlike similar projects however, there were differences/innovations. First, BPP planned to tap agencies that were not traditionally associated with biodiversity conservation. For this, forging partnerships was key. Second, LGUs played a bigger role not just in terms of participation but also in the means to do so, relying mostly on local planning processes and policy instruments related to land-use such as CLUPs, to achieve project ends.

However, community participation in this project is noted to be passive and indirect at best when it comes to the major outcomes of the project. For instance, it is simply assumed that communities were properly consulted when the CLUPs were passed by the local legislative councils by way of ordinances, which theoretically, must undergo public consultations. The Evaluation Team did not encounter informants or documentation on the level or quality of public consultations in the approval process of the CLUPs, or on how certain objections to the proposed zonings were addressed.

With regard to IPs, the only documented involvement is in the ADSDPP preparation for the Bugkalot and Agta communities in QPL even if there are reported IP communities in the other sites (e.g., NECKBA, MHRWS).

Replication approach

Replication is built-in and is an inherent feature of the project with the overt effort to adopt national policies that will allow LGUs to manage their natural resources, technical assistance given for pilot-testing by LGUs, development and production of manuals, and actual mainstreaming. The results of these mainstreaming efforts were designed to be the basis for expanding similar efforts.

There is also a knowledge management system that was supposed to be developed for the project that can be helpful not just for reporting purposes but also for replication. Theoretically, therefore, the experience generated by BPP would pave the way for future sites to follow without having to undergo a similar steep learning curve.

The Evaluation Team notes however that the intensive involvement in the provision of technical assistance for the land-use planning activities of some LGUs by the PMU may make it harder for other LGUs to replicate, and may even discourage some since such technical assistance will no longer be available after BPP.

UNDP comparative advantage

BPP takes advantage of UNDP's wealth of experience in implementing conservation projects, strong relationship with various agencies in the Philippines and other non-State actors both at the national and local levels, its keen understanding of how institutions work and the reforms needed to address environmental problems, its current portfolio of environment-related projects, and cross-sectoral grasp of national development priorities. UNDP has likewise developed a template for management, monitoring, financial and project reporting culled from both its national and international activities that the Philippine agencies are already familiar with.

Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

As previously mentioned, BPP has an overlap with the NewCAPP, with the latter developing new modalities to expand KBAs in the country, and the former theoretically providing the local policy environment that will support its successful conservation. On top of this, the ProDoc identifies other interventions within the sector such as the following:

- ENRMP – a WB-GEF-supported project which seeks to develop key priority watershed sites in the Philippines using the ecosystem-based management approach. This has a potential link with the Sierra Madre corridor of the BPP in QPL.
- Mindanao Rural Development Project – another WB-GEF-supported project which has related activities in biodiversity conservation in the 225 municipalities in all of the 26 provinces in Mindanao. It aims to institutionalize a decentralized system for agriculture and fisheries delivery that will promote participation, transparency, and accountability. This has a potential link with the LMKBA and MHRWS sites of the BPP.
- Philippine Climate Change Adaptation Project (PHILCCAP) - another WB-GEF-supported project which aims to demonstrate approaches that would enable targeted communities to adapt to the potential impacts of climate variability and change. This would be achieved by strengthening existing institutional frameworks for climate change adaptation, and by demonstrating cost-effective adaptation strategies in agriculture and natural resources management. Per ProDoc, the BPP stood to benefit from the results of the PHILCCAP pilot sites so that cost-effective approaches can be adapted to ensure appropriate mitigating measures are available to reduce the impacts of climate change on biodiversity.

- Integrated Natural Resources and Environmental Management Sector Development Program (INREM) – an ADB-funded project, it can work together with the BPP in supporting the harmonization of national level policies in support of LGU-driven conservation, development of tools and capacities and formulation of LGU policies and local investment programs in support of biodiversity.
- KFW Project on Community Based Forestry and Mangrove Management in Central Panay – a local-level project aimed at providing a mix of loans and grants to LGUs to support their local natural resources management initiatives.

Management arrangements

The project followed the typical UNDP management template spelled out in the ProDoc.

Because of the significant role that the LGUs would play as envisioned for the project, the BPP identified the establishment of local project site committees (LPSCs) for site-level coordination, comprised of representatives from LGUs, regional offices of national agencies, local communities, IPs, NGOs, the academe, and other relevant stakeholders. In sites where there is an existing PAMB, it served as the LPSC for the project. In addition, implementation at the field level was at the hands of local responsible partners consisting of LGUs, NGOs, DENR field offices or combinations thereof.

However, other than during the inception phase, documentation of any further activity on the part of the newly-constituted LPSCs in some of the sites is sparse, at best. The coordination that was envisioned by the project especially on policies did not materialize. It was important for biodiversity partnerships to be fostered not just at the national level but at the local level as well, and this is where the importance of LPSCs lies. Despite the attendance of locally-based representatives in annual meetings and other activities, it bears stating that this is not the same as when these individuals sit in a collective capacity and act as one. Such participation can be counted though as part of partnership-building exercises.

Lastly, despite the usual management arrangement from the UNDP, the project had, for one reason or another, difficulty in starting up allegedly on account of lack of personnel. As a result, instead of DENR-BMB, it was UNDP which engaged in the direct hiring of the staff so that the project could finally take-off. The Evaluation Team no longer went into the details of this problem as it was not relevant for this evaluation.

3.2 Project Implementation

Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

The project encountered major challenges in its implementation at the outset beginning with a delayed start-up losing almost a year, the peso appreciation vis-à-vis the dollar resulting in a

significant budget cuts, and the DENR rationalization process that affected the staffing pattern of the agency and its local structuring, program prioritization and implementation.

After UNDP intervened to address the staffing problem, the project found itself playing catch-up and continuously reeled from these challenges, never really being able to hit full stride. Although a decision was made early on by the Project Board to limit the interventions per site in order to maximize limited resources and showcase innovations per site based on strengths and potential for demonstration,⁵ the actual interventions taken that were supposedly based on “felt need” and LGU “demand” did not fully respond to the drivers of biodiversity loss per site and ultimately did not generate the desired lessons from the interplay of various policy instruments which affect biodiversity, where all other factors underlying the reality of field conditions are present, within or outside the KBA. Missed potentials include thematic interventions to address the problem of GMO farming in QPL, mining in LMKBA, or land conversion in NNNP, among others.

These problems were felt even more acutely at the different sites with the delayed release of funds being a common gripe among local responsible partners. This then affected the roll-out of activities and worse, dampened the morale of the local project staff, making them susceptible to jumping ship at the earliest opportunity that was afforded by the DENR rationalization program.

By the time the MTE was finished, several cross-cutting recommendations were made and are enumerated herein for facility:

- Provide a major focus on BD-friendly agriculture and BD-friendly business for the remaining project period
- Further prepare DENR to sustain the facilitation process for mainstreaming BD in other sectors
- Strengthen the verification process for Objective level indicators

During the evaluation, the team found minimal focus on BDFAPs and BDFEs. Instead, the focus remained on finishing the remaining maps for land-use plans for some LGUs and transboundary plans. The draft policies on BDFAP and BDSEA remained pending with the policy reviewing body of the DENR.

Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

On paper, as its name suggests, partnership-building is at the core of BPP as the main strategy in achieving coherence among the different sectoral policies of the government that affect

⁵ Despite this, according to the PMU, they persisted to implement as much of the thematic interventions as possible based on “felt need” and “demand”.

biodiversity, both at the national and at the local levels. However, the project ends with a mixed bag in terms of agency attitudes towards biodiversity, with main thematic outcomes still left not yet fully on the side of biodiversity (i.e., agriculture, investments, local governance). Some national agencies like the HLURB, DOT and the DTI through its Board of Investments have incorporated biodiversity goals within their policies, plans or programmes. The DA has signified its aim to integrate biodiversity goals with the proposed DA-DENR joint administrative order. However, the DILG found the process followed by the BPP to be non-inclusive and it is one of the main target agencies.

On the other hand, local partnerships were relatively more successful with solid documented outcomes. If there is any shortcoming in this aspect, it is the lack of documentation on the reasons for non-participation of some of the LGUs in the project that comprised the project sites. The Evaluation Team encountered several LGUs which were profuse in their appreciation for the technical assistance provided by BPP especially in the completion of their CLUPs, a legally-mandated process. On the other hand, the selection process on which LGUs were to be assisted was more reactive, in one instance, because the LGU official in that site raised his hand. The written correspondences provided by the PMU clearly indicated the value accorded by LGUs to the technical assistance afforded by the project especially in the preparation of their respective CLUPs, and this could have been leveraged more pro-actively to secure broader participation from the other LGUs. Indeed, one lesson that can be culled from this experience is that the CLUP revision process serves as a regular and highly valuable entry point in engaging LGUs in conservation efforts which the DENR can take advantage of with its expertise in mapping and planning.

Lastly, at the level of partnerships among the responsible partners, the Evaluation Team found some strained relations and this was largely due to budget cuts and delayed releases. Especially among local responsible partners who were already on board the project since its formulation, the management decisions seemed to deviate from the original plans for the sites and this may present problems in sustaining the project beyond its term.

Feedback from M&E activities used in adaptive management

Because of the severity of the challenges that the project faced at the very outset, part of the adaptive management strategy agreed upon was to pick “low-hanging fruits”. This translated into limiting the thematic interventions⁶ per site but this decision did little to address the institutional fragmentation which is what the project was hoping to address in the first place. The assignment of thematic areas to the sites also did not seem to take into account the problems that were plainly obvious from each one, for instance, the land conversion in NNNP, the use of GMOs in QPL, the use of chemicals in MSPLS that was affecting its marine waters, poaching in MHRWS, and the lack of transboundary plans in CPM, LMKBA and NECKBA, among

⁶ From the original six, namely, BDSEA, BDFAP, BDFE, wildlife law enforcement, CLUPs and KMS.

others. Instead, the Evaluation Team saw CLUPs for NNNP and QPL, BDFEs for MHRWS, NECKBA and CPM.

It bears stating that as pointed out by the DENR-BMB, the problem of biodiversity loss is multi-faceted and the BPP was not intended to resolve all these. From a theory of change perspective, however, one needs to analyze the project's outcomes vis-à-vis the impact pathway. The ProDoc grasped the complexity of the biodiversity problematique and the interventions it prescribed which centered on effecting policy change, reflected this understanding. Policymaking clearly does not operate in a vacuum. It is a political process that is not detached from the socio-economic milieus that determined the choices to adopt policies like the use GMOs or chemical fertilizers, to allow mining or land conversion, to enforce wildlife laws, to cooperate in transboundary planning with other LGUs, and the like. In other words, the complexity of the biodiversity problem is a project given, not an excuse.

Lastly, as stated earlier, the thematic limitation also created a gap between the PMU and the field partners who felt that their work had become constrained by strict project and budget parameters, and no longer in keeping with their original planned involvement under BPP.

Project Finance

The BPP had a planned overall budget of US\$17,022,061, which included GEF-financing (at endorsement) of US\$4.5 million and co-financing of US\$12,522,061. As of end of 2016, total project cost stood at US\$16,159,398 (94.9% of original budget), consisting of US\$4,339,689 (26.9%) as GEF-financing and US\$11,819,709 (73.1%) as co-financing. The table below provides a comparative breakdown of the actual and planned financing of the project.

Table 5. BPP Financing

Financing Type (US\$)	Cash/Grants		In Kind		Total	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
GEF	4,500,000	4,339,689	-	-	4,500,000	4,339,689
UNDP	301,404	200,589		700,000	301,404	900,589
Government	-	-	10,264,598	9,433,936	10,264,598	9,433,936
Partners	-	-	1,956,059	1,485,184	1,956,059	1,485,184
Total	4,801,404	4,540,278	12,220,657	11,619,120	17,022,061	16,159,398

It bears stating that the BPP had to endure significant foreign exchange fluctuations both at the start and by the tail end of the project term⁷ so a more intensive financial analysis may be

⁷ Average peso to dollar exchange rate in 2012 was P42.2288 versus 2016's P47.4925 per US dollar. (Source: <http://www.bsp.gov.ph/statistics/excel/pesodollar.xls> visited on 08 June 2017)

required to determine how management adapted to the financial shortfall and windfall that occurred within the same project term.

As regards co-financing, this slightly fell short by 5.6%. The PMU explained that a number of field level activities aimed at demonstrating the application of practices and tools (eg. BDFAPs, BDSEA, harmonized ADS DPP) were not carried out due to the delay in the issuance of the enabling policies. Similarly, NGO partners did not deploy the number of staff and equipment originally committed since some of their activities were taken on by the DENR and LGUs (e.g., NECKBA and QPL). Lastly, according to the PMU, not all of the personnel and equipment costs were fully taken into account in these estimates.

There has been a general sentiment that the BPP budget is “small” and not enough for the scope of the project although another UNDP-GEF supported project that was implemented almost simultaneously to BPP (i.e., NewCAPP⁸) had a smaller budget (\$11.037M), had more sites and suffered more or less from the same financial impact owing to the appreciation of the peso during its project term. The results between the two projects are very different⁹ and it may be worthwhile to do a comparative study on the difference in management approaches to address the same problems caused by the peso appreciation and DENR rationalization program which afflicted both projects, in achieving their respective ends.

With regard to leveraging, part of the rationale in partnering with LGUs in conservation is that they have budgets. In fact, the integration of biodiversity in the CLUPs would justify the allocation of budget by the LGU in environmental enforcement, among others. This was evident in QPL and MHRWS which embraced the concept fully. In turn, both sites were able to turn this around and leverage the BPP to secure more external funding for conservation as in the case of QPL, or to attain UNESCO World Heritage status, in the case of MHRWS.

Lastly, the delay in budget releases (at one point, as long as six months) created a domino effect which affected expenditures for the year, and the budget release for the succeeding year. There has been some finger-pointing on the cause for this such as the multiple layers of the budget approval process. Although this was eventually arrested, this pitfall has to be addressed in future projects so as to avoid any repeat.

Monitoring and evaluation

Design at entry. UNDP followed its standard template for M&E, including for GEF-funded projects. This would include the conduct of an inception workshop and its pertinent report, quarterly progress reports, annual project review/project implementation reports (APR/PIR), site visits, preparation of MTE and this terminal evaluation. These are all provided in the signed

⁸ The lead evaluation consultant for BPP was the local evaluation consultant for NewCAPP.

⁹ The report can be accessed at <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/6092>.

ProDoc and evidenced by actual reports.¹⁰ Nothing in the BPP design indicated that a different M&E approach was called for. For this reason, the activity is rated as SATISFACTORY.

Implementation. This aspect of the M&E is rated MODERATELY SATISFACTORY. While the M&E was sufficiently budgeted¹¹ and the standard UNDP template has been effective for most, if not all, of its projects, BPP presented a unique challenge given the obstacles it faced at the very outset and the inherent difficulty in pursuing policy reforms especially since one of the major risks identified did materialize and translated to inaction over the proposed policies for Outcome 1. When this happened, the question then was whether the proposed mitigation strategy sufficiently kicked in to address this risk and if the M&E indicators were promptly revised to reflect the change in strategy.

Secondly, there were issues that were readily apparent. As earlier discussed, the cross-cutting recommendations of the MTE to focus on BDFAP and BDFE appears not to have been followed. The Evaluation Team found continued focus on the preparation of more maps for land-use plans even if per MTE, the output has achieved more than double what was targeted.¹²

This would have been alright had the other thematic areas fared just as well but that is not the case. It was obvious from the field visits that the results per thematic area and per site were uneven. For instance, in general, QPL and MHRWS are faring much better than CPM and LMKBA. Even within a site, the unevenness of the results are evident. For instance, within NNNP, Calatrava received the lion share of technical support over others and little or no documentation in other sites such as Cadiz (one of the bigger LGUs in NNNP).

Overall assessment. Overall, UNDP followed the ProDoc and implemented all the M&E activities as prescribed therein. Reports were regularly generated. Unfortunately, these snapshots of project performance were not able to fully capture the picture. It took a different M&E tool, i.e., the MTE with its longer timeframe, to see the problems and indeed, it was only then that the red flags were raised.

As an international organization, UNDP is constrained on how deeply it can get involved in the implementation of projects undertaken jointly with the Philippine Government. In this situation, it becomes incumbent upon other partners—i.e., national agencies—as members of the Project Board, to take an equally active role in evaluating the reported outcomes of the project, not just the UNDP. There was an instance encountered by the Evaluation Team when one of the national agencies was complaining about the lack of consultations by the PMU on the preparation of one of the major outputs of the project. However, the same agency sits in the Project Board and this could have been addressed early on during its meetings.

¹⁰ See Table 3 for Baseline Indicators.

¹¹ \$244,000 or 1.43% of the total budget.

¹² The DENR clarified that the mapping works were for the fragmentation and land-cover analysis.

Given the compliance with the requirements of M&E and the problems cited, the activity is rated SATISFACTORY.

Implementing Agency (UNDP) Execution

Overall, UNDP provided its standard support to the BPP as in other UNDP projects. While it does not undertake direct implementation, UNDP offers a management template that follows a rights- and results-based approach, is logically designed to achieve targets and is grounded on monitoring and evaluation. It also offers several tools and systems to identify problems and address them in a timely manner.

During the MTE, these problems were identified and under ordinary circumstances, more attention should have been focused on the delivery of actual results achieved and activities undertaken. This role belonged to the Project Board as a whole, not just the UNDP alone. However, this project has shown the limitations of UNDP's current M&E system and the need for more frequent field visits and evidenced-based monitoring. The UNDP has numerous projects that it is administering and it is possible that compliance with reportorial requirements became the norm, instead of a more qualitative assessment. For this reason, it is rated MODERATELY SATISFACTORY.

Executing Agency Execution

Based largely on the disparity between intended outcomes and actual results, the Executing Agency is rated as MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY. Not only did the project start late, the policy bottlenecks which the PMU identified as the reason for failing to mainstream the same, were found within the agency itself. Among the sites, those with the least accomplishments were in areas where the DENR was the local responsible partner (i.e., CPM and NECKBA).

Overall Project Implementation/Execution, Coordination and Operational Issues

Overall, the project implementation/execution is rated as MODERATELY SATISFACTORY. As will be enumerated later, the results attained were a little less than what was targeted. On what was achieved with regard to land-use plans, the potential is high but there is an imbalance with the focus given, and to which LGUs. Doubling more than the expected output, the focus on CLUPs came at the expense of other outcomes, particularly, those which the MTE had already identified as the proper outputs.

It bears stating that the technical assistance given in the preparation of the CLUPs in the form of maps, GIS, and the like were intensive and of high quality. However, based on a review of the CLUPs presented, the quality of the integration of biodiversity in these plans are still at the incipient stage. It remains to be seen how much of the biodiversity values has actually been internalized by the partner LGUs vis-à-vis other competing interests. By the end of its term, the project offers little in terms of how the other stakeholders see the relevance of biodiversity in their respective sectors.

There were also operational issues that could have been anticipated and addressed at the outset. The most prominent were the DENR rationalization program for its personnel and the multiple layers of budget approval, both of which were cited as among the main hindrances of the project.

At the national level, while foundational steps have been taken to institutionalize biodiversity partnerships among the different national agencies whose policies have an impact on the environment both direct and indirect, the question of whether or not the DENR will sign on and finally formalize these partnerships into concrete policy instruments is anybody's guess. Similarly, whether these partner-agencies will enact policies that directly respond to the specific problems in these KBAs remains to be seen. For instance, BDFAPs and BDFEs have overlaps particularly in the sites but will the DA and DTI-BOI continue to discuss these after BPP? Ditto between DOT and DTI-BOI with respect to ecotourism projects. DILG had a marginal role in the drafting on BDSEA and is left without much enthusiasm to carry on with the project. Will the local mainstreaming of BDSEA still push through?

The lack of certainty in the answers to these questions as evidenced by ongoing processes clearly indicate a tenuousness to the partnerships developed. However, it must also be admitted that partnership-building is an iterative process and will depend on how the agencies will make good on their express commitments to support the project even after its termination. The DENR-BMB claims that core groups have already been formed during the project term and will take on the remaining tasks, with several joint resolutions drafted to formalize these partnerships.

3.3 Project Results

Overall results (attainment of objectives)

Overall, the project achieved a solid gain in the integration of biodiversity in local planning and is considered as the main achievement of the project. Used properly, the inclusion of biodiversity in the CLUPs will have far-reaching positive consequences for the environment within the LGUs benefitted by the project. In this respect, at least three of the sites (i.e., MHRWS, QPL and NNNP) have shown momentum that will carry the project even beyond its term.

The BPP was also able to achieve some headway with regard to BDFAP most concretely manifested, among others, by a draft joint administrative order already signed by the DA but still awaiting DENR concurrence. While not yet a full-pledged policy instrument sans the DENR Secretary's signature, it clearly indicated agency buy-in for DA, one of the target agencies.

Notwithstanding the gains on land-use, the other thematic outcomes have not fared as well. BDFAP, as just stated, is a glass half-empty or half-full. BDFE remains in the initial stage while BDSEA has not taken hold and remains amorphous. In terms of ground-based experience, the

project offers little to draw upon for mainstreaming (a key component of the project) and more so, for policy adoption.

Some of the proposed national policy instruments are still drafts and still up for discussion. What is ironic is that this is not due to problems with the other partner agencies but due to questions raised within the DENR itself. On the other hand, because of the limited learnings offered by the project sites on these policies, this may actually be not so bad because the content of these proposed policies need to be further vetted and fine-tuned.

Lastly, specific threats to biodiversity remain in a number of the sites and continue to be disjointed with the program’s components/thematic areas. As earlier mentioned, the assignment of thematic areas vis-à-vis the sites seemed arbitrary. Hence, the threat from the use of GMOs in QPL, for instance, and the conversion of forest lands in NNNP are largely unaddressed by the proposed BDFAP. Mining continues to be a problem in the larger landscape of MHRWS and LMKBA. The inherent transboundary nature of NECKBA and CPM either baffle or elude the stakeholders.

For these reasons, the project is rated under this category as MODERATELY SATISFACTORY, recognizing the gains it achieved in land-use and BDFAP but noting the serious deficiencies in the other thematic areas.

Below is a listing of the project accomplishments per target outcome as provided by the PMU, with the Evaluation Team’s comments and findings written below each target:

<p>Objective: To demonstrate how Local Government Units (LGUs), with enhanced capacities, and working together with local and national partners, can plan and manage economic activities and growth in ways that meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives in critical biogeographic regions.</p>		
OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments ¹³
<p>Populations of at least three critically endangered species in three demonstration sites</p> <p><i>Expected to decrease by at least 10% by end-project.</i></p>	<p>No decline in populations of tamaraw in Siburan forests; Visayan hornbill in Central Panay and NNNP; and Philippine eagle in Mt. Hamiguitan</p>	<p>Baseline data of species</p>

The project was able to establish baseline data for the sites which could be useful for future reference.

¹³ Based on submission by PMU.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Extent of habitat fragmentation in unprotected PAs/KBAs in eight demonstration sites <i>Expected to increase by at least 10% by end project</i>	No net increase in fragmentation in 287,000 hectares of unprotected PAs/KBAs in eight demonstration sites	Fragmentation Analysis (2005, 2010, 2015)

The project produced a powerpoint presentation with maps and tables containing percentage changes in 5-year periods which show a general trend of decrease in forest fragmentation in the period between 2011 to 2015. However, the analysis of the causes of fragmentation and what accounted for the decrease is undocumented. For instance, in MSPLS, the fragmented forests almost doubled from 24.456% in 2005 to 46.771% in 2010, or a fragmentation increase by 91.24%. The PMU explains that this was due to a road project connecting El Nido, Palawan, and the settlements that ensued after the road opening. Given this, further documentation is desired as this could influence the decision-making for similar activities in other KBAs (e.g. another proposed road project in Baggao, Cagayan). Likewise, if properly documented, it could influence the kind of data, impact analysis, and mitigation measures needed for the environmental impact assessment (EIA) of similar road projects to avoid a similar adverse impact.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Extent of remaining natural habitat within PAs in five biogeographic regions <i>Expected to decrease by at least 10% in PAs in project sites by end-project.</i>	No net loss of remaining natural habitat covering at least 310,000 has. in PAs within project sites	

Same comment as above, based on a powerpoint presentation.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Number of hectares in production landscapes/waterscapes under sustainable management	At least additional 10,000 hectares under sustainable management but not yet certified	A total of 129,296.01 has. under sustainable management but not yet certified. This coincides with the mainstreaming of biodiversity in the local land use plans of the LGUs in the eight

<p><i>No increase during the period</i></p>	<p>At least additional 800 hectares and 8 production systems under certified production practices that meet sustainability and biodiversity standards</p>	<p>demonstration sites, the area were delineated under sustainable management zones as per latest draft of the CLUPs and Transboundary plans.</p> <p>1,045 hectares in the eight project sites were assessed and documented as potential sites for BDFAP recognition</p>
---	---	--

Although an enumeration of the additional 129,296.01 has. was not provided, the Evaluation Team has seen a sufficient number of LGUs with CLUPs that incorporate biodiversity, including the expansion of the MHRWS by virtue of the LCA modality.

A matrix (with breakdown) of the 1,045 has. of potential sites for BDFAP recognition was provided. Of the six sites visited, the team encountered an example of BDFAP in QPL and a composting facility in LMKBA (Tubod).

Activities under the ITPGRAF also reported in several BPP sites.

Outcome 1: National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU-level biodiversity conservation efforts.		
OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Agencies with policies and associated capacity to conduct biodiversity impact assessment of sectoral policies and plans	DA and DENR are routinely conducting biodiversity impact assessments of sectoral policies and plans by year 4.	Draft DMC on BDSEA

The BDSEA is a concept without legal anchor in the Philippine jurisdiction and even if the proposed policy instrument was signed by the DENR, it would be vulnerable to constant legal questioning. BPP pilot-tested it using the DENR's National Greening Program¹⁴ and the National Tourism Development Plan of the DOT. The latter yielded good insights.

The tool was also used to assess the CLUPs of three municipalities in QPL, which was a redundant exercise considering that land-use planning and BDSEA are both forms of planning. Additionally, despite the specific reference to DA as a target agency, there was no evidence of BDSEA being applied to any agricultural activity within the sites which pose serious threats to

¹⁴ A nationwide reforestation program and a key program of the previous DENR administration under Sec. Paje.

biodiversity such as use of GMOs in QPL, sugarcane plantations in NNNP and agricultural run-off in MSPLS.

Rather than propose a novel concept like BDSEA, the project should have simply focused on strengthening the biodiversity aspects of the Philippine EIA system, as the ProDoc actually seems to suggest. Not only does this have an already subsisting legal framework, the impact is far-reaching because of the cross-cutting nature of the EIA system as a mandatory requirement to any activity that has a significant impact on the environment.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
<p>Programmes and policies to support BDFAP in critical landscapes</p> <p><i>No agrobiodiversity programs in AFMA plan</i></p> <p><i>National Action Plan for Sustainable Land management (NAP-SLM) do not include agrobiodiversity projects in buffer zones of PAs and KBAs</i></p> <p><i>Standards and certification schemes limited to organic agricultural production</i></p> <p><i>Activities to promote conservation and utilization of indigenous crops</i></p>	<p>Updated AFMA Plan incorporates agrobiodiversity programs.</p> <p>Revised NAP-SLM includes agrobiodiversity projects in buffer zones of PAs or KBAs.</p> <p>Standards and certification system for biodiversity friendly production systems in place</p> <p>Policy and program developed in DA to promote conservation and utilization of indigenous crops</p>	<p>Draft DENR-DA JAO on BDFAP</p> <p>NAP-SLM was revised incorporating provisions on biodiversity</p> <p>Draft BDFAP standards</p>

The NAP-SLM draft has been prepared containing a robust discussion on biodiversity.¹⁵

¹⁵ Per PMU, biodiversity is part of Strategic Objective 2 of NAP-SLM: To regenerate and rehabilitate watershed landscapes and their resources for ecosystem services enhancement. The NAP-SLM also incorporates two (2) sub-programs of the Thematic Program 3: Watershed Landscape Management and Rehabilitation, which includes biodiversity as follows: 1) Sustainable management of forest resources; and 2) Promotion of SLM for forest resources conservation and management. It also includes the listings of completed and ongoing projects on biodiversity in buffer zones of PAs and KBAs. The final draft NAP-SLM was presented by the Committee on the Conservation and Management of Resources for Development (CCMRD) and revised according to the relevant comments.

The project was also able to produce a draft Joint Administrative Order (JAO) on BDFAP based on consultations with the technical working group comprised of representatives from the DA and DENR. As of 2015, it had already been endorsed by the DA to the DENR, where it remains unsigned. According to the PMU, without this policy driver, its mainstreaming to the LGUs was unlikely.

Qualitatively, the Evaluation Team finds that the draft JAO is premature at best. While it provides a definition of BDFAP¹⁶ that is acceptable to both agencies and has undergone several consultations, it is advisable that it is subjected to further conceptual reworking with a broader audience among the country's sustainable agriculture and biodiversity conservation practitioners in order to clarify whether there is a need to come up with a category of BDFAP that straddles between organic agriculture and sustainable agriculture.

At present, it is not clear why the draft JAO does not contain any explicit proscription against GMOs, use of chemicals and the like considering that its application is confined solely within the KBAs. On this score, there is also concern that by limiting its scope within KBAs, it ignores the impact of outside agricultural activities to adjacent KBAs. Lastly, a new agricultural policy for KBAs may be misinterpreted as greenlighting the expansion of agricultural activities to these areas, further worsening forest fragmentation. These are concerns that are hopefully more directly and explicitly addressed in a reworked JAO.

And there are several opportunities that could have been taken advantaged of had organic farming been included as a BDFAP category. First, rather than come up with a new policy, the project could have simply latched on the Organic Agriculture Act of 2010, which is already a law¹⁷ and a settled policy direction of the Philippine Government. While some may argue over the differences between organic agriculture and BDFAP, their aims are not contradictory. By doing so, the project could have avoided the legal quagmire of not having a set policy over BDFAP.

Second, notwithstanding the lack of a signed policy instrument from the national government, the project could have pilot-tested not just BDFAP but the interaction of the different thematic areas. For instance, considering that Negros Island (consisting of two provinces) has already declared itself as an "organic island", BDFAP could have immediately extended its benefits not

¹⁶ Defined under the draft JAO as "practices that use traditional and modern technologies, and agriculture and fishery management techniques to contribute in the maintenance of ecosystem resilience; protect biodiversity reserves and sanctuaries including agriculture important species, habitat networks and biological corridors; facilitate regeneration of natural habitat; protect watersheds and wild habitat against conversion to other uses; using low-input or less environmentally damaging systems that reduce soil erosion and water run-off; and adopt the principles of sustainable livestock and poultry husbandry and use of water, and fishery resources. These practices also aim to increase soil fertility and productivity, balance insect population and reduce air, soil and water pollution that affect important habitats of plants and animals."

¹⁷ R.A. 10068 (2010), "AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND PROMOTION OF ORGANIC AGRICULTURE IN THE PHILIPPINES AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES".

just within NNNP but in the entire island of Negros (and its other KBAs). Lastly, the objections over organic farming as possibly contemplating monocrop farming, clear-cutting, etc. are neither inherent nor exclusive to organic farming and could have easily been qualified to specifically exclude such concerns.

Similarly, BDSEA could have been applied to GMO farming prevalent in QPL in order to arrive at a local ordinance on a site-specific BDFAP. Likewise, BDFE could have been used to wean farmers away in some of the sites from using harmful pesticides.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Systems and procedures for implementation of new regulations of trade in wild plant and animal resources	System established for surveillance, monitoring, and mapping the sources of illegally traded wild plants and animals	<p>CITES e-permitting system developed, test run was done last September 10, 2016.</p> <p>Draft DA-DENR-DILG JAO on the guidelines for the harmonized implementation of regulations on the domestic trade in wildlife is for final review and approval of the agencies.</p> <p>DILG Memorandum Circular Reiterating DILG MC No. 2004-44 on the prohibited acts relative to the conservation and protection of plant and animal species and their habitats was forwarded to USec. Panadero of DILG last October 05, 2016 for their adoption.</p> <p>MoA on strengthening of the collaboration and cooperation in detecting, preventing and restricting illegal trade and transport of wildlife was concurred by different agencies</p>

The Evaluation Team looked into the CITES e-permitting system and wonders as to its relevance to the project. The said system is for legal transport of wildlife. Some of the biodiversity studies conducted in MHRWS identified the problem of poaching in addition to the reported shooting of a Philippine eagle that was released therein. The CITES e-permitting system is not responsive to the problem.

To be fair to the project, this was a thematic area that was not in sync with the other policy initiatives of the BPP, since there are already national as well as site-specific laws protecting wildlife and this is an issue more of enforcement, than policy formulation.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
---	----------------	------------------------

Policies to encourage investments in biodiversity friendly business	Policy in place at DTI Priority biodiversity business identified in DTI policy documents	Concept of biodiversity-friendly business/enterprise was incorporated in the Memorandum Circular No. 2015- 01 General Policies and Specific Guidelines to Implement the Investment Priorities Plan (IPP) 2014-2016 under Part XII. Support to Environmental Protection and Conservation to encourage registered enterprises to protect and conserve biodiversity in their respective area and/or activities and promote biodiversity-friendly businesses/enterprises. DENR-DTI JAO under review by BMB for submission to DENR Executive Committee.
---	---	---

Memorandum Circular 2015-01 mentions biodiversity-friendly businesses in the preambular paragraphs of the Investments Priorities Plan (IPP) of the DTI-BOI. However, it does not translate to anything specific in the over-all implementation of the instrument and cannot be immediately taken as a paradigm shift. When asked, the DTI was not able to identify BD-friendly businesses that should enjoy the fiscal and non-fiscal incentives associated therewith. When the Evaluation Team further sought a current listing of these so-called BD-friendly businesses, the DTI gave a list comprised mainly of piggeries and other agricultural activities, admitting that the term “biodiversity-friendly” will likely take a while to take hold in the agency.

In other words, while the benefits to businesses in claiming they are BD-friendly are readily apparent, establishing the opposite (i.e., these business are actually BD-friendly) is not so and further documentation is needed. This situation is repeated at the LGU level where the investment template is replicated in new or revised LIICs that were passed under the project.

It is in this instance where the interplay among thematic areas would have been beneficial. As earlier stated, rather than operate on vague and general principles, these fiscal incentives could have been directly targeted towards biodiversity issues such as weaning farmers in adjacent agricultural lands from chemical use, or giving tax breaks to companies that directly contribute to wildlife law enforcement. Actually, several of the local partners like the Philippine Eagle Foundation and Haribon Foundation, serve as models given the number of major companies that contribute to these NGOs in their conservation efforts.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
National biodiversity information system <i>PAWB biodiversity information system has</i>	KM system established at PAWB with computerized data storage and retrieval system that can be accessed on-line by LGUs, conservation NGOs	Knowledge Management System (KMS) established by BPP at BMB is undergoing upgrading/updating and accessible at www.philbiodiversitypartnerships.com .

<p><i>limited data and information that can be shared with LGUs, conservation NGOs and other development agencies.</i></p>	<p>and other development agencies.</p>	<p>E-CITES was developed by WRD with the assistance of the project.</p>
--	--	---

The website is already in place but many of its pages are still under construction. Information about the sites are still incomplete. Moreover, other than a few database, the system that will feed the website in order to come up with a national biodiversity information system does not seem to be in place.

<p>Outcome 2: LGUs encompassing at least 1.6 million has. in five biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures.</p>		
<p>OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i></p>	<p>Targets</p>	<p>Accomplishments</p>
<p>LGUs with tools and capacities for mainstreaming biodiversity in local development policy making, planning, budgeting and M&E systems</p>	<p>A comprehensive suite of tools and associated capacity-building support for mainstreaming biodiversity available to LGUs in the target regions by year 3.</p>	<p>Framework and Methods for Biodiversity Mainstreaming in the Local Planning and Process of Local Government Units (LGUs) approved and adopted by Housing Land Use and Regulatory Board (HLURB) last 31 July 2013.</p> <p>Developed the Manual of Procedures for mainstreaming biodiversity in the land use plans of LGUs.</p> <p>Drafted Framework and Methods for Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) and associated Local Development Investment Program (LDIP)</p> <p>Drafted Framework and Methods for Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Barangay Development Plan for finalization to incorporate comments</p> <p>Drafted Framework and Methods and accompanying Manual of Procedures (MoP) for Integrating Biodiversity into the ADSDPP Processes and the BD-Enhanced ADSDPP into the Mandated LGU Plans of Host Local Governments</p> <p>Prepared the Training Module for the BD Enhanced ADSDPP MoP</p>

This is the project's most important accomplishment and unexpectedly got a boost from the adoption by the HLURB of biodiversity as a key requirement in preparing or revising existing CLUPs. The tools developed should be disseminated as widely as possible even to LGUs that were not included in the project but harbor KBAs within their territorial jurisdictions.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
LGUs with toolkits and implementation capacity for application of SEAs, as well as landscape level natural resource management, across multiple and individual LGUs	<p>Tools developed and 20% of LGUs in project sites trained in SEAs and landscape level natural resources management</p> <p>User friendly manuals for transboundary resource management planning developed and 20% of LGUs trained in their use</p> <p>DILG Memorandum Order prescribing planning guidelines and SEA approaches</p>	<p>Developed Manual of Procedures (MoP) on BDSEA for National Government Agencies (NGAs) and MoP Simplified BDSEA for Local Government Units.</p> <p>BDSEA trainings: QPL (Madella, Aglipay, Nagtipunan, Cabbaroguis, Diffun & Saguday); NECKBA (Baggao)</p> <p>Transboundary Planning orientations: NECKBA (Lallo, Gattaran, Gonzaga, Baggao, Buguey and Sta. Teresita); CPM (Janiuay & Lambunao, Iloilo, Sipalay City, Negros Occ.); MHNP (Mati, San Isidro, Gov. Generoso); LMKBA (Tubod, Sison, Mainit, Alegria, Surigao del Norte; Kitcharao, Jabonga, Santiago & Tubay, Agusan del Norte)</p> <p>Drafted the Framework and Methods for Transboundary Planning and accompanying MoP</p> <p>Draft framework pilot-tested in LMKBA and NECKBA</p>

A BDSEA manual was produced although as stated, it has no legal anchor in the Philippines and the effort would have been better served in strengthening the analysis of biodiversity impacts within the context of the EIA system. BDSEA was likewise applied to the CLUPs of several municipalities in QPL in a reductive exercise. Lastly, the Evaluation Team did not sense any strong support on BDSEA from the other government agencies.

As regards the production of user-friendly manuals for transboundary planning, powerpoint presentations were submitted using the framework used in land-use planning.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
LGU development expenditures for identifiably BD-friendly programmes and investments.	200% increase in overall LGU development expenditures for biodiversity friendly programmes and investments	<p>In 2013, total investments for BD-friendly programs amounted to US\$202,310.90.</p> <p>Investments for the last three years from 2014-2016 totaled to US\$3,359,461, which represents an</p>

<p><i>Only LGUs in NNNP and Malampaya have annual budget allocations for biodiversity friendly projects amounting to US \$55,562</i></p> <p><i>Other LGUs in the project sites do not have regular budget allotment to support biodiversity conservation</i></p> <p><i>Budget support to biodiversity related initiatives is negligible and sporadic.</i></p>	<p>At least 3 LGUs in each biogeographic region have budget allocations for biodiversity conservation by end-project (11 LGUs)</p>	<p>increase of 370% from 2013 to 2016: NECKBA (Gonzaga: \$40,905.00, Baggao: \$10,347.86; Buguey: \$12,305.73) MSPLS (Taytay: \$152,793.37) MSKBA (Sablayan: \$232,907.05) CPM (Lau-an: \$217,797.89; Iloilo: \$665,991.70) NNNP (Victorias: \$850,181.94; Silay: \$471,380.19; Calatrava: \$441,713.68) LMKBA (Mainit: \$9,926.16; Tubod: \$3,157.79) MHNP: (Gov. Generoso: \$14,707.34; San Isidro: \$270,338.83; Mati: \$297,218.76)</p> <p>Two (2) LGUs included in their Medium-Term Local Development Investment Program allocated a total of US\$ 1,216,354.09 budget for biodiversity conservation for the period of 2017-2019. CPM: (Lau-an: US\$338,101.82) NNNP: (Victorias City: \$878,252.27)</p>
---	--	--

One of the benefits of the integration of biodiversity in CLUPs is the justification for activities and the allocation of concomitant funding related to biodiversity. This is the singular accomplishment of the project that will likely be replicated in many other sites.

Upon confirmation with the key informants on the amounts reported, many were surprised and found the figures cited as beyond what they can imagine. Some have indicated that their budgetary allocations were more modest in value, although no less significant given the other competing uses of funds.

The Evaluation Team suggests an evaluation of the methodology used in ascertaining the budgetary allocations with a focus on a more objective determination of these monetary commitments.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
<p>LGUs in critical biogeographic regions with policy framework and technical capacity to support biodiversity friendly agricultural practices</p>	<p>20% of LGUs with local ordinances and programs adopting BDFAP</p> <p>20% of LGUs with staff trained in promoting BDFAP</p> <p>20% increase in LGU budgets for BDFAP</p>	<p>Draft LGU template ordinance on BDFAP</p> <p>Orientation: 26% of LGUs covered; drafting of the ordinance will commence upon the adoption and issuance of the BDFAP JAO.</p> <p>27 % of LGUs with staff trained on BDFAPs.</p> <p>Training of Trainers (CPM, NNNP, LMKBA, MHNP)</p> <p>The training of trainers on BDFAP scheduled this October 2016 will cover 15 LGUs from Luzon.</p>

The project has produced draft ordinances and training manuals for BDFAP replication among LGUs but the roll-out was contingent on the draft JAO, which has not been approved.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
LGUs in critical biogeographic regions with local regulations and capacity to implement policies on wildlife trade	<p>10 LGUs with local ordinances to support regulation of local endemics</p> <p>10 LGUs with staff trained on policies and procedures governing wildlife trade</p> <p>Local coordinating bodies established with DENR, wildlife enforcement agents and volunteers to strengthen regulation of wildlife trade</p>	<p>The following LGUs are currently preparing their LEC:</p> <p>Baggao, Cagayan (final draft) Sebaste and Culasi, Antique (for SB review) Sablayan, Mindoro Occidental (for refinement)</p> <p>LEC Orientation: 12 LGUs (6 in NeCKBA and 6 in QPL)</p> <p>25 LGUs trained on policies and procedures governing wildlife trade: MSPLS: Taytay, Palawan (1) CPM: Libacao and Madalag, Aklan; Barbaza, Bugasong, Culasi, Lauan, San Remigio, Valderrama, Antique; Jamindan, Tapaz, Capiz; Calinog, Janiuay and Lambunao, Iloilo (14) MHNP: Mati City, San Isidro and Governor Generoso, Davao Oriental (3) LMKBA: Tubod, Sison, Mainit and Alegria, Surigao del Norte; Kitcharao, Jabonga, Santiago and Tubay, Agusan del Norte (7)</p> <p>Local coordinating bodies to strengthen regulation of wildlife trade were established at: MSPLS, NNNP, LMKBA</p> <p>Local MoA on wildlife surveillance, monitoring of illegally traded wildlife deferred pending the approval of the MoA at the National level.</p>

The Evaluation Team did not find any supporting documents on the above except for the draft local environmental codes for Calatrava (NNNP) and Sablayan (MSKBA). As for the trainings, it is not clear if the number represents municipalities trained or just individuals.

Based on the interview with LMKBA representatives, the LMDA has current logistical difficulties while for NNNP, its Provincial Environmental Management Office (PEMO) is in charge of this task. The latter claims not to be part of BPP however.

As for the MOA on wildlife surveillance, a copy thereof was not provided. It is also pending approval, as stated.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
LGUs with regulatory structures and incentive systems to encourage the development of biodiversity-friendly businesses, including investor codes of conduct	10 LGUs in project sites with regulatory structures, incentive systems, investor codes of conduct and programs and budgets promoting BD-friendly business.	9 LIICs passed: Cagayan: Sta. Teresita, Lal-lo, Buguey OccMin: Sablayan Palawan: San Vicente Quirino: Saguday & Diffun Davao Oriental: San Isidro Negros Occidental Strategic Action Plans (Tourism): QPL, NECKBA, MHNP

The Evaluation Team was able to review six LIICs,¹⁸ and three strategic tourism action plans¹⁹ with tourism guidebook.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Mechanisms and capacities for intra-LGU knowledge sharing on mainstreaming biodiversity <i>Mechanisms exist for intra LGU sharing on environment programs and performance but not on biodiversity</i>	Mechanism and network established to regularly share lessons on mainstreaming biodiversity New national policy proposals formulated/approved based on lessons from LGUs/project sites Improved capacity by LGUs to advocate improved policies	The Local Project Site Committees that serves as mechanism and network to share lessons on biodiversity mainstreaming was strengthened. Part of the management response to the recommendation of the Midterm Evaluators, the BMB and BPP-PMU will organize a forum/round table discussion to discuss and share learnings drawn from the project that will eventually provide platform to develop new policy proposals LPSCs in the demonstrations sites are maintained and continue to provide guidance to the project and are being prompt to provide the coordinating mechanisms beyond the project life. Prepared the Terms of Reference for the creation and operationalization of the BD-Net. The BD-Net, a consortium comprising of academic (state and private universities and colleges or SPUCs), non-government organizations (NGOs), other allied institutions (AIs) will serve as the institutional platform for the provision of technical assistance and essential and relevant biodiversity data, information, knowledge and associated services for

¹⁸ These were: Sablayan, Occidental Mindoro (MSKBA); Calatrava, Negros Occidental (NNNP); San Vicente, Palawan (MSPLS); Sta. Teresita, Cagayan (NECKBA); and, Saguday & Madella, Quirino (QPL).

¹⁹ These were for the provinces of Davao Oriental (MHRWS), Cagayan (NECKBA) and Quirino (QPL).

		local government units (LGUs) and other site-level stakeholders for the not only for the integration of biodiversity conservation planning into the local land use and development planning and plan implementation but also for the monitoring and assessment of the status and health of the biodiversity by the LGUs. The BD-Net also will provide the venue for the exchange of data and information including knowledge-sharing, and the furtherance of biodiversity conservation advocacy that can be useful in the policy formulation and decision-making processes at the national, regional, provincial, and local levels.
--	--	---

The two LPSCs encountered by the Evaluation Team in NECKBA and CPM only had start-up meetings. There is indication that the NECKBA LPSC had subsequent meetings but the documentation needs to be improved.

As earlier stated, other sites have existing equivalents to the LPSC and most are pre-existing and already functional. LMKBA has the LMDA but it is currently having problems with budget and personnel. For MHRWS, this is the PAMB. For NNNP, it is the PEMO, which considers itself as not part of BPP. For QPL, the provincial government has pro-actively created a Special Projects Unit (SPU), which oversees not just BPP but other foreign-funded projects in QPL.

Unfortunately, another missed opportunity from the project is learning among the sites especially in this project where 2 to 3 of the sites are well-established and can provide inputs to the others. These are MHRWS, QPL and NNNP which seem to have their own momentum.

Outcome 3: Systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering at least 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro, Mindanao).

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
<p>LGU development plans at project sites complying with SEA approach, as well as landscape level natural resources management</p> <p><i>LGUs do not apply SEAs in local development planning</i></p>	<p>At least 20% of LGUs in the project sites apply SEA in their development planning.</p> <p>At least 20% of LGUs in the project sites integrate biodiversity conservation zoning (PA or KBA zoning) in their CLUP.</p>	<p>13% of the total LGUs covered by the project covering six (6) LGUs from Quirino Province and one (1) in NNNP pilot-tested the simplified BDSEA in their local land use plans.</p> <p>Provided orientation training on BDSEA for additional 11 % of the LGUs.</p> <p>56% of LGUs in the project sites integrate biodiversity conservation zoning (PA or KBA zoning) in their CLUP. These LGUs include Sta. Teresita (up to preparation of the Proposed Land Use Plan only), Buguey, Baggao in Cagayan; Cabarroguis,</p>

<i>PA management plans and FLUPs not integrated in CLUPs</i>		Maddela, Aglipay, Saguday, Diffun and Nagtipunan in Quirino; Taytay, Palawan; Calatrava and Silay (on-going) in Negros; Culasi (up to spatial options) and Sebaste (up to spatial options) in Antique; Tubod, Kitcharao, Mainit, Tubay, Jabonga, Santiago, Sison, and Alegria; Gov. Generoso (on-going) and San Isidro in Davao Oriental.
--	--	---

See previous comment. Only the three municipalities²⁰ in QPL have documented BDSEAs for CLUPs. As for the other sites, the BDSEA was like a rare species, and unheard of except by one interviewee from NECKBA.

A number of sites have CLUPs that integrated biodiversity conservation. This is the most solid achievement of the project.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
<p>Inter LGU cooperation in planning and regulation of natural resource use</p> <p><i>Municipal and City LGUs plan separately and do not coordinate and harmonize their plans.</i></p> <p><i>Provincial Land Use Committees oversee and approves municipal and city land use plans.</i></p> <p><i>LGUs within PAs or KBAs do not jointly adopt any economic PES instruments</i></p>	<p>At least two transboundary conservation areas established</p> <p>LGUs in the project sites (at least 3 jointly managed landscapes) harmonize their development plans for natural resource use in biodiversity landscapes that cut across their administrative boundaries.</p> <p>LGUs in the project sites sharing PA or KBA areas jointly adopt resource planning tools such as FLUP, ICRMP, ecological zoning.</p> <p>At least 3 Provincial CLUPs in the project sites adopt the planning tools for biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>PES instrument developed and tested in at least one biodiversity landscape.</p>	<p>Two transboundary conservation areas have been identified under the project namely: LMKBA and NECKBA.</p> <p>The Protected Area Management Plan (PAMP) for QPL was enhanced and finalized.</p> <p>The PAMP for NNNP is for consultation with PEMO-Negros Occidental.</p> <p>Taytay and San Vicente in MSPLS jointly adopted the FLUP, ICRMP and Environmental Critical Area Network (ECAN) Framework planning, initiated by Palawan Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD).</p> <p>PES on Watershed Management and Water Systems were developed and pilot-tested in QPL.</p>

²⁰ These are Cabarroguis, Maddela and Nagtipunan.

The documentation on these targets are sparse. The Evaluation Team heard of transboundary plans mentioned by interviewees from NECKBA and CPM but these are still very much in the pipeline.

As for the objective of LGUs harmonizing their development plans in their jointly managed landscapes, because of their geographic characteristics and political history, CPM, NECKBA, MSPLS and NNNP are the primary sites.²¹

Lastly, as regards the adoption of the PES involving the setting-up of a drinking water system for residents of Bgy. Sto. Niño, Maddela in QPL, the activity is too miniscule, generating only roughly PHP4,500 per month, half of which needs to be retained for repair purposes, while the remaining half is not even sufficient to pay the monthly minimum wage of a single employee. There might also be some reservations on the concept of linking PES with access to safe drinking water, which other funding organizations might actually provide for free as a Millennium/Sustainable Development Goal, especially in this remote village.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
New conservation areas established	Three new conservation areas established covering 15 LGUs	Established new conservation areas (Local Conservation Areas) in MHRWS and LMKBA and critical habitat in CPM (Lambunao and Sebaste).

This is another solid accomplishment of the project with San Isidro enacting an ordinance²² to expand MHRWS by virtue of the locally conserved area (LCA) modality. There was a positive interaction here between the BPP and NewCAPP, both UNDP-GEF funded projects.

Meantime, the documentation for critical habitat establishments in Sebaste, Antique in CPM (and additionally, Alegria, Surigao del Norte in LMKBA) are just drafts. There was no documentation for Lambunao, Iloilo although the Evaluation Team was able to speak to its municipal environment officer who mentioned the biodiversity assessment undertaken for the site.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
---	----------------	------------------------

²¹ QPL is already being spearheaded by the provincial LGU so not only is its PAMP harmonized, its CLUPs are all harmonized. MHRWS, as an established PA, already has a PAMB so the harmonization is already institutionalized by law. MSKBA is found in only municipality, i.e., Sablayan, Occidental Mindoro. LMKBA already has the LMMA that serves as venue to thresh out differences among its component LGUs.

²² Municipal Ordinance No. 225, as amended.

Farmers adopting biodiversity friendly practices <i>No increase over project period</i>	At least 5,000 farmers adopting BDFAP Additional 2,000 farmers and producers meeting certification standards	To date, about 8,878 hectares (candidates for certification through recognition) in the eight project sites were assessed and documented as potential sites of farm areas practicing biodiversity-friendly agriculture practices. Another 5,000 has. from MHRWS (Gov. Generoso) is subject for validation
--	---	--

A matrix of BDFAP sites were provided with a listing of the specific farms that comprise them. For further validation.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Pressures from overharvesting of wild resources <i>Expected to increase over total area of KBAs/PAs in project sites by 10% each year</i>	Pressure reduced in PAs totalling at least 260,000 hectares No net reduction in population of key species in selected sites (e.g., hornbill, Philippine eagle, etc.)	The propose policy on the guidelines for the harmonized implementation of regulations on the domestic trade in wildlife were reviewed and discussed within DENR-BMB and DILG, the said policy is for further review/consultation and approval. To lessen the pressure in PAs, conservation works were included in the local development plans. Another approach of the project to reduce the pressure in the PAs is to encourage LGUs to put in place an ordinance or formulate a Local Environment Code (LEC) that translates into action the stipulations under the Wildlife Resources Conservation and Protection Act (RA 9147) which states that LGUs shall initiate conservation measures for endemic species in their areas. The biodiversity assessments in the eight (8) demonstration sites were completed.

Efforts to enhance or formulate local environmental codes in all the sites except for MSPLS were documented.

Biodiversity assessments were completed for the sites.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Private investments in biodiversity friendly	At least four businesses engaged in biodiversity-	Demonstrated BDFEs with potentials for scale-up and supported through market linkage and partnerships with private investors:

business in selected project sites	friendly enterprises in project sites by year 5. At least four producer groups in PAs/KBAs adhere to LGU investor codes of conduct	NECKBA: Bakong Enterprise in Sta Teresita; Sarakat and Pataga in Baggao QPL: Coffee in Quirino (local PO, MASREDECA and Philippine Coffee Alliance) MSPLS: Pandan and bamboo small furniture and Honey CPM: Abaca & Nito Handicraft in Antique. NNNP: Souvenir items made of nito, nipay seeds and grass and organic vegetables MHRWS: Almaciga resin tapping (feasibility Study completed); MoA signed with Mati City for the provision of funds to support expansion of almaciga resin production
------------------------------------	---	--

There seems to be confusion between BDFEs and livelihood projects, which is the subject of the next objective. These investments theoretically would have been the result of the LIICs passed by the LGUs. However, those that the Evaluation Team visited are mostly subsistence livelihoods.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Communities receiving incentives for shifting to sustainable practices	Conservation agreements in place with at least two community groups in CPM and NNNP PES schemes negotiated with two more community groups in other sites in PPLS and NNNP 10 communities engaged in sustainable livelihoods	The transboundary planning in CPM was deferred due to lack of interest/cooperation of the LGUs. PES in NNNP was also not pursued because this was done by the PEMO, doing so will only replicate the works. However, the project focused its PES works in QPL. Nine (9) POs involved/supported in capacity and skills training for BDFE: QPL: MASREDECA MSPLS: MPMC, SIKAP NNNP: PAFISFA, VISFFA CPM: TIGMAMUGON LMKBA: SJVPA, EPATLEA MHRWS: LATAGG

There was no conservation agreement or PES scheme in CPM and NNNP although we were able to find one for Bgy. Eden in Cabarroguis in QPL and some entered by CI, based on interviews for MHRWS.

See previous comment on the PES scheme in QPL.

As regards the livelihood schemes, the Evaluation Team was able to visit the livelihood projects in NECKBA (bakong & lubeg wine), QPL (coffee), NNNP (tiger grass, honey-based products) and MHRWS (almaciga resin and handicrafts). The team was also able to talk with the Design Center of the Philippines and the UP Institute for Small-Scale Industries (UP-ISSI) aside from review the DTI reports for its meetings in Davao, Iloilo and Palawan.

Among the accomplishments cited by the PMU, the almaciga resin gathering is the most important and promising, providing an organized and sustainable system for harvesting this commodity without killing the almaciga trees. The Evaluation Team was able to visit a buying site.

The organic coffee production among local residents of QPL was an established livelihood and the BPP has linked them with the Coffee Alliance. Unfortunately, during the visit, the Evaluation Team stumbled upon sacks of chemical fertilizers within the coffee processing facility, putting into doubt its organic claim and the BDFAP efforts.

For the other activities, one of the products predicted to have a major breakthrough in the next couple of years is the bakong (*Hanguana malayana*) a fiber extracted from a plant that grows in Bangalao Lake in Sta. Teresita, Cagayan (NECKBA), with an existing order of several tons just for exhibition purposes alone. However, the biodiversity impact study on this plant has not yet been concluded and the sustainable volume of harvest thereof has not been established. Considering the projected order, this is another missed opportunity where BDSEA could have been used for this BDFE, or a simple biodiversity impact assessment would have sufficed.

As regards the other livelihoods visited such as the baskets from tiger grass in Silay and the honey-based products in Victorias municipalities both in NNNP, the Evaluation Team found the same too micro in scale and financially unsustainable. The tiger grass was not even sourced from the locale of the weavers. Livelihood experts interviewed doubt if these can be sustained in the next five years.

OVI <i>Baseline (where indicated)</i>	Targets	Accomplishments
Data and knowledge management systems to support local initiatives <i>Some LGUs have isolated data and knowledge management systems but not linked to national system</i>	Rapid resource assessments completed/updated in eight project sites Population estimates of critically endangered species in eight sites determined Monitoring system in place to determine progress in	Biodiversity assessments in the eight sites were completed and ecological profiles were updated. Population estimates as of (2013-2014) of the critically endangered species of both fauna and flora in the eight sites are as follows: M&E system for LGUs in the project sites that will be linked to existing M&E systems of the LGU, DILG Regional and Central Offices and DENR BMB are still being developed.

<p><i>Insufficient data to adequately monitor status and trends in biodiversity and impacts of development programs</i></p>	<p>meeting conservation plan objectives, linked to knowledge management system</p> <p>Increased public awareness and positive support to conservation efforts among local stakeholders</p> <p>LGU level data and knowledge management system enhanced</p> <p>LGU staff trained in use of data and knowledge management system</p> <p>LGUs able to access and share data and information in national system</p>	<p>The initial indicators identified to monitor the impact of the local policies and programs include:</p> <p>Presence of clear biodiversity information, in absence of biodiversity assessment/inventory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of specific zone and land use for biodiversity • Presence of area allotted for the practice of biodiversity-friendly agriculture practices • Presence of livelihood/enterprises which is biodiversity-friendly • Presence of biodiversity quality indicators
---	--	--

As regards this output, the biodiversity assessments were completed with documentation. However, the LGU-based M&E system in the project sites was not, including the linking by way of KMS or LGU capacitation.

As far as local awareness of the importance of biodiversity is concerned, this was most palpable in NNNP and MHRWS.

Relevance

The project is rated as RELEVANT. Based on the interviews with key informants in the course of the evaluation mission, all of them are aware or were made aware of the importance of biodiversity and the role of other developmental aims, particularly sustainable development goals.

However, there was not much familiarity with the GEF except the mention that it is the source of funds for the project and the interview respondents are aware of such fact.

Locally, as pointed out by in the MTE, LGUs embraced the technical assistance offered by the project to help them comply with the mandated land-use planning process. Beyond this, most of those interviewed expressed earnest appreciation in understanding the concept and value of biodiversity, which can have potential economic benefits. More readily, knowledge of important species within their locality became an immediate source of local pride.

Both nationally and internationally, there has been no change in the biodiversity strategies of the country and the project remained on point. At present, the project's relevance was made more pressing in the light of political developments where even climate agreements seem to fall apart. Considering the importance of protecting biodiversity to a climate-vulnerable nation like the Philippines, the project has definitely retained its relevance.

Effectiveness

This is rated as MODERATELY SATISFACTORY.

As stated, the mainstreaming of biodiversity in land-use planning is the project's most dominant achievement. Despite being only one of six thematic areas, biodiversity-integration in CLUPs has far-reaching consequences and can affect the other thematic areas as well.

Land-use planning is the spatial framework by which LGUs manage and conserve their resources. It is the language spoken and understood by LGUs. Various legal threats to biodiversity in the form of conversion, agricultural practices, mining, etc. are circumscribed by land-use plans and can be used by ardent biodiversity advocates to oppose or mitigate their impacts. Even BDSEA, if ever it is approved, will still depend on land-use plans to be effective so its importance cannot be underestimated.

It bears noting though that conversely, a bad or "incomplete" land-use plan can wreak major havoc to a KBA. This may be the reason why mining was able to enter an area adjacent to Mt. Hamiguitan and has actually fragmented a much larger biodiversity landscape within the province.

The other footnote to this major accomplishment is that as mentioned earlier, the Evaluation Team observed that the intervention was uneven among the sites, and even within component LGUs of the same KBA. Hence, when it comes to transboundary plans, it's only as strong as its weakest link.

This highly significant accomplishment notwithstanding, the meager accomplishments in the other thematic areas weigh down the project. Per PMU designation, aside from land-use planning, there were five other thematic areas, namely: (a) BDSEA, (b) BDFAP, (c) enhanced wildlife law enforcement through a more focused local environment code, (d) BDFE, and (e) setting up of KMS. There is little by way of experience, insights or lessons learned to take home in terms of BDFAPs, BDFEs, KMs, etc. and more importantly, how these concepts interact with each other. The sole exception is QPL and it stands out because of the involvement of its Governor who is capable of not only making the different components of BPP work together but also making the different projects of the various funding agencies lining up the province complement each other.

The Evaluation Team likewise observes that it was not evident in the project sites if there are significant post-training follow-up activities that will build on the lessons learned including the

formation of core groups that will carry on and build upon the application of the learnings from the trainings. It can be mentioned that there were LPSCs established to serve as a platform for follow-up activities, but they did not function as intended.

Another lament is that there was also no cross-pollination among the sites. Disjointed as they are, the weaker sites were not able to take advantage of the experience and wisdom from the more advanced sites like MHRWS, QPL, NNNP or even Sablayan, Occidental Mindoro (per ProDoc). For instance, MHRWS was able to readily address the problem posed by the rationalization and the other sites (CPM, in particular) could have benefited from this. The bacong weavers of NECKBA could have also learned from the design and quality standards used in MHRWS.

Efficiency

This is rated MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY.

A common complaint among practically all local partners was the delay in the release of funds which in turn resulted in the delay in the implementation of activities, which then affected the ability to meet project outcomes. While the partners did their best to catch up, this problem should have been addressed early on.

Another issue was the problem with the DENR rationalization which could have been addressed outright, instead of being cited now as the reason for some of the failings in some of the project sites. This was not a problem that was not unanticipated. Neither was it without any solution, as some of the sites were able to capably demonstrate.

Country ownership

The very prominent role of the LGUs in the implementation of project outcomes as rooted in mainstream LGU functions as provided under the *Local Government Code of 1991 (RA 7160)* is the best evidence of country ownership for the BPP. This is bolstered further by the prominent roles played by national government agencies (e.g., DENR, DA, DILG, etc.) in the capacity enhancement and mainstreaming components of the Project.

It was also clear from the sites and the partners that while this may be a foreign-funded initiative, this was a project developed and implemented by Filipinos. Even UNDP noted the high degree of country involvement from the beginning of the project even at the conceptualization stage.

Mainstreaming

Framework. The framework used to assess the breadth and extent of the mainstreaming of project interventions was inspired by gender mainstreaming,²³ which sets out the following stages:

- a. Foundation formation²⁴ – this is the stage where the agency’s awareness of biodiversity conservation²⁵ is heightened and it sets the tone for appreciating the value-added in committing to biodiversity conservation as one of the priority thrusts of the agency.
- b. Installation of strategic mechanisms²⁶ – this marks the transition of the organization towards mainstreaming biodiversity conservation.
- c. Application²⁷ - this is where biodiversity conservation activities are consolidated for more impact. Once they are consolidated, they cease to become sporadic and uncoordinated.

²³ NCRFW (2001).

²⁴ Some actions which may indicate this is happening are :

- (1) Broad statements by top management expressing support to biodiversity conservation;
- (2) Reviewing existing policies to determine their responsiveness to biodiversity conservation;
- (3) Allocating budget to fund activities related to biodiversity conservation; and
- (4) Evaluating and analyzing the organization’s potentials for incorporating the biodiversity conservation in the agency programs and projects.

²⁵ This may be the key item that will be evaluated, though as described in the ProDoc, specific outcomes relating to application of strategic environmental assessment, biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices, strengthened regulation of trade in wild plant and animal resources, development of biodiversity-friendly businesses and investment programs and knowledge management programs and advocacy networks, may also be considered.

²⁶ Some strategic mechanisms set up to support biodiversity conservation are the following :

- (1) Biodiversity conservation focal system or technical working group who serve as the planners and implementers of biodiversity conservation in the agency or entity;
- (2) Biodiversity conservation plans that translate and incorporate biodiversity conservation into actual programs and projects and set the direction of its mainstreaming efforts;
- (3) Identification of institutional mechanisms, such as funding and staff, to be tapped in implementing biodiversity conservation programs and projects; and
- (4) Issuance of policies and guidelines to hasten the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in the agency.

²⁷ Some of these interventions are :

- (1) Integration of the interventions in the key result areas (KRAs) of the agency and in the performance contracts of its officials;
- (2) Ensuring that the agency’s flagship programs address the issues relating to biodiversity conservation;
- (3) Biodiversity conservation training programs are more focused and particular to the needs of the sponsors, advocates and targets of change; and
- (4) Use of “biodiversity conservation lens” by field workers to develop, analyze and evaluate programs and projects.

- d. Commitment enhancement and institutionalization²⁸ - this is the full realization of the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in the agency. It also challenges the agency to continuously evaluate and improve their efforts.

From these stages in mainstreaming, there is STRONG mainstreaming when the various actions and initiatives are present in all the four stages of mainstreaming (foundation formation, installation of strategic mechanisms, application and commitment enhancement/ institutionalization); MODERATE mainstreaming when some actions are done in some of the four stages; and WEAK mainstreaming when there are only one or no action or initiatives at all in some of the stages.

Based on the above criteria, the project is rated to have achieved MODERATE MAINSTREAMING of its over-all efforts in achieving biodiversity conservation though it has not undertaken fully all the stages of mainstreaming in all of the thematic areas.

Examination of the Mainstreaming of the Project Sites. The table below indicates which stages of the mainstreaming process have been achieved on a per site basis:

CPM

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After rationalization which happened after June 2015, staff considered BPP dead; thereafter, lone staff started Dec 2015, but no activities were undertaken due to zero funds • Biodiversity assessments done in Lambunao but it did not lead to CLUP
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LPSC set up in 2014 though it does not appear to have done anything substantive after that
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE although GIZ's ForClim Project has taken over some of the activities of the project

LMKBA

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPP provided funds until 2015 only
-----------------------------	--

²⁸ By this time, the agencies should be implementing the following:

- (1) Policies and procedures are constantly modified and improved to make them responsive to biodiversity conservation;
- (2) Biodiversity conservation programs and projects are constantly introduced, evaluated and enhanced to sustain the mainstreaming effort; and
- (3) The accountability of sustaining the gains of mainstreaming is accepted and claimed as a commitment of everyone in the agency.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSU Naawan study on biodiversity assessment of the lake being updated; but this is not a limnological study CLUP a major benefit from BPP
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LMDA is a toothless body; OIC background is tourism, not wholly competent to run LMDA if the focus is on conservation of the site; does not even see the role of the LMDA to resolve conflicts among LGUs re the use of the lake Does not also see the urgency of addressing the problems of the lake Transboundary plan will ensure conservation of the area Next BOT has prioritized the selection of a full-time Director
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BPP not instrumental in minimizing spread of mining tenements Major threat is small-scale mining and illegal logging but further interviews indicate that a large-scale mining company is causing problems in the lake; meanwhile, fishkills are occurring indicating problems in the health of the lake
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NONE

MHRWS

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BPP assisted in the formation of LATAGG, which worked on developing almaciga resin for the benefit of the constituents of Gov. Generoso municipality
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PASU focused on the development of CLUPs including the passage of ordinance expanding the LCAs PEF worked on community agreements as their platform to ensure community rights are protected Ordinance passed to regulate the cutting of the almaciga trees in Gov. Generoso municipality Mayor herself is very active; supported by sanggunian
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There's a mining tenement near the site, but it was already there before BPP Recognized by UNESCO In spite of lack of urgency to deal with the forest destruction, various activities such as hunting, poaching including the killing of carabaos, mining continue in the areas
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mayor has several initiatives, like the multi-purpose conference center and hotel, that seeks to maximize the benefits of the municipality from the influx of visitors to Mt. Hamiguitan

NECKBA

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPP inputs were on awareness-raising on importance of biodiversity • Biodiversity assessments provided data to updating of CLUPs in the site • CLUP mainstreaming and development of transboundary plans • DENR transition severely affected implementation of BPP activities
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial Resolution started the mainstreaming process; but Provincial Development & Physical Framework Plan will also be updated with BPP inputs • Implementation mechanism set up for transboundary plan • LPSC set up in 2014, intended to push for transboundary plan; consolidation of the plan by PMU being awaited so Sanggunian can act on it
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder process under BPP takes up a lot of time though it is worth doing because it fosters stronger ownership of the results • Whether this will result to increased budgets for biodiversity conservation from hereon, a respondent said they are not sure of it • Violators who are mostly LGU officials are difficult to apprehend • Budget of 200k returned to PMU, due to lack of activities
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE

NNNP

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPP provided: a) information & capacity, including thematic maps, and b) funds to do biodiversity assessment, thus updating what partners know about key species in the site • CLUP done in Calatrava; also FLUP
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAMB convened since 2012 • BD-net set up, but not as big • No substantive engagement with PEMO, save for inviting them for workshops, nothing else
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDFAP did not change sugar production methods; problems of charcoal, illegal structures, encroachment and land use conversion unaddressed; forest guards catch their neighbors catch warty pigs, or gather firewood, but they merely warn them

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Calatrava, when one looks at one map, the area including the strict protection zone is planted with sugarcane; explanation is that the sugarcane has already been there even before the BPP²⁹ • increase in CENRO budget & updating of management plans, but selling of rights on-going • Users' fee approved recently by PAMB to address illegal structures though there were frequent clashes on illegal structures; differences within LGUs on enforcement protocol • The baseline figures for BDF practices appears to be very high
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE

QPL

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity assessment a significant contribution • SPU worked with 6 bgy's for their Barangay Development Plans, which became a GOLD awardee • CLUP mainstreaming, like the one carried out by Madella MPDC
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAMB created in 2005 but it does not have the full set of powers as it is only created under a Presidential Proclamation • Special Projects Unit set up at the Provincial level in 2013 • Provincial Environment Code passed in 2013
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest clearing an unaddressed problem in the site • BPP has not addressed the spread of RR corn as BDFAP is a very recent effort • There were some BDFAP applied in some areas though it was too small to spur a cascade of adopters that will eventually change the practice of agriculture in the province • CADT areas (Bugkalot CADT has some 102,000 has while the Agta CADT is around 32,000 has) which comprise 70% of the site, were apparently not impacted by BPP
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships beyond BPP established and already running, moving beyond BPP – JICA, KOICA, World Bank, GIZ

To recap, the Evaluation Team finds there is MODERATE mainstreaming of the project's thematic areas since there are existing plans with budgets, but the personnel in the LGUs, while present, are not really permanent and there are uncertainties in the placement of personnel at

²⁹ The DENR-BMB claims that a proposed land-use map has already been prepared and that uses inconsistent with the prescribed zoning will be disallowed or imposed sanctions.

the local government level. That does not indicate long-term application of the learnings and capacities taken up through the various activities of the project.

Examination of the Mainstreaming of the Project's Thematic Areas. Another way to examine how thoroughly mainstreaming has been achieved is to look at the four stages of mainstreaming vis-à-vis the achievements in each of the six thematic areas of the project.

BDSEA

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDSEA of CLUPs in QPL • Orientations done in NeCKBA, and in the Municipality of Mainit, in LMKBA • The manner of consultation on the Memorandum Circular on BDSEA left something to be desired (like fuller collaboration and the presentation of finished product already to the agency partners)
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDSEA draft policy held up at DENR executive committee • The enhanced ADSDPP which was supposed to also be a policy mechanism that may incorporate BDSEA seems to have been stuck in the in-fighting within NCIP
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piloted in National Tourism Policy and National Greening Program
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE

BDFAP

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not tapped in Lambunao as people are into agroforestry, like coffee and cacao • Awareness raising done in NECKBA but no follow-up done on the students, 435 of them • There was also a mistaken belief by respondents in this site that mainstreaming happened already at the conduct of the IEC • Planning Division of BMB was not aware that Negros Occidental, together with Negros Oriental, has a joint policy issuance mandating that the entire island of Negros be an Organic Island. On hindsight, BDFAP would have been mainstreamed with that policy issuance in the entire island. There were incompatibilities though between BDFAP and Organic Agriculture Act as per the BSWM which could have been resolved WITHIN the Organic Act so BDFAP would have checked the excesses of Organic Act practices
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMB planning not aware there is such a thing as an Organic Island ordinance in the Negros Island provinces; such ordinance would have been a good strategic mechanism for mainstreaming BDFAP • BDFAP JAO ok with DA; still with DENR executive committee

Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some efforts were done to put BDFAP in practice like in QPL, but such application has not modified the major agricultural activities in the six sites visited, noting however that major changes in agricultural practices do not happen overnight • A draft ATI Manual on BDFAP has been prepared • In Maddela in QPL, BPP input has purportedly shifted investments in CDP, but they are not that significant
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE

Wildlife Law Enforcement

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife Law Enforcement • The draft Local Environment Code (LEC) is good but LGUs have not had the opportunity to implement it yet. It should have been the focus area of the BPP. The LGUs assisted have acknowledged that biodiversity conservation (including wildlife law enforcement) is now an important component of LEC.
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some ordinances were drafted (Culasi, Sebaste, CPM)
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was some application in NECKBA but the focus of this policy should be in the uplands
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE

BDFE

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, most initiatives here were started without BPP intervention, highlighting the thrust towards value-addition per ProDoc • Bakong-based products started by Sta. Teresita Mayor; no cent was given by BPP at all although a handloom was secured through the Shared Service Facility of the DTI • Organic coffee by CBFM beneficiaries in QPL started by RP-German project though BPP did some trainings in value chain analysis and business modeling as support to the PO as well as linkaging with coffee buyers PCA/Bote Central • Nito basket weaving started by PAFISFA; linked with Association of Negros Producers
-----------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gawahon eco-park VCO soaps, snacks, started; needs further training • Almaciga resin started by the former Mayor through a study by the UPLB; FS also done as part of BPP activities of DENR-Region XI in 2014 including an almaciga tree inventory • Furniture products in CPM-training objectives got mixed-up • There was no vision to explore the biochemical compounds of natural products by way of partnering with state universities and colleges, thus the BDFE was limited to handicraft type of initiatives • Because of BPP, BOI has put as a matter of general policy a word of encouragement to enterprises to implement best practices to protect and conserve biodiversity and promote biodiversity-friendly businesses and that is what can be found now in the 2014 Investment Priorities Plan in part XII of Memorandum Circular 2015-01
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear business models were established • Ordinance was passed in 2014 to prevent over-harvesting • In QPL, there's now a Provincial Multi-Investment Plan with 5 crops up for development • Tappers of almaciga in Gov Generoso are organized and given regular trainings and their activities are now regularly monitored • The 2012 JMC is all about the formulation of the LIICs to LGUs; and this is another contribution of DTI to BPP, the development of policy to encourage BDFE in LGUs, who will be the ones to give it out to the local investors
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No repeat orders can be in the horizon • Evaluation team found chemical fertilizers in the storage house of the PO. This starkly illustrates the compartmentalized implementation of the thematic areas. Had the thematic areas merged, BDFAP may have been applied here • Almaciga festival in August every year • Questions still hang on DTI's willingness to mainstream biodiversity beyond the usual awareness-raising and advocacy work and further up into the policy chain (e.g., in the upcoming rationalization of fiscal incentives currently pending in the Senate through Sen. Villar, on whether BDFE incentives will be retained)
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not survive in 5-10 years although this is not solely the responsibility of the project but also of the other stakeholders • Since the plant species used for handicrafts is harvested only and is closely identified with Sta. Teresita, scaling-up nationwide may be difficult • Almaciga festival in August

CLUPs

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trainings done • Transboundary planning may not be a good basis for further mainstreaming of biodiversity • DILG collaboration did not materialize
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Development Plan approved in Maddela • Approved via ordinances • CDPs in barangays
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear if the Regional Development Councils (RDC) took them up to mainstream them throughout the region, noting however, that the upscaling of the BD-responsive CLUPs in the Regional Physical Framework Plan requires the crafting of a framework and process that was not part of the project design. This constraint also applies in the mainstreaming of biodiversity in the regional development plans • The importance given to biodiversity was not adequately reflected in the LGU budgets • Application in gender and DRR-CCA were floated during the meetings, but it was not clear if concrete outcomes resulted therefrom • Given the PMU's expertise in biodiversity, efforts should have been made to incorporate biodiversity in DILG's DRR-CCA or peace promotion initiatives
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE • Most CLUPs are new; they haven't been subjected to day-to-day application and will only be updated later

KMS

Foundation Formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confused with IEC (in NNNP)
Establishment of Strategic Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trainings were done, but not much else happened after that
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There does not seem to be a clear KMS set up in the sites
Commitment Enhancement & Institutionalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE

Exploring further how the mainstreaming of the BPP's interventions were achieved using the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012-2018 for the Philippines, the project achieved MODERATE MAINSTREAMING in the following sub-outcome areas :

- Sub-outcome 2.1 – productive employment for sustainable employment and growth

The project's BDFE thematic area has gone up to the three stages of mainstreaming from foundation formation, establishment of strategic mechanisms and application by providing employment to identified partners, which even if it may take a lot of effort to become sustainable, will put partner-communities on a path that will provide them gainful employment provided all the elements of the enterprise can be sustained beyond the lifetime of the project.

- Sub-outcome 4.2 – climate change adaptation

The project's BDFAP thematic area, once fully implemented, should enable communities to adjust to the challenges of climate change, thus enhancing the communities' resilience.

- Sub-outcome 4.3 – ENR protection and conservation

The work on the local environmental codes has gone through three stages of mainstreaming (i.e., drafting of the local ordinances, setting up of wildlife enforcement committees, and initial efforts at catching violators). This should address the over-exploitation of natural resources as envisioned by the UNDAF.

Sustainability

Financial resources. This is rated MODERATELY LIKELY.

One of the benefits of the inclusion of biodiversity in land-use planning is that it will likely translate in other short-term plans of the LGUs dependent on the CLUP such as the comprehensive development plans (CDP), LIICs, etc. Recognizing the biodiversity values can justify the creation of a local environmental office, the appropriation of budget and the like. Several of the LGUs within the sites have actually started this process so the sustainability in these areas is very likely. In some like QPL and MHRWS, the funding stream has actually grown because these LGUs have managed to integrate and focus their priorities to include biodiversity. Similarly, some of the partner NGOs of BPP have likewise secured funding for subsequent work in these areas (e.g., CI in QPL, PBCFI in NNNP) so their interventions will likely continue.

One drawback, as stated, is the relative unevenness of this outcome and some sites of BPP (e.g., CPM and NECKBA) are likely to be left behind because there is no strong biodiversity policy/social infrastructure that was left behind by the BPP after its term ends.

Socio-economic. This is rated MODERATELY LIKELY.

There are actually existing institutional mechanisms and linkages in each site that will likely carry on biodiversity aims beyond BPP. These include the Antique Development Foundation in CPM, Negros Organic Producers Association or the Association of Negros Producers in NNNP, the Special Projects Unit of Quirino Province in QPL, the Sta. Teresita LGU and Design Center

Philippines for the bakong products in NECKBA, the San Isidro LGU for MHRWS, along with the partner NGOs whose presence in some of the sites has predated BPP. Credit should also be given to the local communities and IPs who have been in these KBAs for decades and have sustainably managed these resources over long periods of time.

Institutional framework and governance. This is rated MODERATELY LIKELY.

This is the arena where the project largely played and has made significant inroads particularly with the HLURB, DOT, and many of the partner LGUs. DA has likewise been introduced to biodiversity. More work needs to be done with DILG which cannot be dispensed with because of its special role in local governance.

Sadly, it is the DENR which remains sharply divided on the value of biodiversity.

Environmental. This is rated MODERATELY LIKELY.

BPP did not have direct interventions to address this concern, focusing instead on the policy drivers of forest fragmentation. Hence, the fruits of its efforts will be seen in the kind of activities that will be undertaken as a result of the policy efforts and this may take some time (e.g., less use of pesticides, deputation of more forest wardens, etc.)

The report on the rate of forest fragmentation over 5-year periods between 2005 to 2010 and 2011-2015 have shown that it has slowed down in the latter period. Whether or not this is attributable to the project is not very clear.

Overall likelihood. This is rated MODERATELY LIKELY. As stated, the elements are present for the biodiversity aims of the project to be carried on both at the national and local levels. However, it remains to be seen whether the conflicting priorities that plague the DENR has been addressed. Likewise, the unevenness among the sites will result in some making further progress while others will likely do so at a much slower pace.

Impact

Policy interventions take a while to bear fruit and may take years before they can be reaped. This is the case with BPP and while funding for the project may have already ceased by then, it would be worthwhile to see using some of the project's metrics, if these have yielded results five or ten years down the line, for instance, on how much budget allocations for biodiversity have actually increased.

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project³⁰

- MTE & TE are good but regular monitoring should also be done to elicit more evidence and information in the project areas especially in difficult projects [UNDP]
- Project Board members should also have a bigger role in M&E [Project Board]
- Identify solutions beforehand to complications that can arise with working with the government as local responsible party (e.g., budgetary considerations, protocol, staffing, etc.). For instance, include UNDP-work in the IPCR of project staff who are eventually absorbed by the agency, and institute fund management seminars to the finance staff of the local field offices to familiarize them with the different accounting processes [Government Agencies & UNDP]
- Further documentation is needed on the role of women in conservation and how the project empowers women [PMU]

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

- Explore commonalities with organic agriculture to move BDFAP forward [DA, DENR, NGOs]
- Study how the present EIA system can be tweaked to be more biodiversity-focused, instead of pursuing BDSEA [DENR]
- Work with DILG on how biodiversity integration can be included in the LGU recognition system of the DILG (i.e., Performance Challenge Fund) in order to improve further the quality of these land-use plans [DENR, DILG]
- Mandate DENR technical assistance to LGUs on CLUPs, not just FLUPs [DENR, DILG, HLURB, LGUs]
- In KBAs that overlap with ancestral domains, document the process of integrating ADSDPPs with CLUPs [DENR, NCIP]
- Instead of bigger transboundary plans, go back to basics by initiating biodiversity-integration in the land-use plans of KBAs that did not fully benefit from the project (i.e., Antique and Cagayan PLGUs) [DENR]
- Link BDFE with BDFAP by studying the possibility of giving fiscal and non-fiscal incentives to agricultural activities that do not use pesticides, GMOs, among others. Pilot-test in QPL. [Quirino PLGU, DA]
- Continue the process of mainstreaming through constant application and strengthening of the foundations of the project thematic areas, including increasing budgetary commitments by LGUs [Government Agencies, LGUs, NGOs, UNDP]
- Instead of the usual enumeration of endangered species, identify the relevance of biodiversity to the other agencies and include these in the KMs to be produced [DENR]

³⁰ Responsible agencies/partners indicated in brackets.

- Translate in more easily understandable terms the process of BD-integration in CLUPs for future KMs so other LGUs can adopt the same [DENR, HLURB]
- Community involvement by way of consultations in CLUP formulation should be strengthened [LGUs, NGOs]
- Sensitivity training needed for some agencies working with local communities and IPs [Government Agencies, NGOs]

Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

- Instead of BDFEs, explore the possibility of formulating fiscal incentives that can generate funds directed towards forest protection, tree planting, etc. and can serve as much-needed capital for biodiversity-friendly livelihoods which can benefit IPs and POs alike and tied directly with conservation (e.g. financing of ICCAs by IPs) [DTI, DENR, NEDA]

Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Best Practices

- Recognition of the role of erstwhile unrelated other government agencies in conservation (e.g., HLURB, DOT, DTI)
- Integration of biodiversity with LGUs via land-use plans

Worst Practices

- DENR after it had insisted on a bigger role in BPP project implementation
- Bureaucratic protocols

5. ANNEXES

Annex A. TOR

See attached files.

Annex B. Itinerary

Date	Location	Office Visited
19 Sep 2016	Bgy. Patag, Silay City, Negros Occidental	PAFISFA
	Silay City, Negros Occidental	ENRO-Silay
	PBCFI Office Bacolod, Negros Occidental	PBCFI
	PEMO Bacolod, Negros Occidental	PEMO
20 Sep 2016	Gawahon Ecopark Victorias, Negros Occidental	Ecopark Staff VISFFA
	MPDC Office Calatrava, Negros Occidental	MPD Coordinator Planning & Development Office-Calatrava
21 Sep 2016	DENR-Region VI Iloilo City	DENR-Region VI PENRO-Negros Occidental
	MENRO Lambunao, Iloilo	MENRO-Lambunao
	Iloilo City	ADF
26 Sep 2016	HLURB Tuguegarao City, Cagayan	HLURB
	PPDO Tuguegarao City, Cagayan	PPDO
	DENR-Region II Office Tuguegarao City, Cagayan	DENR-Region II PENRO-Cagayan
27 Sep 2016	CENRO Aparri, Cagayan	CENRO-Aparri
28 Sep 2016	Provincial Capitol Cabarroguis, Quirino Province	Office of the Governor
		PNREO-QPL

Date	Location	Office Visited
		PASu-QPL
		SPU-Quirino Province
29 Sep 2016	Maddela, Quirino Province	MPDC-Maddela
	NCIP Cabarroguis, Quirino Province	NCIP-Quirino Province
30 Sep 2016	Tuguegarao City, Cagayan	PASu-NECKBA
03 Oct 2016	DENR-Reg. XI Davao City	PASu-Mt. Hamiguitan
	Philippine Eagle Sanctuary Malagos, Davao City	PEF
04 Oct 2016	Gov. Generoso, Davao Oriental	Office of the Mayor
	San Isidro, Davao Oriental	Office of the Mayor
05 Oct 2016	DENR-CARAGA Butuan City, Agusan del Sur	DENR-CARAGA
	Watergate Hotel Butuan City, Agusan del Sur	Tubod LGU
06 Oct 2016	Surigao City, Surigao del Norte	LMDA
	Mainit, Surigao del Norte	Mainit LGU
05 Dec 2016	CMD Conference Room BMB Compound, Quezon City	BPP Terminal Evaluation Debriefing

Annex C. List of Persons Interviewed

Organization/Affiliation	Names
PAFISFA	Mary Jane Sumbria Rona Arellano Rosario Honoria Roslyn Pareñas Rosario Villariña Rodolfo Villariña Eladio Panganiban Rodelia Panganiban <i>PAFISFA Members</i>
ENRO-Silay	Christia Ledesma, <i>Environment Management Specialist</i>
PBCFI	Lisa J. Paguntalan, <i>Executive Director</i> Godfrey Jakosalem Andrew Reintar Anamor Bantolo
PEMO	Atty. Wilfred Ramon M. Peñalosa, <i>PEM Officer</i> Dr. Rowena Parcon Pierre San Jose
Gawahon Ecopark Staff	Ricky Sobesta, <i>Maintenance/Tour or Bird Guide</i> Joseph Antiporda, <i>Maintenance/Tour or Bird Guide</i> Romeo Cordeño, <i>Maintenance</i> Rolly Menardo, <i>Maintenance</i> Johnny Ortiz, <i>Maintenance</i> Lauro Flor, <i>Forest Guard</i> Enrique Hagdon, <i>Forest Guard</i> Maricel Rebatado, <i>Staff</i> Roda Pilara, <i>Remittance</i> Rosalie dela Cruz, <i>Maintenance & Housekeeping</i>
VISFFA	Jamesbert Innocencio, <i>VISFFA representative</i>
MPDC-Calatrava	Anastacio Nuñez III, <i>MPD Coordinator</i>
DENR-Region VI	Emelyn S. Peñaranda Liza Marie L. Cabungcal Lilian A. Villanueva

Organization/Affiliation	Names
	Bernabe H. Garnace Nancy G. Gayan, <i>Chief of Finance</i>
PENRO-Negros Occidental	Andres T. Untal, <i>PENRO & PASu-NNNP</i>
MENRO-Lambunao	Leony L. Loot, <i>MENRO</i>
ADF	Rhoda Pon-an, <i>Executive Director</i>
HLURB-Cagayan	James L. Reyes, <i>Housing & Homesite Regulatory Officer</i>
PPDO-Cagayan	Mar dela Cruz Rolando Calabazon, Jr.
DENR-Region II	Wilfredo C. Malvar, <i>ARD for Technical Services</i> Severino Antonio, <i>Devt. Mgt. Officer</i> Maripi T. Asino, <i>DMO II</i> Katherine R. Rosario, <i>Finance & Admin Aide</i>
PENRO-Cagayan	Susima T. Tattao, <i>Sr. Systems Mgt. Specialist</i> Roman Capili Mae delos Santos Katherine Rosario, <i>Finance & Admin Aide</i>
CENRO-Aparri	Aida S. Adap Eunice Tarun
Office of the Governor	Junie Cua, <i>Governor</i>
PNREO-QPL	Yolando B. Bunag, <i>PNREO</i>
PASu-QPL	Alex Barayuga, <i>PASu-QPL</i>
SPU-Quirino Province	Enrile N. Eniego, <i>Agricultural Technician II</i> Estrella Pasion, <i>Project Evaluation Officer III</i>
MPDC-Maddela	Engr. Arnel Ramel, <i>MPDC</i> Isagani M. Vino, <i>MENRO Staff</i> George Colebra, <i>Local Investment Promotions Officer</i>
	<i>Representative, Coffee Producers Cooperative</i>
NCIP-Quirino Province	Manahan D. Ataggoy, <i>Provincial Officer</i>
PASu-NECKBA	Mina Labuguen, <i>PASu-NECKBA</i>
PASu-Mt. Hamiguitan	Ruel Colong, <i>Regional Focal Person/PASu-MHRWS</i> Clint Michael Cleofe, <i>EMS I, PENRO</i> Mauricio Limbaga, Jr., <i>PASu Staff</i> Melody Joy Dagta, <i>PASu Staff</i> Angelique Elizalde, <i>PASu Staff</i>

Organization/Affiliation	Names
PEF	Jerolyn B. Egento Rai Kristie Salve Gomez Kathleen Aballe
Office of the Mayor	Edgar Solis
Office of the Mayor	Justina Yu, <i>Mayor</i>
DENR-CARAGA	Nonito M. Tamyo, <i>Regional Director</i> Nelda Ebrone Josephine L. Araujo, <i>BPP Coordinator</i> Bem Diapat Anna Michelle Pagudpod PDO Tomas Tener, Jr. Rosendo Adriaque <i>Representative, Provincial LGU-Agusan del Norte</i> <i>Representative, Municipal LGU-Tubod, Surigao del Norte</i>
Tubod LGU	Cristina Hemady R. Arcillas, <i>SP Member, Surigao del Norte</i>
LMDA	Arturo M. Ruje, <i>OIC</i>
Mainit LGU	Ann Ruvik Mondano, <i>OIC, MPDC</i> Susan R. Baguio, <i>Statistics Aid</i>

Annex D. List of Resource Persons

Organization/Affiliation	Names
DA-Technical Working Group	Samuel Contreras, <i>Chair-TWG/Bureau of Soils & Water Management</i> Grace Pastores, <i>Policy Research Service</i> Ardibel Villanueva, <i>Policy Research Service Point Person</i> Francesca Garcia, <i>Bureau of Agricultural & Fisheries Statistics</i> Jessica Muñoz, <i>Bureau of Fisheries & Aquatic Resources</i> Evangeline Dacumos, <i>Bureau of Soils & Water Management</i> Michelle Montiel, <i>Agricultural Training Institute</i> Charo Ampil, <i>Policy Research Service</i>
HLURB	Linda Hornilla, <i>Commissioner</i> Nora Diaz, <i>Director</i> Anabelle Guanzon, <i>Housing and Homesite Regulation Officer</i>
DENR-BMB	Theresa Mundita-Lim, <i>Director</i> Armida Andres, <i>Chief EMS</i>
UP-ISSI	Engr. Leoncio Cubillas, <i>BPP Program Manager</i> Marsha Lee Delfinado, <i>BPP Program Senior Staff</i>
DILG	Jenifer G. Galorport, <i>Local Govt Opns Officer (LGOO) VII, Division Chief</i> Angela Barrientos, <i>LGOO V</i> Arce Fajardo, <i>LGOO V</i> Charity Agbayani, <i>LGOO V</i>
UNDP-Philippines	Floradema Eleazar, <i>Team Leader</i> Grace Tena, <i>Programme Associate</i>
UNDP-Regional Office	Doley Tshering, <i>Regional Technical Adviser (via skype)</i>
Design Center of the Philippines	Marilyn C. Munio Rolyn S. Lomocso Remedios N. Palenzuela
DTI	Ma. Rosario J. Dominguez, <i>Division Chief</i> Luna Gracia P. Ahmad, <i>Project Coordinator</i> Lubin R. de Vera, Jr., <i>Finance Officer</i>
CI	Ricardo Nuñez, <i>Executive Director</i> Agnes Payson, <i>Operations Manager (via skype)</i>

Organization/Affiliation	Names
	Rey Alcantara, <i>Grants Officer</i> Ireneo Talosig, <i>Program Manager, QPL</i>
DENR	Analiza R. Teh, <i>Undersecretary</i>
BPP-PMU	Joey Regunay Ben-Hur Vilorio Jay Siasoco Joy Eugenio Edge Genciagan Zipporah Caspe
NCIP-ADO	Agustin Panganiban, <i>ADO</i>
NEDA	Jane Magturo

Annex E. List of Documents Reviewed

Almaciga Resin Production: A Model Biodiversity-friendly Livelihood Project of the Municipality of Governor Generoso, Davao Oriental

Annual and Quarterly Reports (APRs/PIRs/QPRs)

Assessment of Quirino LGUs/Barangays adapting (sic) BD Friendly Agricultural Practices
(*unsigned*)

Audit Action Plans

Baggao Letter to PENRO-Cagayan dtd 04 February 2014

Baseline Data Survey Report of the critically endangered Palawan forest turtle (*Siebenrockiella leytensis*) in Malampaya Sound Protected Landscape and Seascape, Taytay, Palawan (Apr 2014)

Baseline Photo Identification Survey of the Critically-Endangered Irrawaddy Dolphin (*Orcaella brevirostris*) in Malampaya Sound Protected Landscape and Seascape, Taytay, Palawan (Jun 2014)

BDFAP: Concept, Principle and Framework for Assessment, DA-Project TWG, Sep 2013

BDFAP Training Module, ATI.

Biodiversity Partnership Project: Key Trigger Species Assessment, Mt. Hamiguitan Range/Highlights: Biodiversity Assessment Surveys in Barangays Talisay and La Union, San Isidro, Davao Oriental, D.M.M. Verdote.

Biodiversity Partnership Project: Key Trigger Species Assessment, Mt. Hamiguitan Range/Highlights: Biodiversity Assessment Survey in Barangay Luban, Mati, Davao Oriental, D.M.M. Verdote.

Biodiversity-Focused Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA): Municipality of Nagtipunan, Quirino Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) 2013-2022 (Dec 2014)

Biodiversity-Friendly Business and Investment Forum: Conserving Biodiversity to Promote Inclusive Economic Growth (Feb 2015)

Biodiversity-Friendly Businesses & Enterprises Fact Sheet

BPP Midterm Review

BPP Project Document

Business and Entrepreneurship for SMEs Training (BEST) Workshop (Sep 2014)

Business for Biodiversity Conservation: A Report on the Rapid Assessment of Biodiversity-friendly Businesses in the BPP Sites, Cathy Racho

Calatrava Letter to BPP Project Board dtd 28 October 2016

Central Panay Mountains Biodiversity: Northern Antique, Southern Antique, Aklan, Capiz and Iloilo, Philippines: A Terminal Report (Jun 2014), Tabaranza, Jr.

Completion Report: Training Program on Value Chain Development for LGUs & POs of Lake Mainit, UP-ISSI

CONSERVATION AGREEMENT for Sto. Niño Pilot Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) Project (with Sto. Niño Integrated Forestry Association or STISFA)

DENR-BMB Letter to ForClim II Project dtd 06 May 2015

Design and Architecture of the KPMIS and its Subsystems (Grageda; Nov 2012)

Development of Local Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation System for LGUs in the BPP Sites (Felicisimo Z. David, Jr.)

DOT Letter to BMB dtd 9/23/16

Ecological Assessment Result Mt. Hamiguitan Range, Governor Generoso, Davao Oriental, R.K.S. Gomez

Executive Order No. 04, series of 2014, AN EXECUTIVE ORDER CREATING THE LOCAL PROJECT SITE COMMITTEE (LPSC) AND THE INTER-AGENCY TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (IATWG) FOR THE PARTNERSHIPS FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION: MAINSTREAMING IN THE LOCAL AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPES OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS PROJECT (BPP) (Sep 30, 2014)

FINAL REPORT ON POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION: MAINSTREAMING IN LOCAL AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPES (BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP PROJECT), delos Reyes.

Focus Group Discussion and Community Validation Report on the Presence of Tamaraw *Bubalus mindorensis* in Mt. Siburan Key Biodiversity Area, Sablayan, Occidental Mindoro, Haribon Foundation, Aug 2015.

Forest Cover Analysis (*powerpoint presentation*)

Forest Fragmentation Analysis (*powerpoint presentation*)

Formulating a Local Investments and Incentives Code: A Guide for Local Government Units (DILG-BLGD & DTI-BOI, 2012)

Gattaran Letter to PENRO-Cagayan dtd 22 August 2014

GEF Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Projects in GEF-3, GEF-4, and GEF-5

INTEGRATING BIODIVERSITY INTO ADSDPP PROCESSES AND THE BD-ENHANCED ADSDPP INTO THE MANDATED PLANS OF HOST LOCAL GOVERNMENTS: Approaches, Conceptual Frameworks and Methodologies; Ernesto M. Serote

Kasalukuyang Kalagayan ng Bundok Siburan: Ulat Mula sa IBAMS team ng Sablayan

Lake Mainit Final BD Assessment

LMDA Letter to BPP dtd 10 April 2013

Maddela CLUP (2013-2022)

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Local Land Use Planning Process of Local Government Units (LGUs): Framework and Methods; DENR-BMB (BMB-DENR-BPP-GEF-UNDP, 2014)

Memorandum of Agreement dtd 18 June 2014, DENR-BMB and DCP

Memorandum of Understanding dtd 27 November 2015, Philippine Coffee Alliance, Inc. and Mataga-ay Coffee Growers Producers Cooperative

Monitoring of Tools on Investments Promotion (Davao, Aug 2015)

Monitoring of Tools on Investments Promotion (Iloilo, Sep 2015)

Monitoring of Tools on Investments Promotion (Iloilo, Sep 2015)

Municipal Ordinance No. 2014-04, "An Ordinance Enacting the 2014 Local Investments and Incentives Code of the Municipality of Calatrava"

Municipal Ordinance No. 225, s. 2013, "An Ordinance Declaring Certain Timberlands as Local Conservation Area (LCA) Incorporating the Same Area as Expansion (sic) of the Mt. Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary and Providing for the Legal Transboundary framework (sic) for its Sustainable Conservation, Management and Development, Including the Utilization Program for Ecotourism Livelihood with Authorization for Collection and Use of Ecotourism Fees and for Other Purposes"

Municipal Ordinance No. 230, s. 2014, "An Ordinance Declaring **Pulang Lupa** and **Macudlong** in Barangay Sto. Rosario and Barangay Maputi All of this Municipality with an Area of x x x (389.34 has) and x x x (341.64 has), Respectively, as Part of the Local Conservation Area Already Declared under Municipal Ordinance No. 225, Expanding the Mt. Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary"

Municipal Ordinance No. 23013-004, "An Ordinance Enacting the Modified Investments and Incentives Code of Sablayan, Occidental Mindoro"

Municipal Ordinance No. 9, s. 2014, "An Ordinance Enacting the Investment and Incentive Code of 2014 of the Municipality of Sta. Teresita, Cagayan"

NECKBA & QPL Biodiversity Assessment Report (*no title*)

NECKBA Transboundary Management Plan (*powerpoint presentation*)

Northern Negros Natural Park: Biodiversity Assessment, Jakosalem et al: DENR-BMB & PBCFI, 2015.

Ordinance No. 003, s. of 2012 (Capiz Province Investment Code)

Ordinance No. 058-2011 (Roxas City, Capiz)

Ordinance No. 11, s. of 2014, "An Ordinance Revising the Local Investments and Incentives Code (LIIC) of the Municipality of San Vicente, Palawan"

Ordinance No. 2015-18, Arbor Day (last Friday of August)

Ordinance No. 3, s. of 2014, "An Ordinance Revising the Local Investment and Incentive Code of the Municipality of Saguday, Quirino"

Peso-Dollar Historical Exchange Rates (BSP, June 2017). Available at <http://www.bsp.gov.ph/statistics/excel/pesodollar.xls>

Pilot PAYMENTS FOR ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (PES) in Sto. Nino, Maddela under the BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS PROJECT (BPP in Quirino Protected Landscape)

Pilot-Testing: SEA of the Philippines' National Tourism Development Plan, delos Reyes (2013)

PPDC-Quirino/CI Letter to BPP dtd 03 January 2013

Project Results Framework (Nov 2016)

Project Terminal Report (May 2014-Sep 2016) on "Integrating the Conservation of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture into Decentralized Landscape Management for Food Security and Biodiversity Conservation in Critical Eco-Regions of the Philippines"

Quarterly Progress Report (January-March 2015) (MSPLS)

Rapid Ecological and Biophysical Assessment of Bakong (*Hanguana malayana*) Species in Sta. Teresita, Cagayan; Torio and Catulin

Resolution No. 1, series of 2014, RESOLUTION CREATING THE LOCAL PROJECT SITE COMMITTEE (LPSC) FOR THE PROVINCES OF ILOILO, CAPIZ, AKLAN AND ANTIQUE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS PROJECT IN CENTRAL PANAY MOUNTAINS

San Isidro Investment Code

SB Ordinance No. 2016-27 (Madella, Quirino Province)

SB Resolution No. 58, series of 2012, RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS PROJECTS (BPP) OF THE CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL-PHILIPPINES (CI-P) IN COOPERATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES (DENR) IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF SAGUDAY, QUIRINO

Silay Letter to BPP dtd 08 September 2014

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of Cabarroguis, Quirino Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) 2013-2030

Strategic Environmental Assessment: Comprehensive Land Use Plan of the Municipality of Maddela, Province of Quirino (May 2015)

Strategic Tourism Action Plan: For the Promotion of Biodiversity-Friendly Tourism Activities in Davao Oriental Province (DOT, Dec 2014)

Strategic Tourism Action Plan: For the Promotion of Biodiversity-Friendly Tourism Activities in Cagayan Province (DOT, Dec 2015)

Strategic Tourism Action Plan: For the Promotion of Biodiversity-Friendly Tourism Activities in Quirino Province (DOT, Dec 2014)

Survey Report on the Current KMS Networking and Information Systems of DENR, Partner Agencies and LGUs Covering the 8 Project Sites (Grageda; Nov 2012)

Tourism Guidebook for Local Government Units

Tubod Letter to BPP dtd 26 November 2013

Workshop Reports on Designing of KMS With PAWB, DENR Units And Partner Agencies (Grageda; Nov 2012)

Annex F. List of DRAFT Documents Reviewed

AN ORDINANCE DECLARING FOUR HUNDRED SEVENTY SEVEN (477) HECTARES DENR – LGU CO-MANAGED AREA LOCATED AT BARANGAYS CROSSING, SAN ROQUE AND BANGAYAN, KITCHARAO, AGUSAN DEL NORTE AS KITCHARAO LOCAL CONSERVATION SITE.

AN ORDINANCE DECLARING SIXTY NINE (69) HECTARES OF MARSHLAND LOCATED AT BARANGAYS PUNGTOD, ALEGRIA, SURIGAO DEL NORTE AS LOCAL CONSERVATION AREA OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF ALEGRIA CALLED “ALEGRIA MARSH”.

An Ordinance Providing for the Establishment of a Critical Habitat in the Municipality of Sebaste, Province of Antique Defining and Delineating the Area of Coverage, Creating Institutional Management Mechanisms, Defining its Powers and Functions, and for Other Purposes

BDFAP Standards

BPP Web Portal System: (Partners & Administrator) User Manual version 1.0

GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATIONS ON DOMESTIC TRADE OF WILDLIFE (ANIMALS) UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

GUIDELINES ON THE ESTBALISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF CRITICAL HABITAT OF PHILIPPINES TARSIER AND OTHER WLDLIFE OF TUBOD SURIGAO DEL NORTE.

Joint Administrative Order, Adoption and Use of the Manual of Procedures for the Mainstreaming of Biodiversity Conservation in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan of Local Government Units, DENR-HLURB

Joint Administrative Order, Adopting the Biodiversity-Friendly Enterprise Framework

Joint Administrative Order, Mainstreaming Biodiversity-Friendly Agricultural Practices In and Around Protected Areas and Key Biodiversity Areas and Promoting the Same in Wider Agricultural Landscapes, DA-DENR

LGU Ordinance on BDFAP

Local Environment Code – Sablayan, Occidental Mindoro

Manual of Procedure for the Mainstreaming of Biodiversity in the CLUP of Local Government Units

Manual of Procedure on BDSEA

Memorandum of Agreement (between DENR, DTI, DA-BAI, DA-BPI, LTFRB, LTO, MARINA, CAAP, CAB, PCG, PPA, PNR, LRTA, PNP, NBI, BOC, NPS & OTS)

Pilot-Testing: BDSEA of the NGP, Biodiversity Policy and Knowledge Management Division, National Parks Division, Wildlife Resources Division

Prescribing the Adoption of the Biodiversity-focused Strategic Environmental Assessment
Evaluating the Effects of Policies, Plans and Programs

Proposed Ecological Zones Maps (LM, NECKBA) (maps)

Proposed Land-Use Maps for Calatrava (*powerpoint presentation*)

REITERATING DILG MC NO. 2004-44 ON THE PROHIBITED ACTS RELATIVE TO THE
CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION OF PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES AND THEIR
HABITATS

Training Manual on BDFAP

Annex G. Evaluation Question Matrix

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?				
Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?	<p>How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD?</p> <p>Does the project support other international conventions, such as the UNFCCC and the UNDRIP?</p>	<p>UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design</p> <p>Level of implementation of UNCBD in the Philippines, Program of Work on Protected Areas and contribution of the project</p> <p>Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally</p> <p>UNCBD and other international convention web sites</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners</p>
Is the project relevant to the GEF biodiversity focal area?	How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities?	Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area	<p>Project documents</p> <p>GEF focal areas strategies and documents</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>GEF website</p> <p>Interviews with UNDP and project team</p>
Is the project relevant to the Philippine Development Plan and environment and sustainable development objectives?	<p>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Philippines?</p> <p>How does the project support the NBSAP?</p> <p>Is the project country-driven?</p> <p>What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?</p> <p>What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?</p> <p>Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?</p>	<p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</p> <p>Degree to which the project supports implementation of the NBSAP</p> <p>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</p> <p>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <p>Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies</p> <p>NBSAP</p> <p>Key project partners</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with UNDP and project partners</p>

		Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria		
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	<p>How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</p>	<p>Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</p>	<p>Project partners and stakeholders</p> <p>Needs assessment studies</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</p>
Is the project internally coherent in its design?	<p>Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources, etc.)?</p> <p>Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</p> <p>Are the resources of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</p>	<p>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</p> <p>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</p>	<p>Program and project documents</p> <p>Key project stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Key interviews</p>
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	<p>Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</p> <p>How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</p> <p>Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?</p> <p>How has the Project influenced other donor funded projects/funding organizations which were implemented after BPP?</p>	<p>Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally</p>	<p>Documents from other donor supported activities</p> <p>Other donor representatives</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>

	How has the Project catalyzed the support of other donor funded projects and funding organizations/ stakeholders active in BD to support major activities initiated under BPP?			
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?	Quality and relevance of lessons learned with future similar projects	Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
Are project activities relevant and appropriate to meet objectives and current development context?	How appropriate are the planned and implemented activities? (in the context of any changes that have occurred in the PAW/ENR sector in the Philippines, recent priorities and opportunities for policy change and program shifts)?	Level of contribution of activities in achieving project objectives Connection of activities with current policy environment	Data collected throughout evaluation Project reports, and new policies in the ENR sector	Data analysis Document review and KII
Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?	See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	Project documents Project team and relevant stakeholders Data reported in project annual reports	Documents analysis Interviews with project team Interviews with relevant stakeholders
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?	Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues Quality of risk mitigations Strategies developed and followed	Project documents UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders	Document analysis Interviews
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? What changes could have been/should be made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the	Level of accomplishment of project outcomes Facilitating and hindering factors	Project documents UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders Data collected throughout evaluation	Interviews Data analysis Risk analysis

	achievement of the project's expected results?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<p>Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</p> <p>Did the logframe and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?</p> <p>Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</p> <p>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</p> <p>Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?</p> <p>Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?</p> <p>Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</p> <p>Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</p> <p>How was results-based management used during project implementation?</p>	<p>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</p> <p>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</p> <p>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</p> <p>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</p> <p>Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</p> <p>Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</p> <p>Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</p> <p>Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</p> <p>Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</p> <p>Timeliness of release of funds to local partners</p> <p>Timeliness of approval of annual budgets</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Project team</p> <p>Local responsible partners</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Key interviews</p>
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?	Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>

	<p>Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?</p> <p>What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</p> <p>Which methods were successful or not and why?</p>	<p>Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p> <p>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p>		
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	<p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</p> <p>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</p>	<p>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<p>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</p> <p>How could the project have been more efficiently carried out (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnership arrangements, etc...)?</p> <p>What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</p>	<p>Value for money of partnership arrangements and delivery mechanisms</p> <p>Efficiency of alternative approaches and adaptation strategies undertaken by the project</p>	Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
How efficient and effective are the management and coordination arrangements, including oversight mechanisms for the project?	<p>Does the Project Board provide a useful management and steering function for the project activities?</p> <p>Does the PMU provide a useful and effective management function? Should other alternative arrangements be explored?</p> <p>How effective is the UNDP CO in supporting project implementation,</p>	<p>Quality and timeliness of actions taken based on Project Board decisions, MTE recommendations, etc.</p> <p>Degree by which the Project Board appreciates the actual accomplishments vis-à-vis project objectives</p> <p>Quality of Project Board decisions to address problems raised</p>	<p>Minutes of Project Board meetings</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>Assessment reports</p> <p>PMU, partners</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interview with key staff and officials</p>

	<p>technical assistance, and oversight?</p> <p>How effective is BMB overall in performing its responsibilities as Implementing Agency?</p>			
<p>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</p>				
<p>What are the major factors which influence sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>Are policies sufficient and in place to support the roll out of the initiated interventions?</p> <p>Does the DENR provide adequate priority to BD conservation as a programme and the enhancement of capacities of its agency and staff?</p> <p>Do the stakeholders have sufficient capacities, ownership and commitment to continue the innovations and enhanced systems developed under the project?</p> <p>Is there sufficient financing available or are there suitable fund sources to continue what have been initiated under the project?</p> <p>Do implementation arrangements support ownership of the project outcomes by government and stakeholders?</p> <p>Do project coordination mechanisms support sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>Clear policies specifying procedures and mechanisms</p> <p>Program and budget levels allocated by DENR to PAWB, its programs and continued capacity development</p> <p>Commitments, pronouncements, joint issuances between DENR/PAWB and partner agencies</p> <p>Estimates of financing required to continue innovations introduced by the project, and financing capacity assessment</p> <p>Evidences of uptake by stakeholders</p> <p>Effectiveness of coordination mechanisms, evidences of ownership</p>	<p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p> <p>Community feedback</p> <p>Insights/perceptions from institutions and partners</p> <p>Site reports</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Community FGD and interviews</p> <p>KII with partners and representatives of key institutions/DENR</p> <p>Rapid field assessments in selected pilot sites</p>
<p>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduction in threats to biodiversity in KBAs, and/or improved ecological status?</p>				
<p>Has the project made/or is likely to contribute to measurable difference to the conservation of terrestrial KBAs in the Philippines?</p>	<p>What evidences have there been, to establish reduction of environmental stress, prevention of incompatible land uses in and around conservation areas, and improvement of ecological status?</p>	<p>Extent of habitat fragmentation, unsustainable land use practices, and/or incompatible land uses within and around KBA pilot sites</p> <p>Existence of national and local policies on land-use, agriculture, wildlife law enforcement,</p>	<p>Baseline BD assessment results</p> <p>BD monitoring reports in pilot sites</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Rapid field assessment</p>

		enterprise and impact assessment that are biodiversity-oriented	Copies of policy instruments (national and local)	
--	--	---	---	--

Annex H. Audit Trail

UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail

To the comments received on (Apr 2017) from the Terminal Evaluation of Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes (Biodiversity Partnerships Project) (UNDP Project ID-00074945)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location ³¹	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken ³²
UNDP CO	1	Page 7	Please complete the financing at end of the Project. To be supplied by PMU.	DONE. (See p.33)
UNDP CO	2	9	Cross learning is a specific output of the Project: Output 2.6 Intra-LGU data and knowledge-sharing and advocacy network to synthesize and project lessons learned into national policy- and decision-making	The context of the recommendation was from an operational standpoint as an implementation strategy. Some sites had easy answers to problems that stumped others. Output 2.6 is output-oriented. Lastly, the actual achievement for Output 2.6 was deemed minimal.
UNDP CO	3	8-10	There was no mention of lessons from the Project. Please distinguish lessons from recommendations; and/or add lessons. Since this is Terminal Evaluation, these follow up recommendations cannot be acted upon by the Project. Are these meant for BMB to add value and/or capitalize on the gains already achieved by the Project? Please explain the context of these recommendations.	Lesson on LGU opportunity for biodiversity added. (See p.9). As for the recommendations, these are left to the agencies to pursue given the commitment that some have expressed or instituted by integrating biodiversity into their work so despite the fact that BPP is about to end. It is hoped that these recommendations will be acted upon. (See Response to Comment No. 84 for the agencies responsible)
UNDP CO	4	20	If applicable: Indicate whether there were any changes/any additional outputs throughout the implementation of the Project. If changes	According to UNDP, there was a decision made by the Policy Board very early on not to

³¹ Pagination under this column is based on the first draft of the Terminal Evaluation Report.

³² Pagination under this column is based on the final version of the Terminal Evaluation Report.

			<p>occurred, please indicate whether these were documented and if reasons were provided (e.g. Original outputs not sufficiently articulated, exogenous conditions changed to which changes in objectives / outcomes was needed, or the Project was restructured because original objectives were over-ambitious)</p>	<p>apply all the thematic areas to all sites owing to its delayed start-up and the significant budget reduction resulting from the peso appreciation at that time. This decision preceded the MTE.</p> <p>Nonetheless, this decision is not reflected in the logframe and as per comments of the PMU to the first draft, they still proceeded to work on the different thematic areas in all sites and in fact, continued to focus on CLUPs notwithstanding the MTE recommendation to focus more on BDFAPs and BDFEs.</p>
UNDP CO	5		<p>Were there any unintended or unexpected results documented?</p>	<p>HLURB policy (see p.23)</p> <p>The Fragmentation Analysis developed under the project is actually expected. (See Table 3, ProDoc) It is one of the main OVIs for the project with an expected 10% increase sans project intervention.</p>
UNDP HQ	6	22	<p>If possible, please include information on whether the capacities of the executing institution and its counterparts were properly considered when the project was designed, and if partnership arrangements were identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval</p>	<p>Yes. This is indicated in the ProDoc including capacities of counterparts. (See Table 2 on Key Stakeholders, par. 93 pp. 25-28; par. 138 and 133, pp. 35-36; par 212, p. 53; par 228, p. 56; on Management Arrangements, par. 254 et seq., pp. 80-81).</p>
UNDP CO	7	22	<p>It would be worth mentioning if the project identified this as an assumption in the project logic or anticipated this as a potential risk to the achievement of results (As stated in the project document or in annual work plans and progress reports, where risks and mitigation strategies are regularly updated)</p>	<p>This was indirectly assumed by the project. (See ProDoc, Table 6, p.51). The TE Report validates this risk and threat assessment and indirectly comments on the inadequacy of the mitigation strategy, with the recommendation to rely more on a locally-driven policy agenda. (See pp.25-26, Final Report) The Evaluation Team agrees that LGUs have sufficient leeway to develop their own legislation to protect</p>

				biodiversity as evidenced by the Quirino Province experience and other LGUs as described in par. 67, 108 and 109 of the ProDoc.
UNDP CO	8	23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kindly comment on perceived appropriateness of the risk ratings assigned (M=medium, L=low). Effectiveness also refers to how risks and risk mitigation was managed by the Project. Kindly comment on the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed 	Risk ratings were validated in First Draft. A more appropriate strategy to the policy risk was also provided. (See p.26)
UNDP CO	9	24	Plans for rationalization within DENR was suspended during the time of PPG. Nonetheless, nobody could have anticipated the exodus of project staff towards new permanent positions vacated from the RatPlan.	<p>The Rationalization Plan was not only mandated by an executive order (E.O. 366, s. 2004) but also stood to affect a significant number of DENR staff so actual implementation was anticipated, as expressed by respondents from DENR from national and field offices.</p> <p>The TE Report also did not identify an “exodus” of BPP staff as a problem since the persons involved merely transferred from one position to another one (albeit with better tenure) within the DENR. It was the management response that proved problematic in some areas.</p>
UNDP CO	10	28	Kindly comment on whether LPSCs and RPs (LGUs, NGOs, DENR FOs) were engaged in the regular review of project performance through participation in annual Project Board meetings.	DONE. (See p.30)
UNDP CO	11	28	<p>This decision was also encouraged by UNDP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project has [8] sites, and the resources are not enough to cover all thematic areas in all these sites. It will be spreading the resources of the project too thinly. - The purpose of site implementation was to demonstrate an innovation which can make a case for policy improvements or development. Showcasing an innovation in 1 site should be based on a clear analysis of the strengths and potential of the site to be a demonstration case. The Project could have been selective in 	<p>Limitation on thematic interventions incorporated. (See p.31)</p> <p>The comments miss the point that it was the lack of significant lessons from the interplay of various policy instruments affecting biodiversity that was found problematic, not the limitation per se.</p>

			the mix of interventions in its project sites but not necessarily implementing all thematic areas in all sites due to budget constraints.	
DENR-BMB	12		<p>Despite the start-up delays, the BPP has been able to hasten the implementation of the project activities as evidenced by the substantial progress done on the delivery of the outputs called for in the Project Document. As of end of 2016, the Project registered an overall accomplishment of 91% against the overall target of 100%. This level of accomplishment has been affirmed by the Project Board, the Implementing Partner, the GEF Focal Person, UNDP-Philippines Country Office, and the UNDP Regional Technical Adviser. While there have been slippages in the Project, these mostly are under Outcome 1 relating to the approval of the enabling policies. It must be stressed that while there have been delays in the formulation of the policies, these proposed policies were submitted already to the management of the concerned partner national agencies even prior to the MTE. However, because of the tedious review process of the government agencies, the approval of the policies were overtaken consequently by the change in the government due to the national elections. Subsequently, the proposed policies are now undergoing another round of review by the new management team of the concerned national government agencies. The approved project extension mainly is focused in securing approval of these policies prior to project closure.</p> <p>A review of the MTE recommendation would reveal that nowhere in the MTE report did it say to limit the intervention to one thematic area per site. What the MTE specified was to provide a major focus on BD-friendly agriculture and BD-friendly business for the remaining project period to which the BPP with approval of the Project Board and UNDP concurred with. As such, subsequent activities after the MTE were focused on those activities to meet shortfalls on the targets outlined in the Project Document while completing those activities that the Project has made substantial progress already. Besides, the Project design specified in the Project Document does not</p>	

			<p>specifically require the implementation of ALL activities in ALL of the BPP sites. In fact, a key principle stipulated in the Project Document is “value adding” where “The catalytic support of the Project necessitates that cost effectiveness be achieved through value adding to existing initiatives....Thus, Project resources are directed at filling important capacity gaps to enable both local and national actors to carry out their commitments. This will ensure that activities in the selected sites demonstrate a high degree of success”. As such, specific project interventions in the sites were guided by the on-going initiatives of the project responsible partners and the LGUs rather by the need to implement ALL project components in ALL the sites. During the course of project implementation the commitments of the LGUs, which are the critical elements for project acceptability and sustainability were obtained early on. These commitments were obtained based on the “felt need” and “demand” of the LGUs drawn from their perceived priority concerns for biodiversity conservation. This approach is consistent with the “bottom-up” participatory approach to project planning and implementation rather than the previous traditional top-down strategy for project planning where the project interventions were based on pre-conceived measures drawn by technocrats at the central/national level. The integration called for in the Project Document does entail spatial integration of intervention but integration of the primary layers of management. Specifically and as cited in the Project Document, “The project addresses three primary layers of management: national, LGU and demonstration site. Each of these layers has been assigned its own outcome. In order to ensure effective integration amongst these layers/outcomes, parallel outputs have been designed to address common themes. Thus, for example, integration of biodiversity impact assessment in policy, planning and program formulation is addressed at national level (Output 1.1), LGU level (Output 2.1) and demonstration site level (Output 3.1)”...</p>	
DENR-BMB	13	28	The PMU believes that although there were delays in the release of funds to Responsible Partners (RPs), these delays were in turn	Noted. The Evaluation Team stands by this observation. They did not make any such

		<p>caused by a myriad of factors such as the need to comply with the stringent requirements for the submission of the defined deliverables and financial reports prior to any fund release. This was a key concern cited by the audit teams of the Commission of Audit commissioned by UNDP. There were also instances when the PMU could not transfer funds to RPs since the PMU itself was waiting for the release of funds from UNDP which also were sometimes delayed. The evaluators wrongly assumed that the delays in the roll out of the activities were due to the delayed fund releases. In fact, the Project has endeavored to address these delay in fund releases and mitigate its impact on the project progress by carrying out planning sessions with the partners as soon as the approval and release of funds have been obtained through the preparation of adjusted annual plans to facilitate the conduct of activities to address the delays. The results of these are evident in the overall physical and financial progress of the BPP. As of end of 2016, the Project already has registered an overall physical accomplishment of 91% against the target of 100% and a financial disbursement of 96% against the overall planned cost of 100%.</p> <p>Similarly, the evaluators wrongly assumed that the delays in the fund releases were the reasons for the “dampened the morale of the local project staff, making them susceptible to jumping ship at the earliest opportunity that was afforded by the DENR rationalization program”. There is no direct evidence that the delays in fund releases were the reasons for the departure of the project staff. Recall that the engagement of the DENR project staff were on a contractual basis with no tenure security. The DENR rationalization program provided the contractual project staff an alternative for a more secure employment tenure with the DENR. If this was the case, then the local staff should have taken the earliest opportunity to jump ship perhaps in 2013 a year or six months into their contract with BPP, but most of our local project staff chose to stay until 2016 when the opportunities for a permanent position within the DENR became available due to the rationalization program. Indeed one cannot</p>	<p>assumption. They merely reported what respondents relayed to them.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>fault the local project staff for taking these opportunities since employment as DENR personnel would offer greater security. It is also a testament to the quality of the local project staff that most, if not all of them were absorbed into the DENR. With such development, the DENR field offices are now accorded with staff that have the knowledge and skills on mainstreaming biodiversity that subsequently would be advantageous when the BPP initiatives are replicated and scaled-up within the DENR hierarchy.</p>	
UNDP CO	14	29	<p>What have been the reasons for this? Please elaborate. Are the reasons valid in so far as the project is concerned?</p>	<p>Per DENR-BMB comment, neither MTE nor ProDoc proscribed the continuation of this type of intervention. It is likely that this is PMU's expertise. The Evaluation Team agrees with the MTE that this target has been exceeded and that other thematic areas deserved more attention.</p>
DA	15	29	<p>The DA also aims the incorporation of biodiversity goals within its policies. This could be fully achieved once the DA-DENR Joint Administrative Order is signed by both departments. The process followed by the BPP is not non-inclusive as pointed by the evaluators. As a matter of fact, through the process, the DA-BAR was able to implement the ITPGRFA project which supports the BPP targets on the development of protocols for in situ /on farm biodiversity conservation of indigenous crops. Also, there are already efforts to introduce potential BD-friendly agricultural practices within the DA (e.g. through Integrated Rice Farming System or "Palayamanan", Organic Farming, Soil Conservation and Water Management, etc.) whose promotion can be further enhanced by tagging them as BD-friendly through the BPP process.</p>	<p>The Evaluation Team apologizes for the inadvertent inclusion of DA. This has been corrected. (See p.32)</p>
DENR- BMB	16	29	<p>The DA is one of the major responsible partners of the project and it is very unfortunate that despite the time and effort poured in by the DA towards establishing a working TWG team among its various bureaus, the BPP Terminal Evaluators portray this initiative on the BPP partnership process is non-inclusive. The DA team through</p>	<p>See immediately preceding response.</p>

			<p>consensus among the bureaus, has jointly produced and validated through national and field consultations these notable outputs for the project to wit: the draft BD-friendly Agricultural Practices joint administrative order, the BDFAP ATI manual, BDFAP standards, certification and recognition systems, and the incorporation of Biodiversity in the revised Philippine National action Plan for Sustainable Land Management (NAPSLM). For the case of DILG, the project tried in several occasions to coordinate with them but their participation in BPP activities was sporadic at most considering the succession of new focal persons, directors assigned to BPP resulting from the turn-over of 4 Secretaries and retirement of focal staff which have the institutional knowledge of BPP. Despite their regular attendance on Project Board Meetings, there were difficulties in scheduling meetings/ consultations in lieu of the absence of a permanent focal person assigned for BPP.</p>	
DENR-BMB	17	29	<p>The findings of the technical evaluators in saying that the selection of the LGUs to be assisted in the BD mainstreaming work CLUP is arbitrary and based on the raising of hands is absolutely wrong. Had the evaluators clarified with the BPP-PMU and the site partners on how the LGUs were selected, they would have obtained the detailed process on how the selection and the mainstreaming work have been carried out. At the onset and prior to undertaking the mainstreaming activities, the BPP conducted orientation-seminars for LGUs covered in each of the project sites citing the relevance and importance of mainstreaming biodiversity in the CLUP preparation process. The BPP emphasized that the Project would only provide the technical assistance and the cost of preparing the CLUP would be borne by the LGUs. From this, the LGUs were requested to submit their respective Letter of Interest to be assisted in the preparation of their BD-responsive CLUP with a commitment to shoulder the cost for plan preparation. This now became the basis for the selection of the LGUs for CLUP mainstreaming and just the raising of hands. For a number of LGUs in the project sites, CLUP preparations had commenced already and were on the final stages of drafting the CLUP and have</p>	<p>Noted and revised. (See p.32)</p> <p>The observation was taken out of context. The Evaluation Team reported an actual <u>instance</u> that was relayed by the LGU involved, as clearly stated in the First Draft.</p> <p>The PMU provided the Evaluation Team with copies of letters/resolution from seven (7) LGUs (out of the 56% LGUs reportedly assisted).</p>

			expressed to be assisted in the other aspects of the BPP.	
DENR-BMB	18	30 ³³	Again, there was never an intent to focus on one thematic area per site. In fact, there were several sites representing convergence of the thematic areas like NeCKBA, QPL, MSPLS, NNNP, MHRWS, and the LMKBA. The PMU is not clear on what the evaluators mean by “institutional fragmentation”. As cited above, the Project design did not specify spatial integration of the thematic areas (meaning, all thematic areas to be implemented in all sites) but rather the programmatic approach to project interventions that called for an outcome-output integration. The evaluators also miserably failed to appreciate the fact that in some of the project sites (e.g., Mt. Siburan and CPM), other projects were already providing assistance to LGUs similar to those activities of the BPP. As such and to optimize the use of the limited project resources, the project opted to focus its assistance to these LGUs that were not part of the design of the other projects existing then in the project sites.	See response to Comment No. 11 which is now reflected in the text. (See p.32) “Institutional fragmentation” refers to the inadequate/discordant policy environment which ultimately have an adverse effect on biodiversity, as extensively discussed in the ProDoc. The fact that other sites are receiving assistance from other projects is actually a reason to expect more results, not less, as was capably demonstrated by the Provincial Government of Quirino in its handling of various environmental grants. This was clear from the DENR-BMB letter to ForClim dated 06 May 2015 that emphasized complementarity.
DENR-BMB	19	30 ³⁴	Again, the design of the Project as called for in the Project Document involved a programmatic approach. The intention is development enabling policies at the local level (Outcome 1) and then provide capacity building assistance to partners and LGUs (Outcome 2), and then test and demonstrate the application of these enabling policies at the project site level. The selection as to which sites are to be covered by the testing and demonstrations are thoroughly discussed with the project partners during the annual planning workshops and quarterly review workshops taking stock of the conditions prevailing in the project sites. The PMU has never on its own decided to which sites the thematic areas are to be carried out. It must be emphasized that problem of biodiversity loss is a multi-faceted one and there was never the intention of the BPP to resolve all of this. It must be emphasized and the main intention of the BPP is to develop enabling policies and	Noted. Policymaking is a political process and land conversion, use of GMOs and chemical fertilizers in agriculture, law enforcement and transboundary planning are not detached from the political milieus that determined such choices.

³³ Identified as p.29 in the DENR-BMB comments.

³⁴ Identified as p.29 in the DENR-BMB comments.

			<p>tools to address these problems and then test and demonstrate their applicability in the sites. The problems of land conversion in NNNP, the use of GMOs in QPL the use of chemicals in the MPSLS, the poaching in the MHRWS, were the main reasons for the testing and demonstration activities for thematic areas 1, 2, 4, and 5.</p> <p>With regards to Transboundary Plan in CPM, the BPP exerted efforts to initiate the preparation of the Transboundary Plan for this site. However, the 16 LGUs of the four (4) provinces encompassing the CPM cited differing suggestions on how to proceed with the transboundary planning work with a number of them emphasizing the time needed and difficulty in organizing the LGU planning teams including the provision of LGU funds to support the data gathering and planning workshops. The LGUs, particularly those in the Iloilo provinces suggested to have an incremental preparation of the Transboundary Plan, starting with Iloilo and then proceed with the other 3 provinces when they are ready and have the fund to support the planning work. However, the preparation of the design for this incremental transboundary planning process was overtaken by the MTE recommendation to focus the remaining work of the BPP on BDFE and BDFAPs and cease starting mainstreaming work in other LGUs within the project sites. It is for this reason that the BPP discontinued further work in transboundary planning in the CPM.</p>	
DENR-BMB	20	30	<p>The perception of the evaluators regarding the gap between the PMU and the project partners has never been raised nor manifested during the course of the project implementation. The planning and implementation activities of the project have been guided always by the project design stipulated in the Project Document. The implementation roles of the partners were based on the agreed memoranda of agreement and project work plans specified during the Project Inception workshop held in 14-16 December 2011. Subsequently, the PMU together with the partner institutions prepared Annual Work and Financial Plans that guide the yearly activities of the project. On a</p>	<p>This may be explained by the candor afforded by the independent nature of the evaluation process and these sentiments were accurately reported. The Evaluation Team wishes to emphasize that it abided by the evaluator's code of conduct in this respect and stand by their observation.</p>

			<p>quarterly basis, workshops with the project partners are held to review and update this project work plan supported by more detailed annual plans of the partners based on the progress of project implementation. These workshops provided the venue to discuss issues and problems of the project and agree on the approaches and strategies to resolve these. The “gap” that has been perceived by the evaluators was never manifested during these workshops as evinced by the numerous minutes of the meeting to document the results of these workshops. This “gap” also not raised as an issue by the MTE.</p> <p>The project planning parameters and financial allocations have been all based on the design of the project based on the Project Document and later on the recommendations of the MTE, which in turn provided the basis for the preparation by the PMU together with the partners of the project work plan and the annual work and financial plans. The budgets and expenditure frameworks were all guided by the NIM and COA guidelines.</p>	
UNDP-CO	21	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an analysis of planned vs. actual expenditures. • Observations from financial audits should also be considered. Please see attached 2015 audit report and the multi-year audit action plans. • When analyzing the effectiveness of the financial planning, kindly include your analysis on how the financial controls inform decision makers regarding budget at any time, allows timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables. • When data on the planned and actual co-financing have been generated, kindly state the reasons for the differences, if any. • Kindly also include if there have been leveraged resources as a result of the project, whether in kind or in cash. It will be good to include here the support and co-financing provided by LGUs on the CLUP preparation, on BDFE (Cagayan, QPL, etc.), by national agencies (eg. Design Center, DTI, DoT, BMB, etc.) 	<p>DONE. (See p.33)</p> <p>The latest Audit Report reiterates the findings of the Evaluation Team with regard to the attainment of results, which is similarly explained per DENR-BMB comments.</p> <p>Please see responses below to DENR-BMB comment.</p> <p>DONE. (See p. 34)</p> <p>DONE. (See p.34)</p>

DENR-BMB	22	30	The findings of the evaluators are subjective regarding the comparison of the budget and utilization of two (2) projects with different objectives, scope, site coverages, activities, targets, and institutional partners. This observation of the evaluators should be supported by data and facts to serve as empirical evidence to support the arguments of the evaluators.	Access to the report cited. (See Footnote No. 9) While no two projects will ever be exactly the same, the rationale for providing a common system for evaluation is precisely to allow for comparison, learn from lessons and avoid committing the same mistakes.
DENR-BMB	23	31	We agree that delays in fund releases must be addressed in future projects. But we would like to mention that the six (6) month delay was an isolated case, realizing that there would be delays the PMU requested UNDP to provide a bridging fund in order to pursue the implementation of the RPs. The budget releases to Responsible Partners are made only after their submission of the required deliverables and/or financial reports. Also in the case of the initial transfer of the year, the Project has to wait for the approval of the project's overall Annual Work and Financial Plan by both UNDP and NEDA before it is able to make any transfers to RPs, this sometimes is a lengthy process which adds to the delay in getting the funds down to the RPs. Aside from this, RPs are required to submit their Annual Implementation Plan with Financial Plan to have their initial tranche, without this, the PMU cannot download their said initial tranche.	Noted.
UNDP CO	24	31	The report could benefit more from more details in this paragraph, such as analysis of baseline conditions, methodology, roles and responsibilities.	Baseline indicators are provided in Table 3. The methodology followed standard UNDP prescriptions with roles and responsibilities in M&E provided in Table 9 of the ProDoc.
UNDP CO	24	31	Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted? Any comments on the effectiveness of monitoring indicators from the ProDoc for measuring progress and performance?	DONE. (See Footnote No. 11 and p.35)
DENR BMB	25	31	As per recommendation of MTE, the BPP focused on BDFAP and BDFE works at the national land site level. At the national level the draft BDFAP JAO was worked out with DA with 3 regional consultations and DENR PTWG reviews. A BDFAP assessment metrics was	The MTE was clear that the interventions be both at the national and <u>local</u> levels.

			<p>formulated and tested in the sites to determine applicability in the farm level, same with BDFE. There were NO more additional Mainstreaming activities after the MTE.</p> <p>The MTE recommendations did not entail stopping of technical assistance to LGUs within the BPP sites, otherwise the initiated activities with LGUs on mainstreaming biodiversity in the local land use plans will be left hanging and incomplete. There were also no additional new LGUs assisted. The subsequent mapping works as observed pertains to fragmentation and land cover analysis.</p>	
DENR-BMB	26	31	<p>The management agrees that the results of implementation in the sites vary. It must be emphasized though that the sites differ in terms of area coverages and level and depth of biodiversity conservation issues. For instance, the QPL encompass only six LGUs while the MHRWS covers only three LGUs. Both QPL and MHRWS have clear frameworks for biodiversity conservation since these two sites are declared protected areas already. On the other hand, the extensive areas covered by the CPM, which covers four provinces and 16 LGUs, and LMKBA, which has 8 LGUs, coupled with the absence of a clear institutional framework for biodiversity conservation, required a more tedious approach at mainstreaming work. It is important to note, however, that the project was able to draw lessons from these areas and identify appropriate strategies to promote and mainstream biodiversity conservation at the local level.</p> <p>As regards the results of the project in CPM, had the evaluators read previous project reports, they would have found out that there was another project, the ForClim Project funded by the GIZ, that was concurrently implemented in the CPM had the same or similar activities as that of the BPP. Later, another project, the PRDP, supposedly was to be implemented and cover also the CPM. It is for these reasons that the BPP “scaled down” its activities in the CPM which the evaluators must have mistakenly interpreted as the “unevenness” of project implementation in the CPM.</p>	<p>The Evaluation Team stands by its findings.</p> <p>The submitted documentation on the ForClim project clearly states synchronization with BPP, not scaling down of work. QPL has multiple environmental foreign-funded projects but there was no comparable scaling down of work from the BPP.</p>

			<p>For the LMKBA, the findings of the evaluators seemed to be based only mere perceptions rather than by data-supported observations. In fact, LMKBA, despite the absence of a clear institutional framework for landscape level biodiversity mainstreaming work can be considered as among the better sites. It is one of the two sites (the other being the QPL) that have early on mainstreamed biodiversity in all of the LGUs encompassing the biodiversity area. In fact, one of the mayors of the LGUs in LMKBA has been the prime mover and “champion” of biodiversity mainstreaming at the local level. LMKBA is also among the BPP sites where the BDFAP has been piloted.</p> <p>The finding of the evaluators on the NNNP is not exactly accurate. A careful reading of the BPP reports would reveal that other LGUs in NNNP work in partnership and collaborated with the BPP through its site partner, the PBCFI. The evaluators seemed to have mistakenly interpreted the assistance to Calatrava in the BD mainstreaming activities in the CLUP as the sole activity of the BPP in NNNP. Again, a careful reading of the project reports would show that other LGUs in NNNP and including the provincial LGU were all partners in the implementation of the BPP in the NNNP. As to why Calatrava was the only LGU assisted in the BD-CLUP mainstreaming, most of the LGUs in the NNNP at the time when the BPP assistance was offered in 2013 were in the final stages already of their CLUP updating that was facilitated earlier by the HLURB. Hence and because of the deadline set forth by the HLURB in the submission and approval of the CLUPs, most of the LGUs in NNNP did not participate in the mainstreaming activities but committed to include BD during the next updating of their CLUPs. In fact, Silay City in late 2015 requested the BPP to assist them in updating their CLUP.</p>	<p>The Evaluation Team based its findings on interviews conducted and documents provided, not perceptions. An opportunity to present additional documentation was given but none was submitted to substantiate this claim.</p> <p>The BDFAP for LMKBA was recognized in p.36 of the First Draft.</p> <p>DENR-BMB’s comment is inaccurate. First, the draft report contains numerous references to what it recognized as project accomplishments for NNNP. Second, the comment still does not address why some areas (e.g. Cadiz) had no record of any intervention whatsoever given the size of the NNNP area under its jurisdiction. As stated, a more pro-active approach would have been more preferred and a needs assessment report would have provided insight on how better to encourage LGU participation given the menu of interventions BPP offered.</p>
UNDP CO	27	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The identification and mitigation of “red flags” would be possible if these were highlighted in the progress reports and presented to the Project Board for corrective actions. • Please also note that the conduct of the MTE is part of the M&E activities prescribed in the ProDoc. 	Noted. The red flags can literally in be seen in Annex 4 of the MTE.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TE should provide information on the quality of the M&E plan, the M&E budget, timeliness and utilization of the midterm evaluation (MTE), and consistency in reporting between monitoring (Annual Progress Reports) and evaluations (MTE). 	
UNDP CO	28	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please check whether the PIR self-evaluation ratings were consistent with the MTR and TE findings and ratings (you may include a table comparing the MTR and TE ratings) Are there changes made as a result of the MTR recommendations? 	<p>The 2016 and previous PIR ratings differ with the Evaluation Team's ratings.</p> <p>See p.35 on Evaluation Team's observations re MTE recommendations.</p>
UNDP HQ	29	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should "rights-based approach" be results-based approach? If possible, please also include information on the following points: UNDP's candor and realism in annual reporting, UNDP's quality of risk management, and UNDP's responsiveness to significant implementation problems. 	<p>Both rights- and results-based.</p> <p>It goes without saying that these elements were present. The limitations that prevented UNDP from responding more effectively were expressly enumerated in the report. (See p.35)</p>
UNDP CO	30	32	<p>Re comment on frequency, kindly note that project progress and risks are reported on a quarterly basis. Further, the quality of output-level monitoring is partly contingent on the quality of output indicators specified in the project document and the project's M&E plan. UNDP Programme Units also validate reported results through programme monitoring and field monitoring visits.</p>	<p>Noted and revised. (See p.36)</p>
UNDP HQ	31	32	<p>If possible, please also include information on the following points: EA's quality of risk management, candor and realism in reporting.</p>	<p>Paragraph is sufficiently descriptive of what was achieved and what was not. It is possible that the difference in the self-rating and the Evaluation Team's rating is due to an honest difference in appreciation of the issues, not lack of candor or realism.</p>
UNDP CO	32	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether there was an appropriate focus on results and timeliness; adequacy of management inputs and process including budgeting and planning; government ownership Cite how the BMB has supported the project implementation. 	<p>As stated in various parts of the report, there were issues with regard to attainment of results, timeliness, and management responses to problems that arose.</p>
DENR-BMB	33	33	<p>Biodiversity mainstreaming in the CLUP is not just by inserting BD concern in the maps.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

			<p>Mainstreaming involves the integration ALL aspects of biodiversity in the CLUP Process, from the structure, mandate, process and tools for implementation. The major reading by the evaluators of the framework and methods for BD-CLUP mainstreaming, the respective workshop designs, special orders issued by the LGUs organizing the inter-agency technical working groups, and CLUPs prepared by the LGUs that were assisted by the BPP would reveal that biodiversity concerns have been incorporated in not only in the maps but in the entire policy and planning processes at the local level. The fact that the LGUs have mainstreamed biodiversity in their CLUP including the support of the HLURB in the mainstreaming process is actually proof of the “buy-in” for the LGU and of the HLURB on the values of biodiversity and their relevance to local sustainable socio-economic growth. The adoption and approval of the Procedural Guidelines for BD-CLUP mainstreaming through the DENR-HLURB JAO will further strengthen this “buy in”.</p>	
DENR-BMB	34	33	<p>BPP has created a Core Group that serves as technical working group for Thematic Areas 2 & 4 in recognition that BDFAP and BDFE are interlinked. This Core Group involves the DA, DTI, DOT, UP ISSI and BMB. Several times that the group have discussed the concern on BD-friendly Agricultural Practices’ complementation with BD-friendly Enterprise. The partnerships fostered and the commitments between the partner NGAs of BPP is an assurance that even beyond the project life biodiversity concerns will be incorporated in their future works. As part of the sustainability plan, BMB through the Caves, Wetlands and other Ecosystems Division (CAWED) will tap these agencies and if needed will renew its partnerships to pursue BDFAP and BDFE. As part of the turn-over activities of the PMU with BMB, the tools developed for BDFAP and BDFE were pre-tested in other Protected Area (Upper Marikina Riverbasin). A key step in the institutionalization of the BDFAP and BDFE is its adoption and use in the on-going CMEMP of BMB.</p>	Noted and revised. (See p.37)

			<p>As for the ecotourism projects, it has been agreed in the National Ecotourism Steering Committee (NESC), where both DENR and DoT are members, to have a NESC Resolution to adopt the BDFE Framework in support of ecotourism. The draft Resolution currently is being crafted by the technical working group of the NESC.</p> <p>With regards to the uptake of BDSEA by DILG, in the recent Simplified BDSEA workshop for senior DILG staff, they provided recommendations for further simplification of the BDSEA tool and the revision of the draft DMC to a DILG memorandum to LGUs and local offices on the adoption of the simplified BDSEA tool. The template of the Simplified BDSEA tool was derived from the inputs of the pilot testing done with Quirino LGUs.</p>	
DA	35	33	<p>The biodiversity partnership, which was laid by the project at the national level, is a work in progress. During the course of the project implementation, an attempt was made to identify agri-enterprises which can be classified as BD-friendly, which is an overlap of BDFAPs and BDFEs. With respect to sustainability, BDFAP is a concept that can go beyond production and conservation of present resources by looking on its transformation into a business enterprise in the future that will encourage the private sector to be engaged in the process. With some of the BDFEs documented being agri-related, there are good reasons to continue the discussion between how DA and DTI after BPP.</p>	Noted. (See above)
DENR-BMB	36	33	<p>The draft national policies- BDFAP, BDFE, BDSEA and BD Mainstreaming in CLUPs have already undergone several PTWG reviews and vetting by various DENR bureaus and are not wallowing in the discussion table (as the evaluators stated). The draft policies are products of several consultations, technical reviews and field validations and are not 'limited learnings' as suggested by the evaluator who wrongly assumed that the submitted policies should be further vetted and fine-tuned.</p>	<p>The Evaluation Team stands by this finding. The policy inaction by the DENR over these proposed policies did not happen in a vacuum and can be traced to the risk identified in the ProDoc.</p> <p>As regards the limited learning, the Evaluation Team refers to the limited field experience that would have been generated had Outcomes 2 and 3 been more successful.</p>

DENR-BMB	37	34 ³⁵	<p>The problem of biodiversity loss is a complex one and will require a menu of interventions in order to address them. These problems and their causes have been identified in the Project Document with the corresponding strategies to resolve them. A careful reading of the Project Document by the evaluators would have revealed to them that the thematic areas correspond to these strategies. Contrary to the evaluator’s statements that the assignment of thematic areas vis-à-vis the sites are arbitrary, all site partners of the BPP were made aware of the various thematic areas/strategies. Since there was never an intention in the Project Document to resolve all issues relevant to biodiversity loss in the each of the project sites and because of the limited resources of the project, the site partners were requested to identify which of these thematic areas respond to priority issues in their respective sites given their on-going initiatives. This approach is consistent with the “value adding” principle stated in the Project Document. Nowhere in the design of the BPP did it require to address ALL causes of biodiversity loss in ALL of the sites. It must be emphasized that the design of the BPP as stipulated in the Project Document involved a programmatic approach (where outcomes at the national level are linked to the outcomes at the site level) rather than the traditional site-based approach.</p> <p>The issues of GMO corn in QPL has been recognized by the Quirino Province and its LGUs. Among the thematic areas they deemed needed to respond to this issues are the mainstreaming of BD in the CLUPs that would disallow GMO corn in specified areas in the QPL, the passage local environment codes that would limit corn production in less steep sloping agricultural land and the regulation of associated chemicals like glyphosate. Quirino LGUs also have urged the agribusiness companies using GMO corn to adopt the Sustainable Corn Production in Sloping Area (SCOPSA) technologies of adopting contour and diversified farming which are BDFAP technologies.</p>	<p>The paragraph in question actually identified specific (and readily observable) problem per site.</p> <p>See also response to Comment No. 19.</p> <p>Noted. How much of this was attributable to BPP was not documented.</p>
----------	----	------------------	---	---

³⁵ Identified as p.33 in the DENR-BMB & DA comments.

		<p>The conversion of forests to sugar plantations has not been identified as a key issue in the Management Plan of the NNNP. Rather, a threat to biodiversity specified during consultations in the updating of the PA plan and the preparation of the BD-CLUP are uncontrolled the expansion of urban and agricultural (not sugarcane) development and poaching in the PA. In response, the project assisted in the updating of the PA plan and assisted Calatrava and Silay in preparing their BD-CLUP to demonstrate this as responses in addressing these type threats to biodiversity. Also, the DA established a model farm in Murcia LGU Negros Occ. within NNNP showcasing the BDFAP technologies.</p> <p>As to the mining activities, there are none existing within the MHRWS. Had the evaluators obtained the existing thematic maps for MHRWS, they would have learned that no mining activities exist with the PA.</p> <p>The mining activities in the LMKBA have been existing long before the LMKBA has been recognized as an area of high biodiversity value. As such, the LMDA and the DENR-CARAGA as the site partners considered the mainstreaming of BD in the CLUPs as a priority step in controlling and mitigating the impacts of mining activities in the area.</p> <p>The multifaceted causes of biodiversity loss also are the reasons why the project pursued the pilot-testing of the application of BDSEA. The intention to equip the LGUs the needed wherewithal to assess PPaPs to be implemented in their localities and to be able to specify measures to mitigate the impacts to biodiversity.</p> <p>The findings on “The inherent transboundary nature of NECKBA and CPM either baffle or elude the stakeholders” is not clear and should be elaborated. Nonetheless, it must emphasized that the Transboundary Planning work, while preliminary consultations were conducted with the LGUs, was not pursued in CPM primarily because it was overtaken by the MTE recommendation to focus on BDFE and BDFAP and not proceed with work that has not progress substantially and would not contribute significantly in meeting the project targets. On the Transboundary Plan for</p>	<p>Regardless of the type of conversion (revised to reflect a more general sense), it is still ongoing whether for agricultural, industrial or for residential purposes. In fact, one municipality (E.B. Magalona) wants to be removed from NNNP and there is no documented BPP intervention.</p> <p>Lastly, the draft of the NNNP Mgt. Plan provided by and cited by the PMU is <u>not</u> for quotation.</p> <p>The discussion on mining came from the slideshow presentation of MHRWS on almaciga with PMU staff present where a large patch of cleared forest was visible. Note the use of the phrase “larger landscape” in the report as the MHRWS staff explained that the mining activity was between MHRWS and a marine KBA.</p>
--	--	--	--

			LMKBA, the planning workshops done with the Expanded Technical Working Group of the LMDA and other stakeholders revealed sufficient evidence of the “buy-in” of these stakeholders in the process and benefits of the having such a plan. The planning work was cleared with the BoT of the LMDA with the proposed Vision and Spatial strategies confirmed by the Board. The drafting of the plan is in the final stages and will be presented to the BoT when it convenes this year.	
DA	38	34 ³⁶	<p>The threats to biodiversity due to the use of GMOs in QPL can be addressed through various strategies.</p> <p>The adoption of potential BDFAP is one them, i.e. through the promotion of appropriate soil conservation measures such as hedgerow intercropping, conservation agriculture, and agroforestry in suitable areas, and through organic agriculture. There are already efforts that introduce sustainable corn production in sloping areas and convince land users to restore steep and hilly areas (i.e >30% slope) to its original permanent vegetations (forest tree species). Due to the widespread cultivation of sloping areas, it will take years to restore them and will require strict land use policies not only the implementation of BDFAP.</p>	Noted. It is not clear if these measures will address the threats posed by GMOs although it confirms the observation that had organic agriculture been used as the framework for intervention, then it would have been easily mainstreamed.
UNDP CO	39	34 ³⁷	Given the timeframe and limited interventions of the Project, the BPP cannot be expected to reverse these threats to biodiversity in the project sites. It would be interesting to know though, whether there have been interventions introduced by the Project to prevent the spread of these threats, or suspension, or policy statements, or plans that were developed as a result.	The Evaluation Team agrees with the observation. A needs analysis at the onset would have readily revealed the biodiversity challenges faced by each site. As stated in the report, there were a number of missed opportunities where the thematic interventions could have been applied (e.g., BDSEA on GMOs, BDFE incentives for less chemical intensive agriculture for MSPLS, etc.).
DENR- BMB	40	35 ³⁸	The causes of forest fragmentation are already identified in the Project document and remained to be so as validated during the	Noted and revised. (See p.39)

³⁶ Identified as p.33 in the DENR-BMB & DA comments.

³⁷ Identified as p.33 in the UNDP CO comments.

³⁸ Identified as p.34 in the DENR-BMB comments.

			<p>ground truthing work as a follow up to the fragmentation analysis. In MSPLS, in the period of 2005 to 2010, prior to the project, a concrete road going to El Nido was developed (and settlements along the road followed) that cut through a large patch of forest in the area, thus the large increase in fragmentation in the site between 2005-2010. It was at this time when development was done without due regard to biodiversity conservation in the development planning process. It is among the reasons why mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in developmental plans such as CLUP became a key strategy under the BPP. It can be inferred that increased awareness in the importance of biodiversity of policymakers and executives is a first step for a long term solution in addressing forest fragmentation. For instance, in LGU Baggao, a proposed two (2) lane road that would cut through the forest of NECKBA (Sierra Madre) to their coastal area (pacific side) during the preparation of the CLUP. The TWG formed to craft the CLUP became aware of the ill effects of the road project during the series of workshops leading to the preparation of the CLUP.</p> <p>The results of the fragmentation analysis including the ground-truthing work to validate the causes of the fragmentation was presented to and affirmed by the Project Board during its meeting last February 2017. While there may have been many factors that contributed to the reduction in the rate of fragmentation in the project sites, still it is encouraging to note that such reduction occurred during the implementation of the BPP in these sites and might have been the result of the increased awareness among the LGUs in the importance of biodiversity to the viability of their communities as a result of partnerships established with the LGUs and other stakeholders in the localities. The results of the fragmentation analysis can therefore provide the imperatives to continue work on BD mainstreaming in these areas.</p> <p>The methods used in the fragmentation analysis were developed by the Conservation International based on their previous work in similar undertakings in the Philippines. While further vetting could be undertaken, for now,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			the methods used and results of the fragmentation analysis in the BPP remain to be so unless the evaluators can provide alternative methods that can be tested and vetted against the one used by the BPP.	
DENR-BMB	41	35	<p>The PMU provided the evaluators a matrix showing the area coverages by site and LGU of the 129,296 has. The PMU also provided the evaluators the same details for the 1,045 has. that are potential sites for recognition by the DA. The 1,045 has. of demonstration farms under the BDFAP are not only in QPL and LMKBA but also covers demonstration farms in MSPLS, NNNP, CPM, NeCKBA. The summary of the demonstration farms and its size was provided by the PMU to the TE for their reference.</p> <p>The 1,045 has. is still to be assessed by DA using the final BDFAP recognition scheme. DA BAFPS is currently reviewing existing certification schemes that will serve as reference/guide in crafting recognition and/or certification scheme for biodiversity friendly agriculture practices. The certification of the additional 1,045 has. and 8 production systems under recognized production practices will be done after the criteria and guidelines has been set up. BPP has initially assessed the Quirino and Lake Mainit farms for BDFAP compliance using an assessment matrix following the BDFAP 6 principles developed by DA.</p> <p>The evaluation team has only seen so far the organic coffee cum agroforestry site in Quirino but not the sustainable corn production in sloping areas (SCOPSA) with soil & water conservation and tree integration sites done by the LGUs.</p> <p>Other than composting, there were other BDFAP compliant examples seen in Tubod, Lake Mainit like Abaca, Banana and Fruit Tree Multi-storey Agroforestry, reintroduction of heritage/native vegetable spp., organic vegetable and root crop production, Bio-intensive container farming, integrated livestock and crop farming.</p>	Noted and revised. Added ITPGRAF report. (See p.40)
DENR-BMB	50	36	BDSEA is not a redundant exercise with the CLUP process. If one is schooled in the theory and practice of planning, it would be readily apparent that BDSEA and CLUP are not forms	The credentials of the Evaluation Team may be perused from the UNDP, which includes a master's degree in

			<p>of planning. BDSEA is an assessment tool, and not a form of planning, to assist policy and decision makers in ensuring that government’s plans, programs and policies (PPaPs) are sensitive to biodiversity and not only environment considerations. If the evaluators have read the BDSEA Manual, it would have been cleared with them that the BDSEA complements the planning process since BDSEA can serve as a validating tool to ensure that the policies, sectoral plans, and programs contained in the CLUP respond to the requirements of biodiversity conservation. In fact, once the BDSEA is adopted at the local level, it can serve as a tool for the Provincial Land Use Committee reviewing the CLUPs to review whether the CLUPs comply with the intentions of biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>The implementation of the BDSEA at the DA will commence once BDSEA has been fully tested and practiced within DENR. For this purpose, an orientation for national government partners on BDSEA was conducted in early 2017 to fully orient these partners on BDSEA and agree on a plan of action for its adoption and implementation.</p> <p>The BD-focused EIA can augment/input project level objectives, indicators and recommend mitigation measures but cannot guide higher and general level plans, programs and policies of government agencies and LGUs. BDSEA full reading of the BDSEA Manual will show that BDSEA seeks to complement and reinforce the national Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) system by providing guidance for a proactive approach and undertake feed-backing to integrate biodiversity considerations into the higher levels of planning and decision-making. With the current national EIA framework and policy focusing on the environmental impacts of projects, the proposed BDSEA-DMC will strengthen the environmental assessment initiatives by focusing on DENR’s plans, programs and policies.</p>	<p>Environmental Assessment and Evaluation, where SEA was one of the topics studied in the course.</p> <p>The PMU entirely missed the point that as an academic exercise, it would have yielded better results had it been applied to local and plans adopting GMO farming, monocropping or use of chemicals, similar to previous BDSEA exercises on NGP and tourism. These would have actually served as better case studies. To repeat, the value of BDSEA is not the issue, its legality is.</p> <p>The Evaluation Team stands by this observation.</p>
DENR-BMB	51	36	<p>The evaluators should have read the PIR or the Annual Report that bears the complete information about the status of accomplishment related to National Action Plan for Sustainable Land Management (NAP-</p>	<p>Revised to incorporate said information. (see p.41 and Footnote No. 15)</p> <p>The “nothing follows” observation in the first draft</p>

			<p>SLM) or they can ask or validate the information from the PMU. As per PIR, the accomplishments under NAP-SLM: The draft has been prepared which provides for robust discussion on biodiversity. The concern on biodiversity is part of the Strategic Objective 2 of NAP-SLM: To regenerate and rehabilitate watershed landscapes and their resources for ecosystem services enhancement. The NAP-SLM also incorporates two (2) sub-programs of the Thematic Program 3: Watershed Landscape Management and Rehabilitation includes biodiversity as follows: 1) Sustainable management of forest resources; and 2) Promotion of SLM for forest resources conservation and management. It also include the listings of completed and ongoing projects on biodiversity in buffer zones of Protected Areas and Key Biodiversity Areas. The final draft NAP-SLM was presented by the Committee on the Conservation and Management of Resources for Development (CCMRD) and revised according to the relevant comments (Biodiversity included as a major chapter of NAPSLM components; NAPSLM included biodiversity projects e.g. include BPP, NewCAPP and NBSAP related projects).</p>	<p>pertained to the entry in the Results Framework (p.4) submitted by the PMU to the Evaluation Team.</p>
DA	52	37	<p>It is not problematic because it was subjected to series of discussions and consultations at the regional and national levels with consensus and buy-in from different stakeholders. BDFAP was defined based on 1) the importance of agriculture on sustainable production of food, fiber, fuel and other agricultural products and on sustaining rural people's livelihoods, 2) CBD goal on conservation of biodiversity, 3) current threats to biodiversity.</p> <p>While the definition does not specifically contain any explicit proscription against GMOs, use of chemicals and the like, it emphasizes the use low input or less environmentally damaging systems that reduce soil erosion and water runoff. The use GMOs, chemicals, and pesticides are severely restricted in organic agriculture. Organic agriculture is one of the options of the sector and is considered as a potential BD-friendly agricultural practice. However, with agriculture being a market driven sector that focuses on maximizing</p>	<p>Revised to reflect the discourse between BDFAPs and organic farming. (See p.42)</p>

			<p>productivity and profitability to satisfy the increasing demand for food and provide increased income to farmers it also considers other interventions that go beyond organic agriculture.</p> <p>Thus, BDFAP not only considers organic agriculture but other sustainable land management options (e.g. hedgerow intercropping, conservation agriculture, rainwater harvesting, agro-forestry) that could provide the balance between production and economic targets and biodiversity and habitat protection. The final definition of BDFAP was finalized after consultations with stakeholders of the eight pilot sites, representatives from CSOs, national agencies, local government units, and the private sector.</p>	
DENR-BMB	53	37	<p>The comment that the JAO on BDFAP “may even justify the proliferation of new agricultural activities in KBAs that may further worsen forest fragmentation” is misplaced. The promotion of BDFAP in fact will reduce forest fragmentation by increasing land productivity in existing tilled areas within KBAs without necessarily expanding the areas of cultivation. Also, the BDFAP JAO should not be considered exclusively must be taken in tandem with the other policy instruments being proposed for approval by the project. Specifically, the proposed DENR-HLURB JAO provides that BDFAPs are to be located only in areas zoned as Sustainable Use Areas and disallowed in Strict Protection Zones. The BDSEA likewise would ensure that agricultural programs in the wider agricultural landscape support the objectives of biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>The comment must be read in its proper context. Given the “market-driven” nature of the agricultural sector (see DA’s previous comment), the adoption of a new agricultural policy exclusively in KBAs MAY be misinterpreted as a signal to expand agricultural activities in KBAs. Rather than question the observation, it is more constructive to find ways to address this potential policy pitfall. (See p.42)</p> <p>Reading the draft JAO together with the proposed DENR-HLURB has no legal basis. Same is true with the BDSEA which has no legal anchor.</p>
DENR-BMB	54	37	<p>The linking of Biodiversity-friendly Agriculture Practices (BDFAP) with Organic Agriculture initiatives was discussed with the DA Policy and Planning and Technical Working Group. DA expressed hesitation considering that the two systems although complementary and have technical commonalities, have differences in objectives and applications. While organic farming aims to provide clean, safe/chemical free and healthy food, some of its production processes are not necessarily biodiversity friendly. Organic farming doesn’t share some of the 6 BDFAP principles- e.g.</p>	<p>Organic farming can be qualified to strictly conform with BDFAP principles/ standards. The pitfalls identified in the comment can very well apply to other types of agriculture and are not exclusive nor inherent in organic farming.</p> <p>As regards the certification process, BDFAP certification may actually serve as a middle step for upland farmers who</p>

		<p>organic farming can use commercial exotic crops; go monoculture and not diversified farming; and may even be the cause for opening up and expanding agriculture in Protected Areas and Key Biodiversity Areas (e.g. clearing of mossy forests for highland/upland organic vegetable farming). Organic farming addresses the client's demand for safe clean farm produce while biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices attend to the bigger landscape level concern on arresting forests fragmentation and land degradation. While organic farming contributes to soil amelioration processes and the restoration of soil productivity, BDFAP considers the multiplicity of environmental benefits alongside the balance of protection and production in the long term. BDFAP incorporates organic farming particularly if it promotes the use of indigenous crops (BPP's thematic area 2 have an ITPGRF component); minimal or non- use of chemicals for production and pest control; and if it simulates natural forest production processes like multi-storey agroforestry, soil regeneration and diversified farming systems. While organic farming's entry into the commercial market is governed by stringent certification standards, BDFAP could only follow (in its initial stage) a recognition framework for best practices. BDFAP at the moment is only recommended for application within the multiple use zones of protected areas and key biodiversity areas. DA has still to promote this in the wider agricultural landscape where it competes with commercial agricultural production characterized by intensive inputs, monoculture of primary, high value and industrial crops and the application of non-BD friendly biotechnologies (e.g. GMO crop farming). BDFAP cannot be attractive and can't easily be sold to first time adopters if it follows the path of organic agriculture. Following the BPP Project Document (Page 15)- The Organic Agriculture Program of DA is supported by a certification system. Although still with limited coverage and consumer patronage, the organic certification schemes in agriculture focus on production processes that entail organic methods as assurance from growers and to ensure prime price. The</p>	<p>cannot readily afford organic certification.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>dominant organic certification is third party certification but it is expensive for a farm to get certified. The cost of yearly certification for a small farm is as high as Php 15,000 (US \$ 333). A cheaper mode is community-based certification, called participatory guarantee system (PGS). PGS is most appropriate for resource poor farmers living in biodiversity conservation areas because the cost of certification is less expensive. When applied more widely, the certification system has the potential to provide the needed incentives to positively influence agricultural practices in the surrounding landscapes of KBAs. Organically certified products command a higher price in the market – as much as 30% more.</p> <p>While there are existing standards for agricultural production systems through the Bureau of Agriculture and Fisheries Products Standards (BAFPS), the current system has no standards covering biodiversity-friendly production systems. The Rainforest Alliance has a set of Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCBS), but these are focused on projects rather than products, with criteria such as carbon sequestration for purposes of funding from donors. Other certifications only involve Best Management Practices (BMP). Lack of expertise to develop the standards and a limited understanding of the benefits to both consumers and producers are the reasons why no certification system for biodiversity-friendly production systems has so far been put in place.</p>	
DA	55	37	<p>Organic agriculture, as one of the options, was discussed and deliberated during the process and therefore is not a missed opportunity. BDFAP was broadly defined not just within the context of restricting the use of GMOs, chemical fertilizers and pesticides but also the promotion of other sustainable land management practices (i.e. aside from organic farming) such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hedgerow intercropping - the planting of leguminous tree or shrub species in double rows along the contour as vegetative barrier. The strips or alleys between hedgerows are planted to different kinds of annual crops. 2. Integrated farming - integrates inter-related farm enterprises (e.g. diversified crop 	<p>As observed by the Evaluation Team during their mission, the shortcomings of BDFAP in terms of being easily understood by ordinary farmers, consumers and policymakers was apparent. The way this is being explained by the DENR-BMB and DA now, all these technical distinctions would have had more potential if carried within the policy on organic agriculture, rather than a stand-alone policy distinct and separate from organic agriculture.</p>

			<p>production with fish and livestock production) that complements with each other (e.g. waste of one enterprise is a resource to another).</p> <p>3. Conservation tillage – the practice of planting seeds through the stubbles of last season’s crop rather than plowing or disking the field. 30% or more of the soil surface is kept covered by soil residues until final seedbed preparation</p> <p>4. Natural Vegetative Strip (NVS) evolved as a variant of Sloping Agricultural Land Technology (SALT), or contour hedgerows, when farmers experimented with the hedgerow concept by placing crop residues along the contour lines and leaving the native weeds to re-vegetate in the unplanted strips, eventually forming stable natural barriers to erosion.</p> <p>5. Residue incorporation - involves the incorporation of corn stalks and leaves, usually chopped, during land preparation for the next crop. It avoids burning of residues in corn areas.</p> <p>6. Agro-forestry development is an integrated approach of using the interactive benefits from combining trees and shrubs with crops and/or livestock. It combines agriculture and forestry technologies to create more diverse, productive, profitable, healthy, and sustainable land-use systems.</p> <p>In the Philippines, agroforestry was advocated as an alternative to the environmentally destructive practice of kaingin-making or slash-and-burn cultivation by many upland farmers.</p> <p>On the other hand, organic farming involves crop rotation, composting, and biological pest control to maintain soil productivity and control pests without synthetic pesticides and fertilizers. Thus, it will not cover most of the BDFAP previously enumerated.</p> <p>There is no “one size fits all” technology or practice and therefore the selection of the appropriate BDFAP depends on the natural (bio-physical and climate) and human (tenure status, land holding, socio-economic) environment in which a practice will be applied.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

DENR-BMB	56	38 ³⁹	This is a wrong interpretation of BDSEA. GMO farming is a private and individual farm venture/project. For now, the LGUs could only advise, encourage and recommend BDFAP technologies but not impose unless passed as an ordinance. BPP is presently directing efforts to incorporate BDSEA in the LGUs' local environment code. BDSEA concerns plans, programs and policies. BDSEA can influence LGU policies and ordinances e.g. banning glyphosate (which QPL has now done).	Ownership is a non-issue in a SEA where analysis is done at the programmatic/policy/sectoral level. If this was not the case, why did the PMU bother with the tourism/NGP exercises in the first place where some of the tourism/planting activities were private ventures? The Evaluation Team reiterates that the problem with BDSEA is not its usefulness, but its lack of legal basis. It cannot be cured by way of an ordinance.
DENR-BMB	57	39	The inclusion of the term biodiversity-friendly in the documents of DTI and in the drafting of the Local Investment and Incentive Code (LIIC) are milestones for the project that aims to demonstrate to these "non-traditional partner agencies (DTI, DA, DILG, HLURB, DOT) the significance of biodiversity in pursuing inclusive socio-economic growth. This paradigm shift in the minds of these agencies is a success in itself. The foundation laid by the project could serve as springboard to pursue biodiversity conservation supportive of national and local economic development. In terms of the provision of the incentives, fiscal and non-fiscal incentives have been discussed several times with Thematic Areas 2 & 4 Core Group, However, an enabling policy would be needed to institutionalize these incentive designed to encourage investments in BDFEs, which is the main intent of the DTI-DENR JAO. Once the JAO is in place, then incentives to other activities as suggested by the evaluators can be pursued. In the meantime, the	While the Evaluation Team acknowledges the use of the term "biodiversity" in the policy instrument of the DTI, its mere mention in passing in the preambular paragraphs should not be taken as a paradigm shift absent operational provisions for the over-all implementation of the instrument. (See pp.42-43)
DENR-BMB	58	41	The BDSEA assessment of national agency PPaPs will be initiated first by DENR-BMB. DOT has shown favorable response on the application of BDSEA on the Natural Tourism Development Plan. So far, BDSEA has been piloted within BMB using as case studies the National Greening Program and the Foreshore Management Plan. The DENR Policy Studies Division and members of the Policy Technical Working Group have also been oriented on	Noted. Participation in orientation activities, as the term suggests, is not equivalent to agency support. The Evaluation Team was describing the materials given to them (i.e., powerpoint presentations). They are not

³⁹ Identified as p.37 in the DENR-BMB comments.

			<p>BDSEA. National level orientations were also done with NEDA, HLURB, and DA participating in the discussions. Upon NEDA's suggestion, a draft Executive Order on BDSEA was also prepared in anticipation of the passage of House Bill 145 Establishing a Comprehensive Environmental Assessment System where SEA for assessing the government's plans, programs and policies has been highlighted.</p> <p>On the Transboundary Planning methods, the Procedural Manual is being prepared based on the results of the piloting in NECKBA and Lake Mainit. The evaluators are mistaken in saying that the framework in land use planning was used for Transboundary Planning. The framework for Transboundary Planning is the landscape-level ecological planning and not land use planning. Land use is only one of the considerations in the Transboundary Planning. Transboundary planning using the ecological based approach combines the methods for protected area management planning, land use planning, sectoral development planning, zonation, and institutional development planning. The evaluators should have sought the assistance of the PMU to clarify with them the framework and methods for Transboundary Planning since both evaluators are not adequately schooled in the planning theories, models, and practices.</p>	describing transboundary planning per se.
DENR-BMB	59	42	<p>The funds attributed to BD friendly agriculture and enterprises are part of the LGUs' funds allocated for activities deemed supportive of biodiversity conservation as indicated in their Annual Investment starting in 2013 up to 2016. The evaluators should have sought clarification with the PMU on the basis for reported amounts.</p>	<p>Documentation provided by PMU (i.e., matrix) has no objectively-verifiable indicator. The Evaluation Team accurately reported the reaction of the LGU informants citing the figures provided by the PMU. They were in a better position to validate these figures than the PMU. As stated, an evaluation of PMU's methodology in ascertaining these allocations is recommended.</p>
	60	45		<p>Revised to include activities by LPSC-NECKBA. Copy of Minutes provided by PMU is unsigned and the date of activities mentioned happened AFTER the said meeting.</p>

DENR-BMB	61	45	<p>The evaluators are firm in their belief that analysis of biodiversity impacts would be better served within the context of EIA. The BPP ProDoc states that biodiversity impacts have largely been ignored in the indiscriminate intensification of agricultural activities leading to increased fragmentation within landscapes surrounding critical habitats and other areas with significant biodiversity resources. These problems have persisted in part due to the absence of national biodiversity impact assessment requirements related to policies, plans and programmes. Again, the EIA is not the right assessment tool for this as it is specific only for projects. Therefore the Biodiversity-focused Strategic Environment Assessment was recommended as it deal with the assessing impacts development policies, plans and programs to balance economic gains from improved production against likely long-term effects of permanent loss of species and degradation of natural habitats.</p> <p>Six LGUs from Quirino participated in a BDSEA piloting covering their respective CLUPs. The outputs of the six LGUs constitute a matrix outlining their Goals, Environmental Indicators and Issues; and Proposed Mitigation Measures. Out of the six, Diffun, Cabarroguis, Maddela and Nagtipunan LGUs pursued the crafting of their BDSEA reports. The results of the BDSEA piloting in Quirino served as the basis in fine-tuning the methods for BDSEA and the preparation of the Manual of Procedures for the simplified BDSEA. The orientation-training for the BDSEA for LGUs commenced in 2015 up to 2016. The participants to these trainings were limited to the MENROs and MPDCs. The respondents of the interviews by the evaluators might have been people who did not participate to these BDSEA trainings.</p>	<p>The Evaluation Team is firm on their belief that BDSEA needs legal basis.</p> <p>The ProDoc did not prescribe the exclusive use of SEA as an assessment tool. It should have prompted alternative strategies as soon as the lack of legal basis became apparent early on in the project implementation as indicated in the BDSEA manual itself.</p> <p>The DENR-BMB is correct on the limitations of the EIA system. However, absent legal basis, the value of SEA is limited and at the risk of being repetitive, BDSEA could have been more productively channeled towards a theoretical analysis of activities with potential impacts on biodiversity like GMO farming, use of pesticides in MSPLS, etc. Within this context, it can serve as valuable inputs if and when SEA is actually authorized by law.</p>
DENR-BMB	62	46	<p>The evaluators mistakenly read the accomplishment report of the BPP. As cited in the accomplishment report, the achievement of the project pertained to adoption by the Taytay and San Vicente LGUs of the planning frameworks for the FLUP, ICRMP, and ECAN. Nowhere in the report did it say anything regarding the adoption of the FLUP. The preparation of the FLUP of Taytay is still on-</p>	Deleted. (See p.52)

			going. The activities already in various stages of completion include the workshops on BD Enhanced FLUP, GIS based thematic maps (partially complete), and data banking (still ongoing). The adoption of the FLUP, once completed, will still undergo the political process of Taytay SB's approval.	
DENR-BMB	63	47	<p>The piloting of Payment for Ecosystems Services in Sto. Niño, Maddela was centered on water use: households as water users from the water supply system will pay water fees which will be used to manage and maintain the water supply system, including the protection and forest cover restoration of the 125 hectare watershed area.</p> <p>The basic framework requires water users to provide incentives or support to those protecting and managing the watershed in exchange for the continuous flow of water to the water users. A Conservation Agreement would capture this arrangement, with flow of funds, incentives, water, biodiversity conservation and other ecosystem services realizable in the future. While the returns of the PES piloting is 'miniscule' from the evaluator's point of view, the mere fact that the community allotted 50% of the proceeds including the formulation of a future business plan together with its watershed management plan (based on the PES conservation agreement) towards forest conservation is considered significant enough laying out the foundation for PES work in QPL.</p>	The Evaluation Team was emphasizing the equity and sustainability aspects of the scheme, more than just its value as an implemented activity under the project.
DENR-BMB	64	48	<p>Part of the process that the project undertook is to define the concepts being mainstreamed to the sites. So, since biodiversity-friendly enterprise is a new concept, its definition was deliberated in several consultation meetings with the agencies involved, hence, it is define as <i>"economic activities and practices of micro, small and medium enterprises, local government units and people's organizations that promote the sustainable use of biological resources; create wealth and value; and open opportunities for the equitable sharing of benefits among stakeholders"</i>. Livelihoods, on the other hand, are <i>"means of securing or making a living"</i>. Within this context, the livelihoods visited by the evaluators were considered BDFEs since they exhibit attributes</p>	Noted.

			for meeting the criteria and upscaling BDFEs. This is the main rationale for the project's focus in the provision of capacity development and linkage to potential partners.	
DENR-BMB	65	49	The MASRADECA training center houses the coffee milling and processing equipment. It also served as a storage area for DA inputs delivered by Maddela's agricultural technicians. The PMU raised this finding of the evaluators with the Site Partner in QPL and they said that the TE team mistook pile of sacks containing seeds of coffee and organic vermicompost and not chemical fertilizers.	The Evaluation Team stands by this finding. They have pictures of the fertilizers. The sacks had the marks "AGROBLEN", "Controlled Release Fertilizer", "Property of Department of Agriculture, Regional Field Office No. 02", "NOT FOR SALE", among others. Lastly, at least one PMU staff was present when we pointed out these sacks (pictures available for verification purposes).
DENR-BMB	66	50	The study being done for the Bakong in Lake Bangalao is Ecological Study and not Biodiversity Impact Study. The project has commissioned the CSU to do the ecological study aimed at assessing relationships of the Bakong to the Lake and to other flora and fauna present in the said lake. The study also incorporates the assessment of the impact of the harvesting on the ecology of the bakong and of the lake ecosystem. Part of the study is to develop a management plan to ensure the sustainable harvesting of the bakong plant. The CSU report is in the final stages of preparation. The BDSEA is not applicable for this purpose because the focus of BDSEA is to check the impacts to biodiversity of the policies, plans and programs not projects.	Taken in its proper context, the study referred specifically to the "Rapid Ecological and Biophysical Assessment of Bakong (<i>Hanguana malayana</i>) Species in Sta. Teresita, Cagayan (See Annex E). Currently, the study makes no mention of a sustainable rate of harvest for the bakong. Read properly, either a BDSEA or a simple EIA study was recommended by the Evaluation Team.
DENR-BMB	67	50	The demonstration of BDFE in the sites was not intended to be scaled-up or generate significant income or returns in the immediate term or within the project life. As provided for in the Project Document (page 24), the piloting component basically intends to demonstrate that economic activities (livelihoods, enterprises) and biodiversity conservation can go together given a range of factors and incentives. This was done within the project wherein various existing and potential BDFEs were identified and developed or enhanced as BD-friendly enterprises in aid of creating different models. In the case of the more established enterprises, the Almaciga resin	Noted. The Evaluation Team's observation was an objective assessment of the scale and sustainability of the said livelihood activities which echoed the observations of livelihood experts interviewed.

			<p>tapping in Mt Hamiguitan and coffee enterprise in Quirino, they already demonstrated positive ROI and strong potential as BDFEs. While for other enterprises, particularly the start-ups, the BPP strategy was to muster the support of various government and even the private sector to enhance the potentials and open opportunities for these start-up livelihood activities. To facilitate this strategy, the BPP tapped and engaged local partners (private sector, social enterprise, etc.) either as support group (hand-holding), consolidator, marketing arm and/or collaborator following the Big Brother approach. To formalize and institutionalize this, MOUs were forged between the POs and the possible private sector or SE/NGO. For the tiger grass in Silay, the DENR Regional Office and BMB forged an MOU with Association of Negros Producers (ANP) to support the BDFE in Negros and provide support to the PO in terms of capacity, marketing and promotion. For the past two years now, ANP has been partnering with the PO during trade fairs and shows and generating additional income to the members. The issue on the sourcing the tiger grass raw materials elsewhere has also been acknowledged by ANP given that the raw material is seasonal, and may require the setting up of nursery and the likes. This is a further intervention that may be undertaken jointly by ANP and with support of local DENR and other stakeholders. Nonetheless, tiger grass enterprise in NNNP is seen to contribute to the objective of the BPP, which is to wean away resource-dependent communities in PAs and KBAs from destructive economic activities. In the case of the honey production in Victorias, it should be emphasized that the main activity in Gawahon Ecopark is eco-tourism, and honeybee keeping (using native species), along with organic vegetable production and herbal production are considered support or ancillary activities that could enhance the value chain of the whole Ecopark. This in turn provides additional and more opportunities for the community to earn from given that support and interventions are sustained. In this case, the LGU and the local conservation NGO partner (PBCFI) have committed support to this community. These</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			exemplify what the ProDoc provides that given a range of interventions through partnership, including institutional support and incentives, BDFE is actually worth investing and sustaining. Moreover, the acceptance of the communities to take on these new and additional livelihoods activities in the context of conservation also affirmed the ProDoc's intent to encourage shift in the values and practices among communities.	
UNDP CO & HQ	68	51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This sub-section can be expanded further. Kindly comment on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which the project is suited to local and national development priorities, including changes over time; The extent to which the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded. <p>Note: Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of the project or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances. <i>See page 15 of the UNDP GEF Terminal Evaluation Guide</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please reconsider evaluation and rating for this criteria. Relevance is not measured in terms of awareness but in terms of whether the Project, as designed and implemented, is pertinent to the needs of stakeholders. 	Revised. (See pp.56-57)
DENR- BMB	69	51	<p>The evaluators are correct in saying that the Land Use Plan is the spatial framework for managing resources at the local level and can used to mitigate impacts on biodiversity.</p> <p>As previously cited, the BDSEA is applied not only to land use plans, but also programs and polices both at the national and LGU levels. It must be noted that aside from the CLUP, LGUs also prepare other sectoral and areas plans required by various national government agencies. The BDSEA for LGUs specifically is intended to ensure that these plans and related policies and programs respond to the objectives of biodiversity conservation.</p>	Noted.
UNDP CO & HQ	70	51	This evaluation criteria rates the extent to which the project's objectives have been achieved.	The rating has been changed to MODERATELY SATISFACTORY because of the recognition of

			<p>How is this aligned to the over-all rating provided, given that the project has “meager accomplishments in the other thematic areas,” and the Project Results in terms of attainment of objectives are rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory.</p> <p><i>See page 15 of the UNDP GEF Terminal Evaluation Guide</i></p> <p>Considering the level of achievement of outputs, would this rating still stand?</p>	BDFAP outputs, so the Effectiveness and Overall Rating are now consistent.
DENR-BMB	71	52	<p>Cross-pollination can be done in two levels, one is through the LGU/community level which involves actual cross visits or exchanges and the other is through the project partners. In the case of the former, this entails significant travel costs which the Project could not afford given the limited funds. However, under the project structure and institutional arrangements, sharing and exchanges of actual experiences/strategies, accomplishments, lessons learned and best practices are deemed part and parcel of the regular activity and M&E strategy of the Project through the conduct of regular Inter-agency Technical Working Group meetings, annual assessment and planning workshops and even the submission quarterly progress reporting. It must be noted that the discussions and interaction between and among partners in these venues have been substantial in terms of guiding the projects and the sites in their implementation. For the BDFEs, it should be noted that the products and production processes of bakong and Almaciga are different. But it is important to underline the best practices of MHRWS in its resin tapping enterprise and Sta. Teresita for bakong which are both characterized by strong LGU support.</p>	Noted.
UNDP CO	72	52	<p>This sub-section can be expanded further to cover the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible (cost-efficiency)</p>	<p>Unfortunately, the data presented does not allow for such a finding. On the one hand, policy initiatives should not entail as much hard costs as pointed out in the MTE. On the other hand, technical assistance on land-use planning does, which the project far exceeded in terms of outputs. Other activities have to be taken into consideration on</p>

				what accounted for the expenditures. There is also no standard pricing in the technical skills provided by the project to warrant a finding on cost-efficiency.
DENR-BMB	73	53	Why the gender mainstreaming framework was used? There must be clear justification why this framework was used as there are other mainstreaming framework can be used.	What is objectionable with the use of this framework? Biodiversity conservation, like gender, is a cross-cutting issue for development. Even government agencies like the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) uses it in assessing the mainstreaming of government development projects. Even GEF's STAP Advisory Document on Mainstreaming Biodiversity (2014) does not have a clear process-based notion on when mainstreaming is actually happening or is achieved.
UNDP CO	74	53	Also explore analyzing mainstreaming with respect to: UN Development Assistance Framework and Country Programme Document; Poverty/Environment nexus; Crisis prevention and recovery (especially with respect to climate change adaptation / the impacts of climate change on biodiversity); and Gender (All projects should pay attention to gender aspects - in terms of stakeholders, gender sensitive programming, etc).	DONE. (See pp.67-68)
UNDP HQ	75	53	The mainstreaming section should also assess, to the extent possible, how the project successfully mainstreamed other UNDP priorities, including poverty reduction, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters and women's empowerment	See above. DONE. (See pp.10 & 68) The Report also recommended the documentation on the role of women in conservation.
DENR-BMB	76	56 ⁴⁰	The evaluators might have mistakenly identified the Existing Land Use Map of LGU Calatrava as the Proposed Land Use Map. In fact, the proposed land use map of Calatrava	See footnote no. 29 to reflect the additional information.

⁴⁰ Identified as p.57 in the DENR-BMB comments.

			<p>already shows the zone boundaries of the NNNP. The mistaken area of the sugar cane plantation falls under the sustainable use zone in the Proposed Land Use. The zone use prescription for the sustainable use zone of Calatrava and the Strict Protection Zone prohibits sugar cane plantations and other agricultural practices that are not consistent with biodiversity conservation. Once the Zoning Ordinance has been approved, the LGU together with the PAMB/DENR has the authority to disallow or file sanctions for uses land that are inconsistent with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>The observation was made based on the document presented by the Calatrava MPDO to the Evaluation Team.</p> <p>It is not clear from the DENR-BMB comment whether the area where the sugarcane plantations are will be removed from the strict protection zone, OR if the <i>strict protection zone</i> will be re-categorized into <i>sustainable use</i> in view of the fact that it is planted with sugarcane.</p>
DENR-BMB	77	58	<p>There were no BDFAP interventions of the BPP in Lambunao primarily because the agroforestry and upland agriculture activities in Lambunao were covered part of another foreign-assisted project of the DENR, the FORCLIM project of GIZ. However, these sustainable farming activities in Lambunao could be considered and later recognized as biodiversity-friendly compliant after the DA-DENR JAO on BDFAPs is approved.</p> <p>The BDFAP “awareness activities” were actually BDFAP assessment field visits in the two branches of CSU (Lallo and Gonzaga). The BDFAP assessment team discussed with the heads of the agriculture departments the findings and merits of the observed organic vegetable, agroforestry and composting activities of the 435 students. The CSU heads have committed to spread these technologies to nearby farms through their regular agriculture extension activities.</p> <p>The difference of BDFAP and Organic Farming is again reiterated. As cited previously in this document, while organic farming aims to provide clean, safe/chemical free and healthy food, some of its production processes are not necessarily biodiversity friendly. Organic farming doesn’t share some of the 6 BDFAP principles- e.g. organic farming can use commercial exotic crops; go monoculture and not diversified farming; and may even be the cause for opening up and expanding agriculture in Protected Areas and Key Biodiversity Areas (e.g. clearing of mossy forests for highland/upland organic vegetable farming). Organic farming addresses the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Documentation of the commitment from the CSU heads?</p> <p>See earlier comment. These pitfalls are neither inherent in nor exclusive to organic farming.</p>

			<p>client's demand for safe clean farm produce while biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices attend to the bigger landscape level concern on arresting forests fragmentation and land degradation. While organic farming contributes to soil amelioration processes and the restoration of soil productivity, BDFAP considers the multiplicity of environmental benefits alongside the balance of protection and production in the long term. BDFAP incorporates organic farming particularly if it promotes the use of indigenous crops (BPP's thematic area 2 have an ITPGRF component); minimal or non- use of chemicals for production and pest control; and if it simulates natural forest production processes like multi-storey agroforestry, soil regeneration and diversified farming systems. While organic farming's entry into the commercial market is governed by stringent certification standards, BDFAP could only follow (in its initial stage) a recognition framework for best practices.</p>	
DENR-BMB	78	58	<p>Regarding the BDFAP efforts in Quirino Province, change in agricultural practices for entire 6 LGUs does not happen overnight. This would be a matter for the LGUs agriculturists (MAOs, ATs) and the DA on how to provide effective extension mechanism for BDFAPs. It is hoped that with the DA ATI manual on BDFAP, it will be popularize and more farmers will take in BDFAP as a sustainable alternative to planting GMO monocrops et. al. BPP and DA has established Sustainable Corn Production through Sustainable Agriculture (SCOPSA) model farms to address the issue of widespread corn planting particularly in sloping lands. Unfortunately these were not seen by the evaluation team despite the scheduled visit to the farms (they were diverted to the meeting with Quirino's Provincial Administrator instead). SCOPSA is now making a dent and infact there was an agreement with the Quirino Provincial government the agribusiness companies to establish SCOPSA and soil and water conservation measures in the corn farms.</p>	Noted. (See p.65)
DENR-BMB	79	59	<p>The tedious process of preparing, vetting, submission, and approval of the Local Environment Code for Sangguniang Bayan's</p>	Noted. (See p.65)

			<p>have a Hand Loom through the Shared Service Facility (SSF) of DTI.</p> <p>BPP facilitated the partnership between MASREDECA (CBFM) and PCA/Bote Central as buyer of coffee.</p> <p>BPP facilitated the capacity and skills training on product development and pricing that started the production of tiger grass products. It also facilitated the linkage to potential investors/consolidators thus, forging of MOU with ANP to assist PAFISFA for tiger grass.</p> <p>The biodiversity assessment under BPP/PNCFI contributed in developing Gawahon Eco-Park's ecotourism potential after it was identified as a potential bird watching area.</p> <p>The Feasibility Study was done as part of the BPP activities of DENR Region XI in 2014. They engaged the services of the University of Southeastern Philippines to do the study. A tree inventory of the Almaciga was also conducted in support of the management of the Almaciga tapping enterprise.</p> <p>During validation and assessment stage, product development/diversification was one of the needs identified by the PO and ADF, hence, the training proposal. This has been coordinated well to the PO and even to ADF. However, along the way and even after the training, the PO decided to focus on producing the traditional furniture for local demand. In fact, ADF received queries on other small items (the result of previous product development) but the PO did not commit and decided to focus on the furniture.</p> <p>While there was no explicit indication that the model BDFEs or the Project would pursue efforts at the level of bio-compounds, it must be noted that the Project did engage into research undertaking through a partnership with DCP, esp. in the manipulation of raw materials as basis for product development. In the case of bakong, the result of the research on the plant proved to be instrumental in developing its potentials for fabric and other uses. For the Lubeg wine, one of the</p>	<p>Noted and revised. (See p.65)</p> <p>Noted and revised. (See p.65)</p> <p>Based on financial records shown by Gawahon staff, the ecotourism potential of the area with the locals is well-realized even beforehand. The study resulted in new visitors, mostly bird experts, but the volume is still minimal.</p> <p>Noted and revised. (See p.66)</p> <p>The Evaluation Team notes that the reason for this was because the PO wanted a finished product while the training only provided a new design so the next step of how to incorporate the new design was not communicated.</p> <p>Noted. No additional documentation provided on research of health properties of lubeg wine.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>recommendations as next step to the LGU of Lal-lo and even to DENR was to facilitate further studies on the following: 1) Health properties and benefits of lubeg, and 2) Research to improved varieties and improve fruiting capability (possibly with UPLB). The conduct of these activities however are beyond the project's TOR.</p> <p>Moreover, as this is a piloting effort, it must be noted also that during the rapid resource assessment and validation conducted per site, existing and potential enterprises, raw materials and products, including herbal-based products and raw materials were identified and documented and could be pursued even after the project.</p> <p>The BDFE is not limited to handicrafts, as per Project Document we only need to demonstrate it. Various models were demonstrated that not only focus to handicrafts but also includes manufacturing of food products and non-timber forest products such as resin.</p> <p>In contrast, the Project was actually able to document various business models, with varying levels of operations and org/financial conditions. The intent was not to come up with enterprise or livelihood that is fully operational or financially stable within the project life but rather document these various pilots to generate recommendations and models for subsequent work on BDFE.</p> <p>In the case of Almaciga, it must be noted that the enterprise has been generating income for the communities and LGU and is considered advanced in terms of operations and the assistance of the project was to ensure that their practices and management are consistent with biodiversity conservation, not to mention, the conduct of the FS to further assist them on their financial operations. For the bakong, the model indicates strong LGU role in ushering the start-up enterprise but with recognition that this will eventually be turned over to the PO (another start-up organization).</p> <p>It must be noted that the project has facilitated support on the organizational development as well as the promotion of the raw materials to the market. Other business</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>models were also documented for other BDFE pilot enterprises, and indicated that some are lagging or may not be feasible at the moment given their org arrangements, etc. but given a range of interventions and support, they can actually be up scaled in the future.</p> <p>This issue has been address/clarified above.</p> <p>The survival of the enterprises demonstrated by the project is not solely the responsibility of the project but also of the other stakeholders. It will be important therefore to continue the collaboration with national and local level partners to ensure the continuity of assistance to bring the BDFEs to a level of financial viability in the medium and long term. As an initial step, to sustain the partnerships and gains, BMB already adopted the BDFE in the PBSAP and incorporated it in the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Management Program (CMEMP).</p>	<p>See response to Comment No. 65 on presence of chemical fertilizers in this facility.</p> <p>Noted and revised. (See p.66)</p>
DENR-BMB	81	60-61 ⁴²	<p>Upscaling the BD-responsive CLUPs in the Regional Physical Framework plan will require the crafting of a framework and process that was not part of the project design. This constraint also applies in the mainstreaming of biodiversity in the regional development plans. However, the Transboundary Planning framework provides the scheme for consolidating and harmonizing the CLUPs into the Transboundary Plan. In turn, the framework also provides for the approach in upscaling the Transboundary Plan into the Provincial Physical Framework Plan. Such upscaling scheme has been presented to the Project Board when the PMU presented the methods and results of the Transboundary Planning work in NECKBA and LMKBA.</p> <p>This statement is not clear.</p> <p>This statement is not clear.</p>	<p>Noted and revised. (See p.67)</p> <p>Clarified in p.67.</p>
UNDP CO	82	62	<p>Can the Evaluation team comment on outcomes/results achieved; and/or the likelihood of achievement of outcomes and impacts?</p>	<p>See Section 3.3.</p>

⁴² Identified as p.61 in the DENR-BMB comments.

	83	62		Deleted to reflect the recent change in DENR administration.
UNDP CO	84	63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please make a summary statement of the conclusion elaborating on why the project has been rated over-all as moderately unsatisfactory; • Kindly elaborate on this statement, why such recommendation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kindly also identify the key agencies that need to undertake the recommended follow-up actions. 	<p>The overall rating has been revised to MODERATELY SATISFACTORY.</p> <p>As discussed in the report, with the implementation of the DENR's rationalization plan, a number of BPP workers (contractual) were absorbed by the agency and assigned with tasks not always related to the project, leaving behind BPP work with minimal transition. For other sites that transitioned smoothly despite the rationalization (e.g., MHRWS), the solution was simple—i.e., to just include BPP-related work as additional deliverables for the newly-absorbed employees so there was no project work interruption. (See pp.10 and 70)</p> <p>DONE. (See pp.70-71)</p>
UNDP HQ	85	74	The list of documents reviewed include the GEF Tracking Tool but there were no specific findings. Were you able to review them as well?	Included in Annex E, second page of first draft. (Currently p.82)
	86	Various		Changes to correct typographical and grammatical errors, including minor stylistic changes are no longer enumerated.

Annex I. Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system

Name of Consultant: **Ronaldo R. Gutierrez**

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): N/A

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Quezon City, Philippines on 01 August 2016.

Signature: _____

