

UNDP Philippines

**Mid-Term Evaluation of the Innovation for Social Impact
Partnership (ISIP) Project**

Final Report

May 2020

Johnson Mercader

Project/outcome Information		
Project/outcome title	Innovation for Social Impact Partnership Project	
Atlas ID	Project ID: 00094778	
Corporate outcome and output	2018-2021 UNDP Strategic Plan: Outcome: 2. Accelerate Structural Transformations for Sustainable Development Output: 2.1 Government at national and sub-national levels adopting evidence-based policies, structures, and mechanisms, using frameworks that support the integration of climate change, urbanization and inclusive economic growth, promoting and creating decent and green jobs/livelihoods and resilient and sustainable communities	
Country	Philippines	
Region	Asia and the Pacific	
Date project document signed	21 June 2018	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	5 January 2018	31 December 2020 (with planned extension to 2022)
Total committed budget	US\$ 2,052,021	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	US\$ 677,104	
Funding source	Australian DFAT	
Implementing party	United Nations Development Programme	

Evaluation information		
Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)	Project	
Final/midterm review/ other	Midterm review	
Period under evaluation	Start	End
	5 January 2018	31 December 2019
Evaluators	Johnson Mercader	
Evaluator email address	kyip1951@gmail.com	
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion
	7 January 2020	15 May 2020

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iv
Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	4
The ISIP Project	4
II. Purpose, Objectives and Scope of Evaluation	7
Purpose and Objectives	7
Scope	7
Geographic Scope	7
III. Evaluation Approach and Methodology	9
Methodologies and Techniques	9
Analysis Tools	9
IV. Findings.....	10
1. Project Design	10
2. Entrepreneurship Component	11
3. Education Component	14
4. Policy Agenda Component	17
5. Financial Performance	18
6. Monitoring and Evaluation.....	19
7. Governance and Implementation Arrangements	20
8. Gender and Marginalized Groups	21
9. Risk Management.....	22
V. Conclusions.....	22
1. Relevance.....	23
2. Coherence	23
3. Effectiveness	24
4. Efficiency	25
5. Sustainability.....	26
6. Impact.....	26
7. Risk Management.....	26
VI. Good Practices and Lessons Learned	27
The Good Practices.....	27
Lessons Learned	27
VII. Recommendations	28
ANNEXES.....	31
Annex A. Terms of Reference (TOR).....	31
Annex B Compliances	37

Annex C Features of Selected SEs and HEIs	38
Annex D Project Cost Estimates	40
Annex E Criteria and Key Evaluation Question	41
Annex F Persons Met	43

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACPC	Agricultural Credit Policy Council
ADDU	Ateneo de Davao University
ADNU	Ateneo de Naga University
APR	Annual Progress Report
BARMM	Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao
BatSU	Batangas State University
BCTA	Business Call to Action
Beneficiary Group	Group of individuals being assisted by the SEs
BPI	Bank of the Philippine Islands
CALABARZON	Region IV-A comprising the provinces of Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Rizal And Quezon
CAR	Cordillera Autonomous Region
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CFO	Chief Finance Officer
CHED	Commission on Higher Education
Cohort	In ISIP lingo, this refers to a college/university being assisted by HEIs supported by ISIP
COO	Chief Operating Officer
CPU	Central Philippines University
CarSU	Caraga State University
DA	Department of Agriculture
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DBP	Development Bank of the Philippines
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (of Australia)
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality (of UNDP)
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
DOST	Department of Science of Science and Technology
EOP	End of Project
ERG	Evaluation Reference Group
EVSU	Eastern Visayas State University
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GCTISD	Global Center for Technology, Innovation and Sustainable Development
HEI	Higher Education Institutions
HVCP	High Value Crops Program
IC	Individual Consultant/Contractor (of UNDP)
Incubatees	This refers to individuals/group being assisted by HEIs as social enterprise (could be a student, professor or other private individual or group)
IVA	Impact Venture Accelerator (of UNDP)
IVANSF	Impact Venture Accelerator Network Support Facility (of UNDP)
IP	Indigenous People or Intellectual Property
ISIP	Innovation for Social Impact Partnership
KII	Key Informant Interview

LBP	Land Bank of the Philippines
LGU	Local Government Unit (Maybe Barangay, Municipality, City or Province)
MIMAROPA	Region IV-B comprising the two Mindoro provinces and the provinces of Marinduque, Romblon and Palawan
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
NCR	National Capital Region
NGFP	National Guarantee Fund of the Philippines
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PCIERD	Philippines Council for Industry and Engineering Research and Development
PHILDEV	Philippines Science and Technology Development Foundation
PWD	Persons With Disability
RBMS	Results Based Management System
SBP	Security Bank of the Philippines
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SE	Social Enterprises
SIA	Social Impact Accelerator
SLU	Saint Louie University
SSG	SGS Summit Geneva
Student(s)	In this evaluation context students are university students who have taken Entrepreneurship 101
TBI	Technology-based Business Incubator
Techhubs	Designation of HEIs (by CHED and DOST) as centers for technology and business research and development
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UPD	University of the Philippines, Diliman
UPLB	University of the Philippines at Los Banos
USC	University of San Carlos
USTP	University of Science and Technology of the Philippines
VP	Visiting Professor
WVSU	Western Visayas State University

Executive Summary

The mid-term evaluation of the Innovation for Social Impact Partnership (ISIP) project was conducted by an independent consultant from January 7 to May 15, 2020. ISIP is a three-year project funded with US\$ 2,052,021 grant from the Australian Embassy and is implemented under the UNDP direct implementation modality (DIM) with tripartite management and implementation arrangement involving the PhilDev as Project Manager and the UNDP and the Australian Embassy for overall management supervision. The objective of ISIP is to harness the immense potential of social enterprises (SEs) in contributing and accelerating the attainment of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) of the country. ISIP has three major outputs/components (Entrepreneurship, Education and Policy Reform Agenda).

The **goal** of the Mid-Term Evaluation is to assess ISIP's contributions in the increased capacity and knowledge of Social Enterprises (SEs) including the involved HEIs and the ecosystem in relation to the country's attainment of relevant goals under the SDG of the United Nations (UN). The evaluation covered the implementation period from January 5, 2018 to December 31, 2019 (two years of the three-year implementation period) and was conducted in compliance with OECD-DAC including the new criterion, Coherence and Australian Embassy considerations. The evaluation outputs (Inception Report and Draft Evaluation Reports (2) were reviewed and commented by the ERG comprising representatives from the Australian Embassy in the Philippines, UNDP and PhilDev.

Findings and Conclusion

The report noted numerous good practices and lessons learned the details of which are presented in the main text. The project was noted to be highly coherent, relevant and strong in promoting gender equality and the concerns of the marginalized groups. Three SEs have also generated 193 jobs and the project enabled the SEs to access grants/awards and contracts equivalent to US\$443,000. The project has yet to meet most of the targets set by 2019 with significant works still to be done in the three components. Significant activities scheduled for 2019 implementation were moved to 2020, the last year of the project.

The findings are summarized as follows:

1. The Project Design is flawed and seem oblivious of the Theory of Change given its failure in functionally integrating the components; its lack of comprehensiveness to cover the elements of the Theory of Change; Governance and implementation arrangements; flawed activities in Policy Agenda component and possibly inaccurate cost parameters. These flaws led to deficient M&E framework; under-spending due to excessive cost allocation; and the nebulous results in policy component, among others.
2. The Entrepreneurship component interventions were appreciated and deemed relevant by the SEs; however, many taught practices remain to be adopted by the SEs. This could be attributed to lack of SE resources as these practices require financial investment. The SE loan fund did not materialize and only three SEs (Taxumo, Virtualahan and Solar Solutions) were able to garner substantial contracts and investments. Further, the targeted SEs are too few to make significant contribution to SDG attainment as envisaged in the Theory of Change.
3. The Education component has made significant progress based on the project design and the M&E framework. As of 2019 however, it has not conducted key interventions

particularly on integrating SE support in HEI incubators plan and operation and in enhancing incubators management capacity. These are key interventions that would actualize the Theory of Change approach in enhancing the pipeline of SEs.

4. The performance of the Policy component is a consequence of poor project design and M&E system with indicators that minimally contribute to the attainment of SE-supportive ecosystem policies envisaged in the Theory of Change. The activities in the component depart from the logical sequence of sector/ecosystem review/scanning; policy agenda formulation; specific policy formulation and advocacy.
5. The project has **low level of expenditure** with 37.6% of funds spent over a two-year period (2018 to 2019) on the project management component. This leaves 62.4% or PhP67,231,497 to be spent in 2020. With the COVID- 19 pandemic which resulted in national lockdown and the uncertainty of the quarantine period, it is unlikely that the project fund would be fully expended by end 2020.
6. The M&E system has deficiencies such that the APR does not even reflect important outcome indicators such as employment generated by SEs, financing accessed by SEs, HEIs' incubation and cohort activities. The indicators and reporting system are also flawed.
7. Gender equality and the empowerment of women and the marginalized groups is a strong point of the project. The selected SEs are 66% women led. Activity-wise, women were consciously given equal opportunity in participation. Women and marginalized groups, in particular, the IPs, PWDs, Conflict Affected Persons and the poor are focused beneficiaries of majority of selected SEs. Beneficiaries (of SEs) interviewed noted significant and various benefits from SEs' operations in terms of employment and income, health and safety, time saving, health insurance, higher price of produce and others.
8. The Governance and Implementation Arrangements of the project are generally adequate even without the organization of the envisaged Advisory Board. The criteria for selection of Project Manager are sound. However, the Policy Agenda component should have been lodged with UNDP which has established and strategic relationship with numerous government institutions which policies are relevant to social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship, in general.
9. Regarding risk management, the 2019 APR noted that there are no changes in the risks. However, it noted that risk was increasing in terms of Government Support as this has caused delay due to bureaucratic backlog in partner agencies. This refers largely to policy agenda component. While this risk had been identified from the start of implementation, actions taken had not been adequate as the risk is increasing after two years.

Recommendations

Substantial savings are expected given the low level of expenditure over the past two years. The COVID 19 pandemic and the uncertainty of lockdowns are also expected to negatively impact on project operations. On the other hand, there are developments in the impact venture acceleration (IVA) that may negate the gains from the project. In view of these, the general recommendation is to pursue the planned activities of the three components up to December 2020 with specific recommendations for each of the components. Additionally, given the fast development in the impact venture ecosystem including the policy regime, it is recommended that savings be used in the formulation of a new project and the conduct of sector/ecosystem policy review the outputs of

which could be used in designing the next project. These two activities are recommended to be undertaken by UNDP. If these activities could be started by June 2020, they can be completed by December 2020. If, however, the lockdown is further extended, a no-cost extension beyond December 2020 is recommended to complete these two activities subject to Australian Embassy concurrence and approval.

The report discusses specific recommendations on:

- a. Pursuing project and component activities up to end 2020;
- b. Monitoring and evaluation;
- c. Financial and operational review and re-planning
- d. Gender and marginalized groups;
- e. Supplemental study on ecosystem policy scanning/review; and
- f. Formulation of new project.

I. Introduction

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) contracted the services of Mr. Johnson P. Mercader as Individual Consultant (IC) to undertake the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Innovation for Social Impact Partnership (ISIP) Project for 45 working days spread across the period from January 8, 2020 to April 7, 2020 as indicated in the Terms of Reference (TOR) shown as **Annex A**. This assignment was extended at no cost to May 15, 2020.

UNDP and the Philippines S&T Development Foundation (PhilDev) conducted an orientation on January 16, 2020 at UNDP office. Subsequently, an Inception Meeting was held on January 23, 2020 at Citadines Millennium Hotel, San Juan City, Metro Manila. A presentation was made by the IC and the participants discussed, commented and made some recommendations on the Inception Report. The Evaluation Resource Group (ERG) was organized shortly after this meeting. The meeting was attended by representatives from UNDP, Australian Embassy and PhilDev. The Australian Embassy through its consultant, Ron Santos presented his comments to the IC through a video call on March 2, 2020. The recommendations have been incorporated in the work plan of the IC.

On March 23, 2020, the IC submitted the first Draft Mid-term Evaluation Report to UNDP. Due to the Luzon-wide lockdown caused by COVID 19, it was agreed that instead of the planned presentation, the ERG members would send their comments after one week. A videocall presentation was made on April 3, 2020 and the written comments were sent to the IC on April 8, 2020. The comments were incorporated in the second draft report submitted on April 17, 2020. Upon request by PhilDev, a videoconference was conducted on May 7 to clarify some points in the evaluation. Further, Phildev and the Australian Embassy provided further information and comments on May 11, 2020. This final report, submitted on May 15, 2020 is the third in a series of three reports and integrates the comments of stakeholders.

In conducting the evaluation and as required by UNDP and the Australian Embassy, the IC committed to a set of **compliances** shown in **Annex B**.

The ISIP Project

To provide a framework and to contextualize this report, a brief description of the ISIP Project is presented. A more detailed discussion on the project may be accessed at UNDP Philippines website. Prior to the ISIP project, UNDP conducted a study on social enterprises (Filipino Diaspora and Private Sector Fund) in the country and the study was intended to be the basis for project formulation.

Eventually, the ISIP Project was conceptualized and established to harness the immense potential of social enterprises (SEs) in contributing and accelerating the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) of the country. The current ISIP project did not include some recommendations in the issue paper. The project is based on evident-based studies and observations on the challenges faced by the Social Enterprises (SEs) for growth and subsequent contribution to the attainment of SDG. The **overall objective** of ISIP is for SEs to contribute to SDG achievement, acceleration and sustainability. The ISIP **strategy** is grounded on catalytic financing and technical support to the SEs. The interventions are focused on three thematic areas: 1) Capacity Building using various modalities; 2) Technical Support using various methodologies,

as well; and 3) Policy Reforms Agenda. The **Theory of Change** of ISIP is focused on three approaches:

- a. Building the capacity of HEIs including its officials, faculties and students' which would serve as generator of SEs to be supported;
- b. Improving the access of SEs to support mechanisms, both technical and financial; and
- c. Developing policy agenda to facilitate and accelerate innovation and SE development.

The project has three **components/outputs** as follows:

- a. Entrepreneurship- Under this component, 24 SEs were originally envisaged to be provided technical assistance to help them in scaling up. In October 2019, the Steering Committee upscaled the target to 30 SEs with at least 10 receiving funding offers and at least four receiving external funding. Assistance covers the provision of advice, referrals, mentoring and coaching and linkage with financial institutions by ISIP Manager and professional service providers. The selected SEs undergo an intensive social accelerator program which covers the following:
 - Mentorship support from business leaders, entrepreneurs and investor;
 - Strong network support and business matching with direct connection to Silicon Valley;
 - Impact measurement resources, tools and training;
 - Investor round tables and demo days;
 - Free legal and management advisory services; and
 - Free use of co-working space and facilities.

These interventions and services are designed to assist the selected SEs in upscaling their enterprises.

- b. Education- The component covers the provision of training to university partners or Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and incubatees on social enterprise development; conduct of various workshops and training programs for faculty and students on Science, Technology, Engineering, Agriculture and Mathematics (STEAM) innovation; and organizational training and organizational development for SEs. The project would also engage Visiting Professors (VP) in 15 HEIs.
- c. Policy Reform Agenda- This covers the formulation and facilitation of policy reform agenda based on roundtable discussions and research on various aspects of SE ecosystem; and the formulation and sharing of knowledge products such as data bases on SEs, guides for upscaling and sustaining SEs, policy papers and others.

ISIP is a **nation-wide project** which at the time of evaluation involves 15 SEs, 10 HEIs, partners and ultimate beneficiaries. The 15 selected SEs, as of December 2019, cover a wide range of activities including agriculture, environment, manufacturing, services and others. The selected SEs had to meet the qualification requirements of the project. Majority of the SEs are located or based in or nearby Metro Manila area. It should be noted, however, that some have operations outside of their location base, e.g. FAME, Bambuhay, and Gazlight, among others.

The 10 universities/HEIs would provide support to SEs and incubatees and collaborate with cohorts (universities/colleges) and partners in project activities. It should be noted that these HEIs were supported by PhilDev prior to the implementation of ISIP through a CHED project and are designated as “techhubs”. The techhubs are fairly well spread across most regions of the country.

Annex C shows the list of SEs, their enterprise focus and their location and the HEIs supported under ISIP.

The ISIP project is a **three-year** initiative which commenced in January 2018 and is planned to conclude in December 2020.

The project is estimated to **cost** a total of US\$ 5,159,572 over a three-year period. US\$ 2,279,572 or 44.2% is funded by a grant from the **Australian Embassy in the Philippines**. An estimated US\$ 2,880,000 or 55.8% which is unfunded is expected to be provided by private financial institutions to cover financial assistance and a guarantee fund for loans to SEs. The Australian Embassy grant covers the Project Management Component (under PhilDev) and the Support and Oversight Component (under UNDP). The contributions of the SEs and HEIs are largely in kind covering mainly the personnel involved in project activities. Details of the costs and financing arrangements are shown in **Annex D**.

The project is being implemented under the **direct implementation modality (DIM) of UNDP** in which UNDP has the overall management responsibility. On the other hand, PhilDev, a Philippine NGO, is designated as the Project Manager of ISIP. It is tasked to coordinate the partnerships and the provision of support from partner service providers in mentoring and guiding selected SEs and HEIs and in conducting the policy related activities.

The ISIP **governance structure** covers four entities namely, the Steering Committee, Project Management Team, UNDP Quality Assurance, and Responsible Parties. The project document envisaged the creation of the Advisory Board as the apex body of the project. This was not pursued as the Steering Committee was deemed adequate as a policy body for the project. The Steering Committee is chaired by the UNDP Country Director and has the UNDP Senior Adviser, senior representatives from the Australian Embassy and PhilDev and four other members who are not directly involved in project operation. These four other members have not been selected as of the time of evaluation. The Steering Committee is tasked to ensure that identified project indicators and targets are achieved throughout project implementation. The Project Management Team is responsible for the day to day management and implementation of the project. It is composed of a team organized by PhilDev, the designated Project Manager and assisted by the UNDP Program staff of the Institutions and Partnership Unit. The Project Quality Assurance, while being the responsibility of each of the Steering Committee members, is directly supervised and performed by the UNDP M&E Analyst under the supervision of the Deputy Country Director. The Responsible Parties are individuals, institutions (government or private organizations) and other stakeholders that the Project Team collaborates with to achieve specific project outputs. Effectively, the ISIP project management is a tri-partite structure composed of the Australian Embassy, UNDP and PhilDev.

The project **M&E** plan is based on Result Based Management System (RBMS).

II. Purpose, Objectives and Scope of Evaluation

Purpose and Objectives

The **goal** of the Mid-Term Evaluation is to assess ISIP's contributions in the increased capacity and knowledge of Social Enterprises (SEs) including the involved HEIs and the ecosystem in relation to the country's attainment of relevant goals under the SDG of the United Nations (UN).

The **objectives** of the evaluation focus on the determination of: 1) Lessons Learned; 2) Context of Possible Impact; 3) Sustainability; and 4) Assessment of overall ISIP implementation during the period from January 5, 2018 to June 30, 2019 as indicated in the TOR. During the orientation meeting, it was suggested that the evaluation covers the period from January 5, 2018 to December 31, 2019. This was approved by concerned authorities during Inception Report presentation and agreed with the IC.

Scope

The evaluation followed the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (**OECD-DAC**) **criteria**, and the questions are grouped according to relevance, coherence (a new criterion), effectiveness, efficiency, impact (new addition to the TOR) and sustainability. In addition, as the project is funded by the Australian Embassy, its evaluation concerns are included. The Australian Embassy concerns, in addition to OECD-DAC covers the review of the M&E system, the value for money element of the project, innovations, replicability and gender and the marginalized groups. The set of evaluation questions include those under the new criterion (coherence) and impact and are presented in **Annex E**.

Geographic Scope

Ideally, the 15 SEs and the 10 HEIs should be covered in this evaluation. It should be noted however that the breadth of important respondents are too numerous to be covered in this short assignment. Still, this evaluation covered the whole country with as much representation of the stakeholders possible given the socio-cultural, economic and other peculiarities of these island groups. The evaluation covered the three island groups of Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao where ISIP operates.

The evaluation planned to cover the range of stakeholders as presented in the Inception Report. These are 11 SEs, 10 HEIs, 11 SE beneficiary groups, 6 cohorts, 3 incubatees and 7 student groups. These were not fully covered as planned due to various reasons. The major difficulty was the availability or conflict of schedules of respondents especially the SEs and HEIs as reported by PhilDev which organized the itinerary of the IC. Students and incubatees were covered when available. No cohort was covered due to their far-flung location, limited time and their unavailability. However, the IC discussed with the HEIs their activities with their cohorts. Efforts were made to cover beneficiaries of SEs but still short of target. Web search on the other SEs and HEIs was done. The selection of SEs for coverage is based on aging (75% from the first batch and 25% from the second batch and that they represent different industries or services. On the other hand, the HEIs were selected based on island location (30% each from Visayas and Mindanao and 40% from Luzon); and aging under ISIP assistance (50% from batch 1, 30% from batch 2 and 20% from batch 3). The stakeholders covered aside from PhilDev, Australian Embassy and UNDP are shown in **Table 1**. Western Visayas State University was included

although it was not ISIP- assisted HEI to have a “with and without” support comparison. Further, interview was also conducted with Co.Lab Exchange and Green ITB of WVSU which are incubators with significant experience in social enterprises development and are also resource institutions on policy. Interviews were also conducted with UNDP resident representative and Mr. Artak Melkonyan, Chief Operations Officer of UNDP SDG Impact Finance.

Altogether, 121 persons were interviewed. Nineteen are from PhilDev (12), UNDP (5) and Australian Embassy (2). The others are officers and staff of HEIs (39), students (19), incubatees (6), SE officers (9), beneficiaries (28) and incubators (2). Of the 19 students, 7 are also incubatees. PhilDev recognizes only the SEs and HEIs as the project beneficiaries. On the other hand, the evaluator considers the students, incubatees and SE beneficiaries as the ultimate beneficiaries as the SDG directly relate to them. Hence, their inclusion in the evaluation. The interventions to both the SEs and the HEIs are fairly uniform. Thus, covering 7 of 15 SEs and 9 out of 10 HEIs is deemed representative and adequate to support the findings.

Table 1. Stakeholders covered in evaluation

Stakeholders	Area			
	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao	Total
1. Social Enterprises	1. Bambuhay 2. FAME 3. Magwayan 4. Gazlight/ Pascal Resources 5. People Pods	-	1. Coffee for Peace 2. Virtualahan	
Sub-total	5	0	2	7 (out of 15)
2. Beneficiary Group	2		2	4
3. HEIs and Techhubs	1. Batangas State University (BatSU) 2. Central Luzon State University (CLSU) 3. Saint Louie University (SLU) 4. University of the Philippines at Los Banos (UPLB)	1. Central Philippines University (CPU) 2. Eastern Visayas State University (EVSU) 3. Western Visayas State University (Non HEI but a techhub)	1. Ateneo de Davao University (ADDU) 2. Caraga State University (CarSU) 3. University of Science and Technology of the Philippines (USTP)	10
Sub-total	4	3	3	9 out of 10 +1 non-ISIP HEI
4. Cohorts	0			
5. Incubates (Groups)	2	2	0	4
6. Students (Groups)	3		2	5

Apart from the stakeholders cited above, the evaluation also covered UNDP officers, Australian Embassy Consultant and PhilDev officers. In the course of the evaluation, the IC met and interviewed/discussed with stakeholders as shown in **Annex F (Persons Met)**.

III. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The IC adopted a comprehensive approach in undertaking the evaluation tasks. The project cycle approach was employed and conducted in a participatory, transparent and consultative manner together with concerned stakeholders. The approach covers the events, operational processes, systems, products/results, resources, implementation arrangements and operational issues of the project. In employing the project cycle approach, the following were reviewed:

- a. Project Design
- b. Project Operation and Implementation-
- c. Monitoring and evaluation system and reporting issues

The evaluation required numerous **primary and secondary data** and information from various levels and sources. Secondary data and information were derived largely from UNDP, PhilDev, relevant websites; and to a certain extent, from HEIs and SEs. These include project documents of ISIP, M&E reports, annual plans and budget memoranda, surveys/studies, management and organizational systems, finance and administration manuals/documents, annual progress reports, national policies related to SEs and MSMEs and others. On the other hand, primary data were derived from the interviews, FGDs and group consultations,

Methodologies and Techniques

The evaluation used a menu of data collection methodologies appropriate to the nature of the project aspect, its result areas and activities and their information requirements; and utilized quantitative and qualitative methods in analyses that ensure representativeness of data.

Further, in the course of the evaluation, delicate information such as corruptive activities, sexual abuse, human trafficking and possibly numerous others, may be gathered. No such information surfaced during the evaluation.

The following methodologies were employed during evaluation:

1. Documentary Review-Numerous documents needed to be reviewed. In anticipation of the assignment, the IC conducted document search and review of available documents from UNDP and PhilDev and the websites to have prior information and have a head start in the evaluation processes.
2. Key Informant Interview (KII)-This methodology was largely used in gathering information from CEOs and COOs of SEs.
3. Group consultation/discussion- This was used among HEI officers and faculty members.
4. Focus Group Discussion (FGD)- This was largely employed in gathering data from students, beneficiaries and incubates.
5. Visual Examination was used mainly during visits to SEs and HEIs' facilities.

Analysis Tools

Qualitative and quantitative tools were used in analyzing various data and information. There was limited scope for use of quantitative tools except in financial analysis. The qualitative tools used were as follows:

- a. Learning gap analysis (for capacity building interventions)
- b. Competency analysis

- c. Intervention quality analysis
- d. Interventions and output quality analysis

IV. Findings

The presentation on findings cover project design, the three components (Entrepreneurship, Education and Policy Agenda), Financial Performance, M&E system, Governance and Management, Gender and Marginalized Groups and Risk Management.

1. *Project Design*

The social enterprise ecosystem in the Philippines is complex and face major challenges related to technical, financial, governance, education and other factors. Added to this is the pervasive culture that the purpose of education is to get employed after graduation from elementary, high school and tertiary courses. And the preferred employment is with Government given the notion that Government provides permanent employment. The specific challenges to social enterprises presented in the project document cover access to domestic capital/financing; technical capacity to support their scaling up; and ecosystem policies that are viewed as inadequate. The project design is highly biased on financing as the key driver in accelerating SE development. This was proven right as all the SEs including Gazlight which obtained financing prior to ISIP, require financing or co-financing with other investors. Prior to the project, an issue paper recommended the establishment of SE fund to be operated by UNDP. The issue paper also made recommendations on working with SEs across provinces and linking them to each other; educating/IEC for support organizations to SEs; developing a pipeline of SEs; and ways to address challenges related to impact investment and SE development.

The ISIP Project is small in terms of resources and scope as well as limited time frame of three years. While it was not designed to address all the challenges in the enterprise ecosystem, its **overall objective** for SEs to contribute to SDG achievement, acceleration and sustainability is rather ambitious given the numerous social enterprises in the country, the (estimated at more than 30,000 based on the issue paper on Filipino Diaspora) and the numerous and complex challenges that they face. It should be noted that there are no official statistics to support the accuracy of this figure and ISIP was not designed to cover them all.

The project design is based on the **theory of change** discussed earlier. While the theory of change appears to be sound and logical, the resources and allocated time render the ISIP Project as a pilot intervention to test the theory of change. Following the theory of change, the project has three **components**/outputs. These are entrepreneurship; education and policy reform advocacy.

The proposed activities under the **Entrepreneurship Component** are numerous but it did not include local volunteerism (from within the region where SEs and HEIs operate) from retired professionals and businessmen who are bored and generally willing to work for free; and who could have provided localized support where the selected SEs are operating. Volunteers mobilized are predominantly from Metro Manila. The activities in the **Education Component** based on the project design would have been better if HEIs were also tasked to give seminars to Parents Teachers Association (PTAs) on social entrepreneurship as an eye opener that education is not solely the means for income through employment and social entrepreneurship is an option for their children in the future. Further, the HEI Extension Service Office could have been tasked

to organize start up, accelerating and mature SEs in the region/s. This, as the theory of change envisaged a continuing pipeline of SEs. Under the Policy Agenda Component, the project planned roundtable discussions among stakeholders, the results of which, coupled with four knowledge products would be used in formulating a policy reform agenda and advocacy. The component also envisaged four knowledge products. While these products can contribute to policy formulation, they are not policy instruments per se which could be pursued and would ultimately impact on the ecosystem as envisaged in the theory of change.

The project design was not explicit on the synergistic and functional integration of the components. It appears that the individual components are independent from each other except in few activities related to piggy backing and involvement of SEs and HEIs in policy activities.

Apart from the above components, the project envisaged the establishment of SE loan and guarantee funds. This was not pursued as the Australian Embassy grant did not cover its financing. Instead, the Project was tasked to generate these funds through local financing institutions.

In summary, the Project Design is flawed and seem oblivious of the Theory of Change given its failure in functionally integrating the components; its lack of comprehensiveness to cover the elements of the Theory of Change; Governance and implementation arrangements; flawed activities in Policy Agenda component and inaccurate cost parameters. These flaws led to deficient M&E framework; under-spending due to excessive cost allocation; and the nebulous results in policy component, among others.

Recommendations relating to project design are presented in item 6 of Chapter VIII (Recommendations)

2. *Entrepreneurship Component*

The project aimed to accelerate and sustain the capacity of 30 SEs by providing them technical support and linking them to domestic financial institutions in scaling their operation. As of December 2019 (and even in March 2020), the project had 15 SEs (10 in 2018 and 5 in 2019). The selection of SEs is rigorous, and the qualification requirements are stringent to the effect that only 5 were selected in 2019. The project revised its process for the selection of SEs in the second batch. Aside from documentary review employed in the first batch, the project also conducted interviews with SE founders and the community as well as organizational capacity assessment.

Of the 15 SEs, 10 or 66% are women-led and 13 are in early stage of maturity as enterprises. The SEs in batch 1 were in various levels of development. A few SEs interviewed noted that some workshop topics during the acceleration period were too elementary for them. On the other hand, batch 2 participants noted that the SEs were fairly homogeneous in their batch. It should be noted that as of end 2019, the five SEs were still undergoing the social impact acceleration processes.

PhilDev noted that some SEs were able to access \$443,000 in investments, contracts and grants from local and international financing institutions. The 2019 APR did not mention this important achievement in this indicator. The list of SEs with corresponding financing are as follows:

- A. Investment
 - 1. Taxumo- US\$150,000 from Manila Angel Investors Network
- B. Grants/Awards

1. Bambuhay- US\$15,000 as Startupper of the Year
 2. Uproot- US\$6,000 as Startupper of the Year
 3. Uproot- US\$ 2,000 from ULI
 4. Virtualahan- US\$10,000 BPI Final Pitch
- C. Contracts
1. Virtualahan- US\$200,000
 2. Solar Solutions-US\$60,000

No patents/trademarks had been filed either under ISIP. Gazlight had trademark prior to ISIP. The M&E indicator on trademarks and patents is not in line with the selection criteria for SE support as they are well established and had trademarks prior to ISIP.

The SEs have surpassed the targeted direct jobs generated. Bambuhay alone has generated employment for 67 Indigenous People (IP) bamboo harvesters (there used to be just three harvesters). Coffee for Peace has generated employment for 79 coffee farmers and 29 coffee sorters and Virtualahan, 40 Persons with Disability (PWDs) who are largely women. Virtualahan, was also establishing a branch in Cebu City during the time of the interview. The jobs generated by these SEs are largely contractual and seasonal in nature. There is certainly more employment generated but the Annual Progress Report (APR) did not provide information on this important indicator. PhilDev noted that this indicator was deleted by the Australian Embassy M&E Specialist at the onset of project implementation. It however remains in the M&E frameworks; hence these observations.

Among the technical assistance provided are mentoring, referrals and coaching either through ISIP personnel or professional service providers both domestic and foreign. The SEs noted that PhilDev was steadfast in providing assistance to them. These services were highly appreciated and noted relevant by the SEs interviewed as they cited the following:

1. They learned proper valuation and pricing of products and services (FAME);
2. They were linked with mentors who assisted them in business operation (Gazlight, Coffee for Peace, Magwayen, People Pods);
3. They were linked with market and partners/customers (Magwayen, People Pods);
4. They learned strategic business direction (Magwayen);
5. They were linked with a university which provided technical support (Magwayen) and with financial sources (People Pods);
6. They learned basic business operations such as HR, organizational structure, finance and administration (Virtualahan, Magwayen, People Pods); and
7. They were linked with insurance system for employees/beneficiaries (Virtualahan).

Despite the interventions provided by the project, the 2019 APR noted the following:

- 70% of SEs still needed to develop intellectual property (IP) practices and impact monitoring and evaluation;
- Based on the Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT), only 5 SEs have strengthened their financial system and the others have not formalized their accounting and bookkeeping systems;
- Other technical needs are in Human Resources (HR) system development; and
- Accessing loans.

In view of these findings, the project intensified the conduct of monitoring or check-ins (71), mentoring (45), learning sessions (15) and Office Hour interventions or consultations (5). The project also conducted Demo Day and Showcase, SIA Roadshow, Pitch Practice and Boost camps. It also linked 9 SEs with institutional partners for technical support, business management and strategic planning, market and investment, among others.

The project also envisaged to provide financial assistance (loans) of up to USD 150,000 from domestic financial institutions. It should be noted that prior to ISIP, a study conducted for UNDP recommended the establishment of SE Fund which would provide loans to SEs, among others. This, however, did not materialize. Instead, the project attempted to establish functional partnership with private commercial banks. Among them are the Bank of Philippine Islands (BPI), Union Bank and Security Bank Corporation (SBCorp) as well as the National Guarantee Fund of the Philippines (NGFP). This, also, did not materialize.

Conspicuously, the project did not include as financial institution stakeholder/partner the Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) and the Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP). DBP caters to emerging development enterprises including social enterprises. Similarly, LBP provides loans to cooperatives. It should be noted that some SEs, Coffee for Peace, in particular, works with a coffee farmers' cooperative that needs loan to expand coffee production to meet massive market demand abroad generated by Coffee for Peace. In the same vein, Coffee for Peace could have been linked with DBP to expand its coffee processing operation. PhilDev noted that it conducted several meetings with DBP and LBP but both are claimed to have no funds to cover the needs of the SEs being assisted by the project. This is expected as no bank will commit a blanket coverage of prospective borrowers. The Project should have consolidated the loan windows of banks and matched them with the credit needs of the SEs.

Other existing loan and grant programs operated by government agencies were not explored or tapped. The Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) are also not listed as government agency partners despite the coverage of agriculture and environment and cooperatives in SEs' operation. They have loan and grant-giving programs which could have been linked with the SEs given the failure of securing omnibus loan commitments from private financial institutions. Bambuhay and its beneficiaries could have accessed the Social Forestry Program Fund and other programs of DENR to expand their operation and the beneficiaries' bamboo plantations. DA's Agricultural Credit and Policy Council (ACPC) and High Value Crops Program (HVCP) could have been tapped for loans and grants for agriculture-related SEs, e.g. Uproot, Coffee for Peace and others.

Functional linkage between SEs and HEIs is not a strong point of the project. Not one SE is functionally and formally linked with an HEI, by design and operation. It might have been a more beneficial arrangement if the selection of SE was in conjunction with the selected HEI; i.e. at least one SE is assigned to an HEI for technical support. This would have localized the technical support to SE through the HEI. Further such arrangement could have enhanced the industry/enterprise extension services of the HEIs.

As noted earlier, all enterprises contribute to the attainment of one or more of the SDG; albeit, the majority are focused on employment and income. The project could have gained wider traction with the **infusion of SDG concerns** to all sort of businesses; aside from the experimentation on the proposed 30 SEs. The project has noted that even students and incubates developed

appreciation that their projects are contributing to the search for solution for various problems and the attainment of SDG. This realization could have been protracted to several SEs which are in various levels of maturity, the pipeline that the theory of change envisaged. Similarly, they could have been beneficiaries of the HEIs' industry/enterprise extension services. Relatedly, the Impact Venture Accelerator (IVA) of UNDP (Thailand) noted significant success in covering regular enterprises and linking their operation to SDG achievement. There are also 7 UNDP impact venture accelerator programs and facilities which were not tapped for project assistance.

While the component interventions were appreciated and deemed relevant by the SEs, their effectiveness was wanting as many taught practices remain to be adopted by the SEs as cited earlier. This could be attributed to lack of SE resources as these practices require financial investment. The SE loan fund did not materialize and only two SEs (Virtualahan and Solar Solutions) were able to garner substantial contracts. Further, the targeted SEs are too few to make significantly contribution to SDG attainment as envisaged in the Theory of Change.

The recommendations on entrepreneurship are presented in Recommendations, Chapter VIII items 1 and 7.

3. Education Component

Overall, the HEIs interviewed (9 out of 10) were grateful to ISIP for their inclusion in the project. All HEIs were also covered under the project of CHED in establishing techhubs. Phildev was a consulting partner in this project. The HEIs also expressed gratitude for Phildev's assistance both in the past as well as under the ISIP project.

The HEIs are in various level of implementation of CHED directives as well as ISIP activities. The HEIs assisted under ISIP were in tranches of five which now total 10 HEIs. Consequently, not all have received ISIP's interventions in full, i.e., from 2018 to 2019. HEIs also have varied endowment for industry/enterprise research and extension. UPLB for instance, has over Php80 million of research grants from various institutions such as the Department of Science and Technology (DOST), the Department of Agriculture (DA) and the Philippine Council for Industry and Engineering Research and Development (PCIERD), among others; apart from university-provided budget. Other HEIs cited only up to Php 25 million in terms of grants for research and development, mostly in terms of equipment, either in kind or cash for their procurement. HEIs also provide varying budgets for the operation and training activities aside from the salaries of faculty members assigned to their techhubs/technology-based business incubators (TBI). In some SEs, the incubator has full time staff; in others, only part-time staff who also have instructional responsibilities. The results in terms of incubatee development, cohort strengthening, and student engagement vary widely.

Not all HEI Presidents or Rectors or deans have attended the interventions of ISIP. The faculty members noted that those who attended (ISIP or non-ISIP) interventions on social entrepreneurship had made social entrepreneurship support a priority (in terms of budget allocation, push for innovation and prioritization in university program). A case in point are the Presidents and deans of BatSU, CarSU, EVSU, WVSU and USTP) whose presidents are driving their incubators to heightened levels of programs and goals on entrepreneurship.

The project has conducted several **capacity building interventions** to HEIs' officers, faculty members, incubatees and students as well as SEs. The SE training is considered the core capacity building intervention under ISIP. The project also conducted trainings and workshops for

the faculty and students on STEAM innovations; and benchmarking studies in the US and other Asian countries. Further, the project provided venues for the translation of ideas and inventions into high value products with commercial potentials. The project conducted Design Thinking Workshops and Practice Pitch Competitions with SE experts and entrepreneurs and professionals as resource persons. The ADDU involved elementary and high school students in their local pitch competitions. Four visiting professors were deployed to 5 HEIs; one of them covered two HEIs.

The techhubs/HEIs have directives from CHED to support **cohorts** (colleges/universities) in their designated region/regions in pursuit of technology-based business development research and extension activities. The HEIs visited have varying levels of cohort interventions and number of cohorts. SLU has the greatest number of cohorts (31) as it covers the Ilocos Region, Cagayan Valley Region and the Cordillera Autonomous Region (CAR). On the other extreme, one HEI (EVSU) plans to cover only the other four campuses of the university. They also vary in their cohort assistance and development. SLU has Memorandum of Understanding (MOAs) with the 31 cohorts and share the faculty learnings from ISIP through echo seminars/workshops.

HEIs also have varying levels of incubatee development. Most have incubatees of 100% students and to some extent faculty members. WVSU, USTP, SLU, CPU and CLSU stand out with incubates outside the students and faculty members. It was noted that where there are full time manager and staff assigned to the Technology-based Business Incubators (TBIs); they have robust programs as well as operation; and cover more incubatees and cohorts.

Among the benefits that the HEIs attribute to ISIP are as follows:

1. Awareness of SDG and its integration in enterprises;
2. The realization of helping IPs in their area of operation;
3. Confidence in teaching Technopreneurship 101 after undergoing training from ISIP;
4. Knowledge of possible linkage of incubates with angel and other investors;
5. Improvement of Technopreneurship 101 syllabus;
6. New approaches and methodologies on teaching techniques for Technopreneurship 101, to a limited extent; and
7. The integration of social impact in technology entrepreneurship and its management.

The ISIP-trained officers and faculty members of HEIs noted that while the training programs and workshops they attended were very useful, the use of successful local social enterprise models would even be more effective especially in training their cohorts and incubatees. The literature on the Voices of SEs and the knowledge paper on successful SEs need further dissemination effort even among the covered HEIs.

The project conducted training to faculty members who were teaching **Technopreneurship 101**. Only three to five faculty members were trained per university. The faculty members interviewed noted that the training made them confident in teaching the subject and opened their eyes in integrating social concerns and technology in entrepreneurship. Faculty members especially in HEIs that are offering the subject across all engineering and other courses felt that more teachers need to be trained. Although they have echoed their training to other faculty members including those in cohort universities, they felt that it was different from the original training they attended. They noted that they were unable to copy the teaching/learning method employed in the original program. They recommended that a trainer's training be conducted and include the teaching/learning methods. The trainer's training on teaching Technopreneurship 101 would have

a wider multiplier effect and would contribute to sustainability as well as in contributing the pipeline of future SEs.

On the other hand, students interviewed noted the following realization, that:

1. Technopreneurship 101 provided them the option to go into business if they could not find employment after graduation. Only one among interviewed students indicated that business, rather than employment was his pursuit, following his mother's example. This emphasizes the pervasiveness of culture related to employment after graduation;
2. There is business in engineering technology;
3. The course deepened their appreciation of the SDG in business and technology; and
4. Engineers can also contribute to social impact.

Their attendance in the course and participation in other ISIP activities are claimed to have made them realize the importance of meeting other people, of the need to collaborate and to compromise in business dealings. All students noted that the course is too short for one semester (UPLB offered it as a summer course) and only provided an introduction to social entrepreneurship. All students and faculty members indicated the need for a follow up Technopreneurship 102 which would cover the practical aspects of business such as product pricing, strategic business planning, financing, record keeping, business policy and other aspects of business.

Following the positive response from the students, HEIs (USTP, CarSU) which offered the subject to non-engineering technology students (e.g. business management, accounting, etc.,) noted the need for offering a subject on Technology for Non-Technologists to provide students a vehicle for business development.

The IC also visited the WVSU facilities and conducted interviews with its techhub manager as well as some incubates, Viqua and others. WVSU, has forged partnership with the Iloilo City LGU to promote social enterprises by organizing MSMEs under the Innovate Iloilo Movement and supporting SEs through extension services.

The education component covered 5 HEIs (out of 10 targeted by end of project) with support of Visiting Professors (VP). It also exceeded the end of project (EOP) target of 15 with 28 HEIs with SE integration plan in their operation as of December 2019. This includes some cohorts of the HEIs. Of the targeted 90 faculty members trained on integrating social entrepreneurship, 74 have been trained, 82.5% of whom were women, in 2019. The project however was not able to train HEI incubators in integrating SE support out of 10 targeted HEIs. Further, no incubator manager out of 69 targeted by end of project (EOP) was trained on improved incubation management.

The education component has made significant progress based on the project design and the M&E framework. As of 2019 however, it has not conducted key interventions particularly on integrating SE support in HEI incubators, on capacitating incubator management. These are key interventions that would actualize the Theory of Change approach in enhancing the pipeline of SEs.

Recommendations on the education component are discussed in Chapter VIII item 2.

4. Policy Agenda Component

The component envisaged to organize roundtable discussions with SEs, HEIs, private enterprises and government agencies to surface issues related to SE policy ecosystem. The involvement of HEIs and SEs in this policy activity is one of the few visible linkages of the project components. This would culminate in a high-level summit with major stakeholders as well as foreign resource persons to generate strategic directions of concerned institutions. From the results and recommendations of these activities, ISIP would participate in policy advocacy reform processes. The project had completed the round table discussions and is in the process of finalizing the draft knowledge papers.

The project targeted 3 analytical research works to be completed by 2019. Further, the project is in the process of completing four research/knowledge products which are currently in draft forms. These are:

1. Guide to scaling, upscaling and sustaining SEs;
2. Compilation of Philippine laws, policies and regulations related to SEs;
3. Database profile of Philippine SEs; and
4. Project annual reports highlighting innovations, models, lessons and good practices for incorporation in policy papers.

The above outputs are useful in conducting sector policy review or scanning. They however lack a comprehensive basis for adoption as policy by government. A thorough sector policy review requires an analysis of economic and fiscal implications, institutional configuration, risks and mitigation measures. With the fragmentation of mandates related to SE development and the larger enterprise ecosystem, it is expected that various policy instruments need to be formulated as the SE ecosystem has diverse institutional arrangements ranging from education, commerce and trade, technical services, financing and others. The policy agenda is targeted by end of Year 3. This should have been the first output following the ecosystem policy review, if conducted.

The 2019 APR noted that there was zero accomplishment on policy component in the following indicators:

1. SE stakeholders that download SE knowledge products out of targeted 200 stakeholders
2. HEIs that received SE Governance recommendations out of 25 targeted by EOP
3. HEIs integrating SE governance in their operation out of 10 targeted
4. Presentation of research paper to SEs on SE landscape out of targeted 36; and
5. Conduct of meetings with 36 legislators and 10 national agencies on the policy papers.

The planned activities were moved to Year 3 (2020).

The component performance is a consequence of poor project design and M&E system with indicators that minimally contribute to the attainment of SE supportive ecosystem policies envisaged in the Theory of Change. The activities in the component depart from the logical sequence of sector/ecosystem review/scanning; policy agenda formulation; specific policy formulation and advocacy. These procedures would miss the hard facts and evidences for a solid policy formulation which could have been achieved through a comprehensive SE sector review and scanning followed with policy agenda setting and specific policies formulation. While the

round table discussions provide inputs for policy formulation, they are mere steps in a scanning and in validating the results of the review.

Recommendations on this component are presented in item 3 and 7 of Chapter VIII.

5. Financial Performance

The financial performance presented in Table 2 refers to Component 1 (Project Management), funds allocated to PhilDev for the implementation of the project. The figures in the table are derived from the annual financial reports (2018 and 2019) of PhilDev. The funds indicated in Tables 2 and 3 refer to Australian Embassy funds, the sole financier of the project.

Budgets for 2018 and 2019 shown in **Table 2** were designed to consume the funds at the end of 2020. The expenditure levels for both years were low compared to the allocated budget. Absorption/burn rate in 2018 (first year of operation) was 61%. While this happens in many projects as start-up could meet various challenges and cause delays, it should have also served as a trigger for scaling up activities in 2019 as most of the objectives in 2018 were met with less budgetary allocation. In 2019, the absorption rate went down to a mere 50% of budget. For the two years of operation, based on the total allocation for the project, absorption or burn rate reached only 37.6% (**Table 3**) There is serious concern that expenditure level may not be accelerated for the remaining year of the project (2020) and significant project fund may remain unused. Project activities in 2020 may also be constrained by the COVID 19 pandemic and the lockdown in almost all parts of the country.

The low levels of expenditure may be attributed to inaccurate cost estimates in the design as well as in annual project budget preparation. Financial monitoring and management action were not evident in addressing this issue. Other support activities to SEs and HEIs could have been instituted to enhance project operation and the attainment of project goals and objectives. Further, re-planning of policy component could have been done. The annual project plans did not address this issue, as well.

Table 2 below shows the financial performance of the project from 2018 to 2019 by expenditure item.

Table 2. Project Financial Performance by year, in PHP

Year/Expenditure Items/Component	Budget	Expenditure/ Costs	Balance	Burn Rate (%)
2018				
1. Entrepreneurship	3,980,550	996,286	2,984,269	25
2. Education	5,650,800	3,421,158	2,229,642	61
3. Policy	2,119,050	265,537	1,858,513	13
4. M&E	1,533,060	304,366	1,228,694	20
5. Marketing	1,369,095	675,242	693,853	49
6. Personnel	9,890,303	8,788,193	1,102,109	89
7. Administrative Costs	3,753,090	2,950,363	802,727	79
Sub-Total	28,295,948	17,401,145	10,894,803	61
2019				
1. Entrepreneurship	14,491,905	1,746,324	12,745,581	12
2. Education	6,773,820	5,374,875	1,318,945	79
3. Policy	2,755,530	975,545	1,779,845	35

4. M&E	1,782,725	621,195	1,161,570	35
5. Communication	636,297	351,042	285,255	55
6. Common Costs	15,219,662	11,849,484	3,370,179	78
Sub-Total	41,659,919	20,918,464	20,741,455	50
TOTAL	69,955,867	38,319,609	31,636,258	54.8

In the table below, an overall financial analysis of the project is presented. Table 2 above shows different expenditure items in 2018 and 2019. To align project expenditures with what were contained in the project document, some expenditure items, aside from the key components (entrepreneurship, education and policy) were lumped based on the project document. In effect, marketing is put under program support item. Personnel, M&E, communication and common costs expenditures in Table 3 are lumped into Administrative expenditure item.

Over the two-year period (2018-2019), the project spent only 37.6% of the total allocation for PhilDev. That leaves 62.4% of the fund for 2020 project operation. All the three components were under-spending. Education and entrepreneurship components, the key drivers of the project, were spending at less than 25% of their total budget allocation. Worse, the policy component, a key component that could lead to profound reforms in the ecosystem, spent only 11.5% despite the bulk of tasks associated with it but were not included in the design. The reasons for the low level of expenditure are the pro-bono services to SEs (for legal, IP assistance, technical and market services) under the Entrepreneurship component; the postponement of international benchmarking activities of the Education component to year 3; and the piggy-backing of round table discussions of policy component on education and entrepreneurship activities. While expectedly, admin costs including personnel costs would absorb more especially in this type of project, the administrative costs including personnel reached only 51.3% of its allocated budget.

Table 3. Total Allocation and Expenditures (2018-2019)

Expenditure Items/Component	Total Allocation (US\$)	Total Allocation (PhP)*	Expenditure/ Costs (2018-19) in PhP	Balance (PhP)	Burn Rate (2 years) %
1. Entrepreneurship	235,190	11,994,690	2,742,610	9,252,080	22.9
2. Education	708,600	36,138,600	8,796,033	27,342,567	24.3
3. Policy	212,175	10,820,925	1,241,082	9,579,843	11.5
4. Program Support (inc marketing)	29,300	1,494,300	675,242	819,058	45.2
5. Admin Costs (including personnel, common costs, M&E and communication)	814,334	41,531,034	21,293,085	20,237,949	51.3
Total	1,999,599	101,979,549	38,319,609	67,231,497	37.6

* Based on exchange rate of US\$1=PhP51

Recommendations relating to project finance are presented in items 4 and 7 of Chapter VIII.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation

The **M&E Plan** of the project adopted the three principles of the Result-Based Management System (RBMS) which cover ownership, stake holders engagement and focus on results. These

principles were not fully translated in the M&E framework except for focus on results. The engagement of stakeholders in M&E is limited to reporting on major events. This negates the stakeholders' engagement principle. Monitoring of field project activities was highly centralized and done by PhilDev officers and staff and sometimes with participation from UNDP and the Australian Embassy. These are largely through field visits. It should be noted that the terms and conditions of the engagement of SEs and HEIs did not require them to submit regular quarterly reports. It should be noted further that SEs and HEIs have to undertake activities under ISIP aside from attending major project events. HEIs for instance have activities related to incubating start-ups, assisting and echoing new knowledge to cohorts, teaching enhanced Tecnopreneurship 101 and others. On the other hand, the SEs have activities on scaling up their businesses, applying learned business practices, linking with technical service providers, financing search and keeping track of employment records of their beneficiaries, among others.

SEs and HEIs are fiercely possessive of their institutions and therefore ownership is not an issue. Coffee for Peace and Virtualahan noted that Manila is too far away from them in terms of consulting and seeking advice on some of their operational issues. This issue was addressed through emails, telecons and other communication modalities.

The APR is the apex annual report of any project that consolidates achievements/failures based on M&E reports from beneficiary institutions on an annual basis. The M&E system is so deficient that the APR does not even reflect important outcome indicators such as employment generated by SEs, financing accessed by SEs, HEIs' incubation and cohort activities. In fairness, the APR has disaggregated gender participants/beneficiaries in various activities. PhilDev noted that participants in major ISIP activities are required to prepare Re-entry Plans when they go back. The activities in the reentry plans are monitored by PhilDev officers. However, re-entry plans are specific to the topics of workshops or seminars.

Financial reporting is essential in keeping the project on track with planned expenditures to avoid over-spending and in this case, under-spending. Major deviations in the financial plan should have been referred to management to trigger operational plan review and redirection/re-planning of activities.

Recommendations for M&E are presented in items 5 and 7 of Chapter VIII.

7. Governance and Implementation Arrangements

The **Governance and Implementation Arrangements** of the project are generally adequate even without the organization of the envisaged Advisory Board. The criteria for selection of Project Manager are sound. However, the Policy Agenda component should have been lodged with UNDP which has established and strategic relationship with numerous government institutions which policies are relevant to social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship, in general.

The project adopted a tripartite management arrangement (Australian Embassy, UNDP and PhilDev). This however is not explicit in project operations. The SEs and HEIs interviewed noted that they had no direct dealing with UNDP and the Australian Embassy in their project operation except getting to know their presence in major activities and during field monitoring activities. They claimed that their dealings on project activities were largely with PhilDev. The roles of UNDP and the Australian Embassy are not fully understood by SE and HEI stakeholders in this tripartite arrangement. The general knowledge is that "ISIP is a collaborative effort" between these three institutions. Relatedly, when asked about financing arrangement for the project, only one

stakeholder interviewed (USTP) responded correctly. The project is remiss in expressing gratitude to the Australian taxpayers with weak branding of the project to the SE and HEI stakeholders.

The officers and staff of PhilDev are generally qualified, young and have demonstrated passion and enthusiasm in their tasks and responsibilities. And they have produced results assigned to them. Some tasks however require guidance from experienced and more knowledgeable adviser especially in the complex areas of policy development, engaging loans and grant giving institutions; the values of M&E and strategic reporting; project branding; activities redirection and financial and operational planning, among others. UNDP noted that recommendations for hiring a Chief Technical Adviser was not heeded by the project.

The recommendations are presented in item 7 of Chapter VIII.

8. Gender and Marginalized Groups

The project is gender sensitive. Gender equality and the empowerment of women and the marginalized groups is a strong point of the project. The selected SEs are 66% women led. Activity-wise, women were consciously given equal opportunity in participation. Of the 926 participants in various ISIP activities across the three components/outputs, 428 or 46% are women. There were activities in which there were more women than male participants. Among others is the SE roadshow with 81 or 53% female out of 153 participants.

Women and marginalized groups, in particular, the IPs, PWDs, Conflict Affected Persons and the poor are focused beneficiaries of majority of selected SEs. Beneficiaries (of SEs) interviewed noted significant and various benefits from SEs' operations in terms of income, health and safety, time saving, health insurance, higher price of produce and others. The mostly **IP** beneficiaries of **Bambuhay** (initially 3, now 70 households) who are bamboo harvesters from six barangays noted increase in incomes from PhP100/day (when selling to traditional traders) to up to PhP500/day by sorting and selling to Bambuhay their harvested bamboo poles. Prices of bamboo poles vary by size when sold to Bambuhay; but one price for all sizes when sold in the open market. Bambuhay trained them on sorting bamboo poles prior to selling.

The 79 coffee farming households assisted by **Coffee for Peace** are **resettled conflict affected persons**. They benefited higher incomes by sorting and classifying their coffee beans as taught by Coffee for Peace. The cooperative of which they are members were also linked with buyers from Manila, Bacolod and other major cities. Their products have also gained international market recognition with a Canadian firm ordering 200 metric tons (MT) which they could not supply with the 400 hectares coffee plantation in the area. Further, the sorting of beans provided regular employment and incomes to sorters which are all women. Further, Coffee for Peace also hired IPs in its operation. Apart from these, Coffee for Peace advocated intercropping in coffee areas for additional incomes; as food security measure; and to prevent environmental degradation as coffee is produced as a mono-crop in mountainous areas.

The 47 women beneficiaries of **Gazlight** in Talim Island in Laguna Lake noted that using gazlight stoves saved them time which they used for cooking food for vending; had earned them extra income and provided them more time for caring for their children and doing other household works. They also noted reduced respiratory issues as they used to be exposed to smoke from charcoal and wood as cooking fuel. They also noted costs saving as the prices of charcoal and firewood had increased owing to the degradation of the forest in the island. The product is also

noted to be safe and are also used by their husbands in the lake for cooking their food in their fishing forays.

The **women PWD** beneficiaries were thankful to **Virtualahan** for their online training that led to their employment (arranged by the SE) and subsequent higher incomes. They also benefit from group health and life insurance arranged by Virtualahan with Lhuillier Finance Co. This provided them protection for a mere PhP750/year. Virtualahan is currently expanding operation in Cebu City. There are opportunities for engaging PWDs in SEs as well as HEIs and they should be encouraged to hire them in their operation.

Relatedly, the project had involved and impacted on the youth through their involvement in local pitch competition and especially through the improved teaching of the Technopreneurship 101 which for many students, in their exaggerated expression was “life changing” and had opened alternative options when they finish their courses.

The website also noted numerous benefits by the clients of other SEs. The IC was not able to discuss with them due to time constraints and availability issues, mainly by the SEs which would arrange such meetings with the beneficiaries.

The 2019 APR, given the weakness of the M&E system, did not report on the employment and other benefits generated by the SEs and HEIs for the marginal groups except on women empowerment and participation.

The recommendations are presented in items 6 and 7 in Chapter VIII.

9. Risk Management

The project Results Framework identified the major risks related to project implementation which include Government support, HEIs and SEs participation and political climate. The 2019 APR noted that there are no changes in the risks. However, it noted that risk was increasing in terms of Government Support as this has caused delay due to bureaucratic backlog in partner agencies. This refers largely to policy agenda component. The project mitigation measure was ensuring their understanding and commitment to the project; pre-planning with them and emphasizing their roles in ISIP. While this risk had been identified from the start of implementation, actions taken had not been adequate as the risk is increasing after two years. It is recommended that further effort be made for the inclusion and participation of concerned Government agencies.

V. Conclusions

Based on the findings, the criteria are rated using the Australian Aid rating system. These are:

Very Good- Satisfies criteria in all areas- (6)

Good- Satisfies criteria in almost all areas- (5)

Adequate- On balance, satisfies criteria; does not fail in any major area- (4)

Less than Adequate- On balance, does not satisfy criteria and/or fails in at least one major area- (3)

Poor- Does not satisfy criteria in several major areas- (2)

Very Poor- Does not satisfy criteria in any major area- (1)

In adopting the above rating system, it should be noted that the Australian Aid criteria are integrated in the OECD criteria below as follows:

- a. Deliver lasting results and impact- Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability
- b. Maximize Value for Money (VIM)- Efficiency
- c. Collaboration, Communications and Responsiveness- Effectiveness
- d. Policy Alignment and Innovation (except Risk Management)- Coherence, Effectiveness
- e. Effective partner personnel- Effectiveness

Risk Management under item D is discussed separately.

The criteria are rated based on the findings in Chapter V.

1. Relevance

The project is yet to fully contribute to the outcomes and the theory of change. Also, the number of assisted SEs are too few make a dent in SE contribution to the attainment of SDG. As noted in the Gender and Marginalized Groups section in Findings (Chapter V) the project activities and results indicate conscious efforts in providing equal opportunities to women. This is evident in the selection of SEs and HEI participants in project activities. The selection of SEs also took cognizant of the participation of IPs, PWDs and conflict-affected persons.

Although relevant to the theory of change, the attempted linkage between the SEs and the financial institutions has not fully materialized. The interventions under Entrepreneurship are relevant to the needs of SEs and in scaling their operation as envisaged in the theory of change. Further, the SEs operation have resulted in employment, increased incomes and knowledge of their beneficiaries. The education component has significant contribution to the project outcomes and the theory of change with the strengthening of HEIs capacity; but this alone cannot be expected to lead to the realization of the theory of change. Further, the envisaged results under the policy component cannot be expected to have concrete impacts on policy reforms envisaged for the ecosystem.

The project interventions are **relevant** to the needs of the SEs, HEIs and their beneficiaries. Improvements in SE and HEIs operation were cited as results of ISIP interventions. And the activities of SEs have benefited their beneficiaries as noted in Findings.

The project is rated **Good** under the relevance criterion.

2. Coherence

The project is **coherent** with the Government's 2017-2022 Philippine Development Plan (PDP) particularly on the two of three pillars, namely: Pillar 2, Inequality-reducing transformation and Pillar 3, Increasing growth potential. Pillar 2 is focused on expanding economic opportunities in agriculture, forestry and fisheries, industry and services; accelerating human capital development; reducing vulnerability of individuals and families; and building safe and secure communities. On the other hand, Pillar 3 covers, among others, the vigorously advancing science, technology and innovation. Under these two pillars, the Government has established the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Plan (MSMEDP). The project is coherent with this plan and builds upon it with special focus on the attainment of the SDG.

The project is also coherent with the **Australian aid** in the Philippines which is anchored on the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). The overarching goal of Australian aid in the Philippines is the acceleration of inclusive economic growth and political stability. In achieving this goal, DFAT's Australia's Development Aid for the Philippines from 2015 to 2020 focused on the objectives of enhancing the foundation for economic growth; building stronger institutions for transparent and accountable governance; and improving conditions for peace and stability. All objectives address cross cutting issues covering disaster resilience; gender equality; and marginalized groups' concerns. The aid program highlights humanitarian assistance, peace and policy dialogues, infrastructure and economic reforms. The project is aligned with the goal and objectives including the cross-cutting concerns of the Australian Aid which is supportive as well, to the Philippine Development Plan.

The UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021) focuses on the eradication of poverty; acceleration of structural transformation and building resilience to shocks and crises caused by natural phenomena and human acts. The strategies are embodied in the Six Signature Solutions which cover:

- a. Keeping people out of poverty;
- b. Governance for peaceful, just and inclusive societies;
- c. Crisis prevention and increased resilience;
- d. Environment and nature-based solutions for development;
- e. Clean energy; and
- f. Women empowerment and gender equality.

The project is coherent with all the above solutions and is rated **Very Good** in this criterion.

3. Effectiveness

The project's performance in terms of **effectiveness** is a mixed bag. The education and entrepreneurship components largely achieved the envisaged results based on its work plan except in linking SEs with financial institutions although PhilDev noted investments, market expansion and others resulted to an equivalent US\$443,000. It is not however, reflected in the APR. The results of interventions were also formative and transformative in the sense that mindsets of students, incubates, HEI officials and faculty members and SEs were transformed with the infusion of social impact and SGD goals in enterprise development. The Entrepreneurship component covered 15 or 50% of the targeted 30 SEs. The project failed in linking them with identified local financing institutions and did not explore other financing institutions. On the other hand, the component surpassed its target for SEs to generate 160 jobs by 2019. Three SEs have exceeded this target. The flaw is in setting low targets considering that most of the SEs are engaged in labor intensive concerns.

The Policy component had completed the roundtable discussions related to SE ecosystem issues. The four targeted knowledge papers are in draft forms and are being finalized.

Overall, the strategies, tools, interventions used in entrepreneurship and education components were effective to achieve the planned results. They are also responsive to the needs of the stakeholders given the results shown in M&E reports. This is not so with the policy component.

The hindering factor in effectively linking the SEs with financial institutions is the focus on three private banks and lack of efforts to explore other loan and grant-giving institution. Regarding policy component, the hindering factor is the rather flawed policy formulation processes employed.

The change in behavior and practices of stakeholders is evident among the HEI faculty members, students and the SE founders and managers as a result of project interventions.

Collaboration and partnership between PhilDev and the SEs and HEIs is a hall mark of the project with the stakeholders praising PhilDev for its steadfast response to their requests for assistance and other support as discussed in Findings. Collaboration between the tripartite parties had generally been productive particularly in ensuring timely project finances, sourcing external resource persons and others. The repeated advice for engaging a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) to enhance project performance on policy and linking with financing institutions, for instance was not heeded by PhilDev. PhilDev reportedly noted that it has senior officers to assist the project team. Apart from this, collaboration in this tri-partite arrangement had been generally smooth.

The project had introduced value for money innovations that are noteworthy. With the failure to link the three local banks, it ventured into seeking external assistance from international sources. In selecting SEs for the first batch, it selected SEs which have diverse contribution to SDG and not just focused on “mature” SE qualification. It also introduced qualification requirements that eventually covered early maturing SEs. The HEIs are particularly innovative as some, not all, have linked with LGUs in promoting social enterprises development (SLU, WVSU); in engaging parents (through the PTA) and the youth in local pitching activities and seminars; in offering the Technopreneurship 101 subject to other colleges in the university; in cohorts development (SLU); reaching out to IP communities; and many others. All these are not only innovative but also value for money in the project investments as these have changed mind sets (cultural), engaged LGUs (governance), enhanced quality sustainable IEC through proper teaching of Technopreneurship 101; and their potential contributions to the attainment of SDG.

Despite all these, the project can only be **rated Less Than Adequate** as there are failures in major aspects.

4. Efficiency

Efficiency is another mixed bag. Many activities under the education and entrepreneurship components yielded results which were achieved below the allocated budgets and they are value for money as the results are innovative and replicable. They were also achieved in a timely manner. The project structure that affected the attainment of the result is in the policy component. Ideally, this requires major involvement of government with mandates on concerned specific policies. The M&E system appears to have failed in the stakeholder participation angle (no required regular operational reports from HEIs and SEs) as well as in financial monitoring. Consequently, the low spending level or absorptive capacity did not trigger project review and re-planning to redirect the project to address the issue(s).

All components while attaining some activity targets at low level of expenditure ranging from 10% in policy to 50% in education also missed out some targeted outcomes. The low level of expenditure is due to inaccurate cost estimates in the design as well as in the preparation of annual work plan and budget.

The tripartite arrangement was not effective and efficient in linking the project with existing support systems within UNDP. The project was not linked efficiently with these programs and institutions.

There was no negative unintended outcome resulting from the project. A major unintended positive outcome is the transformed mindset of students of Technopreneurship 101 as discussed in Findings. Under the efficiency criterion, the project is rated **less than adequate**.

5. Sustainability

The **sustainability** of the expected project outcomes is doubtful unless measures are put in place for the remaining period of the project or during the extension period, if any. The COVID 19 pandemic would further reduce the remaining project timeline indefinitely. Thus, limiting the institution of operational changes, particularly on financing and policy reforms. However, the outcome on the education component has a chance for sustaining the gains of the project as CHED is pursuing enterprise development and a critical mass of 15 HEIs and hopefully their cohorts will pursue the infusion of SDG in their incubation management as well as instruction on Technopreneurship 101. This will ensure contribution to the pipeline of enterprises with SDG orientation.

The project is **rated Less Than Adequate**.

6. Impact

The project has demonstrated positive effects on the behavior and practices of stakeholders especially due to the infusion of SDG in entrepreneurship. The project also has significant potential impact if the linkage with financing institutions is made successful and if the policies relating to the ecosystem are adopted by concerned agencies. And, if the CHED and the HEIs will sustain the gains from the education component interventions. Finally, the shift to cover more SEs will have tremendous positive impact in accelerating the attainment of the SGD.

The ISIP Project including the activities of selected SEs is considered as environmentally green and some even have considerations on climate change and environmental protection. It therefore has no expected negative environmental **impact**.

The project is rated **Good**.

7. Risk Management

The project Results Framework identified the major risks related to project implementation which include Government support, HEIs and SEs participation and political climate. The 2019 APR noted that there are no changes in the risks. However, it noted that risk was increasing in terms of Government Support as this has caused delay due to bureaucratic backlog in partner agencies. This refers largely to policy agenda component. The project mitigation measure was ensuring their understanding and commitment to the project; pre-planning with them and emphasizing their roles in ISIP. While this risk had been identified from the start of implementation, actions taken had not been adequate as the risk is increasing after two years. **This criterion is rated Less Than Adequate**.

VI. Good Practices and Lessons Learned

The project, over the past two years of implementation has generated good practices and lessons learned related to the development of social enterprises.

The Good Practices

The good practices cited below relate to their contributions and further enhancing in actualizing the theory of change. Some of these practices are outside the project design activities but largely through the initiatives of the HEIs and the SEs. Based on M&E reports and interviews, among the good practices by the project and its stakeholders are as follows:

HEIs

The HEIs good practices contributed to the possible enhancement of the pipeline of future SEs and the engagement of LGUs in supporting social enterprise development.

1. Engaging the youth (elementary and high school students) in pitch competitions of the HEIs is a good youth formation activity that instill in them aspiration in contributing to the attainment of SDG.
2. Opening up enhanced Technopreneurship 101 to other courses led to broader appreciation by students on their potential contribution to SGD.
3. Engaging the LGU (WVSU and SLU) in the promotion of social enterprises led to expansion of technical and financial support to techhubs/HEIS.

SEs

The SEs' initiatives on engaging women, IPs and conflict-affected persons did not only empower them but also provided incomes and employment; improved health care insurance; and environmental protection.

1. Engaging the IPs, PWDs, Conflict-Affected Persons and Women led to gainful employment and income thus reducing poverty in the local area (Virtualahan, Coffee for Peace, Bambuhay, etc.)
2. Environmentally friendly business practices of SEs (Bambuhay, Coffee for Peace and Uproot) led to employment and greater incomes to beneficiaries aside from ensuring food security and protecting the environment.

Project

The project interventions led to effective teaching of Technopreneurship 101, enhancement of HEIs program and budget (with the inclusion of heads of HEIs) and enhanced SEs' capacities on entrepreneurship, to a certain extent.

1. Enhancing the syllabus and method of teaching of Entrepreneurship 101 made the teachers more confident and effective.
2. Engaging heads of HEIs led to greater push, prioritization and budget for SE promotion.
3. Mentoring and coaching opened the minds of SEs to new approaches in business as well as market opportunities (Magwayen, People Pods).

Lessons Learned

1. Education, both formal and informal, on infusing social concerns in business, whether to students, startups, matured businesses, teachers and the general public is a powerful tool that could make significant contribution to the attainment of the SDG. For students, incubates, and even matured or accelerating businesses, it led to the realization that business with social impact is an option for employment and take pride that they are or will be contributing to solving development issues. Teachers/trainers trained on social

impact developed a sense of purpose for contributing to the attainment of development goals.

2. For the selected SEs, the learnings from the project led them to give special considerations in their operation on women, the marginalized groups and the poor. Examples of these are Virtualahan expanding their operation to Cebu; Coffee for Peace covering in its expansion plan IPs and families displaced by conflicts and the poor farmers; Bambuhay expanding in areas of IPs, among SEs visited.
3. Engaging the beneficiaries (HEIs and SEs) in the M&E loop could lead to more timely response to operational issues.
4. In project governance it is important to define the responsibilities of partners including those in the M&E system.
5. Project indicators should be clear to avoid misinterpretation of data required.
6. Strengthening the HEIs industry/enterprise extension service could lead to more SEs assisted.

VII. Recommendations

Substantial savings are expected given the low level of expenditure over the past two years. The COVID 19 pandemic and the uncertainty of lockdowns are also expected to negatively impact on project operations. On the other hand, there are developments in the venture impact acceleration that may further enhance the gains from the project. In view of these, the general recommendation is to pursue the planned activities of the three components up to December 2020 with specific recommendations for each of the components. Additionally, given the fast development in the impact venture ecosystem including the policy regime, it is recommended that savings be used in the formulation of a new project and the conduct of sector/ecosystem policy review the outputs of which will be used in designing the next project. These two activities are recommended to be undertaken by UNDP. If these activities could be started by June 2020, they can be completed by December 2020. If, however, the lockdown is further extended, a no cost extension beyond December 2020 is recommended to complete these two activities.

The specific recommendations are as follows:

1. **Entrepreneurship Component-** As noted in the findings, the current 15 SEs still have numerous needs which need to be addressed. The Steering Committee should consider not adding to the 15 SEs and instead focus on addressing their needs in terms of financing access, business systems and others as cited in the APR. The Social Impact Acceleration process takes six months and more time is needed for nurturing them after the process. This may just add to the frustration of new SEs as even the needs of the current 15 SEs have not been fully addressed.

With regard to SE financing, the project should explore existing loan and grant programs of DA, DAR and DENR and link SEs to these facilities. It would also help to conduct an inventory of loan windows (and their specific requirements) of LBP, DBP and other development banks and disseminate this information to SEs to help them identify appropriate loan windows.

Finally, the project will benefit by linking with UNDP impact venture acceleration programs and facilities to enhance project operations. A new development is the abbreviated acceleration process that takes just two to three months.

- 2. Education Component-** Apart from its remaining planned activities and if time and resources allow, it is recommended that the component consider the following:
- Conduct trainer's training on teaching Technopreneurship 101 to widen the reach of trained professors to HEIs' cohorts;
 - Encourage CHED and assist HEIs in formulating syllabus for Technopreneurship 102;
 - Encourage HEIs to forge partnership with their respective LGUs for financial, technical and other support for SE development;
 - Encourage and support HEIs/ techhubs and their cohorts to:
 - Engage grade school and high school students in SDG-oriented pitch competition and other activities promoting social impact; and
 - Include in PTA meetings/seminars (grade school and high school) messages on social entrepreneurship.
 - Encourage HEIs to organize local Volunteer Corps for SEs in there and cohorts' areas.
 - Encourage HEIs to have fulltime officers in their techhubs; and
 - Conduct orientation to HEI presidents and deans on social enterprise development.

3. Policy Agenda Component- Upon completion of the four knowledge papers, they should be vetted by multi-disciplinary specialists and circulated to concerned agencies/institutions prior to publication.

With regards to the conduct of sector/ecosystem policy review by UNDP, a multi-disciplinary team of policy specialists need to be constituted. The minimum team composition consists of economist/financial analyst, institutional development specialist and business development specialist, preferably with working knowledge on impact venture acceleration. The team is expected to build on the outputs of the Policy Agenda Component. The key product of this assignment is a policy agenda covering various aspects of the sector and draft policy instruments. In conducting this review which may take at least four months, the specialists should work closely with government agencies which have the mandates for specific policies.

4. Financial and Operational Planning- Given the inclusion of two major activities (project formulation and sector/ecosystem policy review) and the expected substantial savings, there is a need for the Steering Committee to review the project plan and budget up to December 2020 to determine the accrued and potential savings; and reallocate financial resources with the concurrence of the Australian Embassy. This should be done once the lockdown is relaxed or lifted. With the financial reallocation, it may be necessary to revise the agreement between UNDP and PhilDev for Australian Embassy approval/concurrence.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation -For the remaining period of the project, as there is limited time to revise the M&E reporting system, the project should include important indicators in its quarterly reports and ultimately in the Final Project Report. The indicators in the M&E framework will be scrutinized during the terminal evaluation of ISIP. Other recommendations on M&E are included in item 6.

6. Gender and Marginalized Groups- For the remaining period of the project, it should continue its commendable work related to gender equality and the special concerns of the marginalized groups including the youth. It could further encourage SEs and HEIs to engage them in project activities. Similar and other recommendations are included in item 6 (new project).

7.New Project Formulation- In formulating the new project, the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the project team should build on the gains and experiences under ISIP; integrate appropriate approaches under UNDP's Impact Venture Acceleration (IVA) which is more comprehensive and inclusive of all enterprises; link the project with the five support institutions such as the UNDP Private Sector Learning Hub in Denmark; IVA Network Support Facilities; Business Call to Action (BCTA); Center for Technology, Innovation and Sustainable Development (CTISD); SGS Summit Geneva; Accelerator 2030 and other UN funding institutions. Further, given the uncertainty of the pandemic, it should consider the provisions under the UNDP COVID 19 Response Venture Acceleration. The theory of change of ISIP may still be largely valid but need to be expanded to cover non-SE enterprises. The new project should have a robust M&E plan with clear indicators and participatory reporting system. Further, depending on the eventual scope and nature of the project, an appropriate governance and implementation arrangement should be formulated. As policy reform is expected to be one of the components, it should engage concerned government agencies during implementation. And new trends in policy reform such as incentivizing enterprises that have SDG consideration should be reviewed and considered in the design.

Project formulation is estimated to last a minimum of six months. Given the remaining 7 months up to December 2020, assuming that the lockdown ends in May 2020, there may be no need for no cost project extension.

ANNEXES

Annex A. Terms of Reference (TOR)

General Information

Job Title: Innovation for Social Impact Partnership (ISIP) Mid-Term Project Evaluator

Brand: UNDP Philippines

Duty Station: Manila, Philippines

Contract Duration: Three (3) months

Type of Contract: Individual Contractor – Individual Consultant (IC)

Languages Required: English

Project description

Despite improved economic growth in recent years, the Philippines still has a considerable way to go to achieve many of the SDGs. Among the many ways to achieve the SDGs, primarily to help in alleviating poverty is the creation of Social Enterprises (SEs). In recent years, SEs that seek to be financially profitable while also meeting social and/or environmental goals have emerged as an important private sector instrument for meeting broader development objectives. The Philippines has had some experience of establishing successful SEs. However, SEs face difficult challenges in moving beyond initial establishment, especially in generating impact investment that will drive its operation to a higher level of scale. A market failure exists in the access to domestic private capital and technical capacity to support SEs grow beyond the initial proof of concept stage to a point where they are able to mobilize resources from the substantial pool of global funds available for impact investing.

To close the gap in financing for SEs, the Innovation for Social Impact Partnership (ISIP) was established. The United Nations Development Programme in the Philippines (UNDP Philippines), in partnership with the Philippine Development Foundation (PhilDev), is implementing a three-year project that will holistically tackle capacity building, technical support, and policy reforms that will benefit the SE ecosystem in the Philippines. Among its strategy, ISIP will provide catalytic financing and technical support to a selected group of high potential SEs to enable them to grow

to a scale of operations and demonstrate a sufficient degree of operational success to attract a higher value of investment from global and local impact investors. SEs supported by ISIP would be those that have demonstrated proof of concept and have a theory of change with a plan for growth and increased impact. They would be ready to validate their blueprint, refine their business model, and enhance the conditions through which they can scale up.

Successful demonstration of the financing and mentoring model of the ISIP can provide the basis for a substantial scaling up of support for SEs, enabling a greater number of tried and tested SEs to access global funding for impact investment. Over time through support from ISIP, it is expected that the SE sector in the Philippines can make a substantially greater contribution towards achieving the SDGs.

UNDP Philippines sought the services of PhilDev, an experienced organization to bring its own substantial experience as well as coordinating partnerships and support from other service providers in mentoring and guiding the selected SEs. PhilDev will act as ISIP manager that will train and enable the SEs to be able access impact investment. UNDP Philippines will provide overall management responsibility for ISIP, be accountable to a multi-stakeholder board of advisors composed of professionals and experts from the development partners and public and private sector, and act as a conduit for channeling resources mobilized from other development partners interested in supporting ISIP.

2 . Scope of Work

Overview of the Mid-term Evaluation

ISIP is looking for an individual consultant to conduct the mid-term project evaluation of the ISIP project. The mid-term project evaluation will cover the implementation period of ISIP from January 5, 2018 to June 31, 2019. The focus of the Evaluation is to identify the lessons learned, context of the possible impact, and sustainability of ISIP.

Lessons should inform future projects on Social impact of SEs. Aside from the lessons and implementation status, the IC will also assess indicative sustainability of results and its contribution to the attainment of its project outcomes. The findings and recommendations from the Evaluation shall be presented to the Australian Embassy in the Philippines, UNDP Philippines, PhilDev Foundation, and key ISIP Stakeholders.

Focus and Scope of Mid-term Project Evaluation

Goal: The mid-term project evaluation is to assess ISIP's contribution in the increased capacity and knowledge of Social Enterprises (SEs), including Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and ecosystem.

Specifically, the mid-term evaluation aims to achieve the following objectives:

- identify the lessons learned, areas of success (what worked) and improvement (what did not work);
- identify context of the possible impact;
- identify the sustainability of the ISIP (particularly its results); and
- assess ISIP's implementation (including design and scope) and its capacity to achieve planned results (the effectiveness of the implementation strategy of ISIP, which includes project

design, assumptions made at the inception of the project, and implementation status against planned results).

The Evaluation Questions

A. Relevance

1. To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change relative to the project's results?
2. To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, and the empowerment of women, and the marginalized sector?
3. To what extent is each project component contributing to the project outcomes/results?
4. How relevant is ISIP's interventions to the stakeholders' needs?
5. To what extent is the project aligned with GoP policy economic reform initiative. To what extent is the project aligned with DFAT's development objectives in the Philippines.

B. Effectiveness

1. In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
2. Are the strategies, tools, interventions used in ISIP's implementation effective to achieve the planned results?
3. Is ISIP effective in responding to the needs of its stakeholders? What are the evidences to show this?
4. What were the contributing and hindering factors in achieving the planned results of ISIP?
5. To what extent have the project and its individual components helped the target beneficiaries?
6. Did ISIP change the behavior of its beneficiaries or the practices of the beneficiary entities with which it worked? What are the evidences to show this?

C. Efficiency

1. Did the actual or expected results justify the cost incurred?
2. How did the project structure affect ISIP's attainment of planned results?
3. Have the project components been implemented efficiently? Why or why not?
4. Did the project Monitoring and Evaluation system produce evidence relevant to decision making?
5. Did the project make decisions based on evidence?

D. Sustainability

1. What are the conditions under which project outcomes will have enduring benefits?
2. To what extent are these preconditions met?
3. To what extent are the benefits of ISIP likely to be sustained after its completion?

4. What factors should be monitored or assessed to improve potential sustainability of ISIP's result (e.g. replication of best practices)?

Institutional Arrangement

The Individual Consultant will report directly to the Institutions & SDG Partnerships Unit of UNDP Philippines, specifically to the Outcome Lead. For coordination during data gathering, the IC shall seek the assistance of ISIP for the address, focal person/s, and contact details. The Outputs shall be reviewed by the UNDP Outcome Lead, ISIP Project Manager, and the Senior Program Officer from the Australian Embassy in the Philippines.

The IC is expected to provide his/her own laptop for the work requirement. During her/his travel to the locales of the study, ISIP shall ensure that s/he shall be provided with a conducive workspace.

Duration of work and duty station The expected duration of the assignment is approximately three months, unless revised in a mutually agreed upon timetable between the IC and the UNDP Philippines.

The assignment is mixed home-based work and with travel to the duty station study, at the UNDP Philippines Country Office, 15th Floor North Tower, Rockwell Business Center Sheridan, Mandaluyong City, Philippines, and various locales of the study spread across the Philippines.

Qualifications of the Successful Individual Contractor

Qualifications Points

Education

Master's degree in areas of politics, economics, development, design, engineering, or related courses. A first-level university degree in combination with additional three years of qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree. 30

Experience

At least 7 years combined national and international experience on planning, monitoring, and evaluation. 50

Language

Excellent command in written and spoken English . 20

Total 100

Corporate Competences

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN mission, vision, values and ethical standards
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability

Other Competencies

- Demonstrates strong analytical skills and mature judgement well-planned and organized;
- Ability to work in close collaboration with a group of national and international experts, to meet strict deadlines and plan the work according to priorities;
- Demonstrates capacity to plan, organize and execute effectively;
- Ability to establish effective working relations in a multi-cultural team environment;
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
- Facilitates and encourages open communication in the team and with stakeholders;
- Excellent written communication and presentation/public speaking skills

Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The Consultant should send the following:

1. Technical proposal for the Mid-term evaluation, including methodology;
2. Financial proposal based on a lump-sum amount for the delivery of the outputs identified below. The total amount quoted shall be “all-inclusive”; all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consumables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Consultant are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal. It must include in its initial payment the actual cost of the IC’s travel to arrive at the designated Duty Station (completion of the journey can be considered as one of the deliverables payable upon arrival). DSA costs in relation to workshop proper must be included in the proposal.

Any deviations from the outputs and timelines will need to be agreed on the between the Consultant and the Deputy Resident Representative, a.i. Payments will be done upon satisfactory completion of the deliverables by target due dates.

Deliverables Due Dates

20% Upon submission and approval of the Inception Report 15 January 2020

30% Upon submission and approval of the Draft Report 25 March 2020

50% Upon submission and approval of the Final Report 07 April 2020

Presentation of Offer

Interested and qualified candidates should submit their applications including the following:

- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability (template provided)
 - Personal CV or UNDP Personal History Form (P11) with three references
 - Half-page description of the Consultant’s understanding of the TOR and proposed methodology and program
 - Financial proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided and clearly stating payment percentage:
- | Deliverables/ Outputs | Payment Tranche | Deliverable 1 % | Deliverable 2 % |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | |

Criteria for Selection of Best Offer

Applications from qualified candidates will be desk reviewed by the UNDP Philippines' selection panel. Assessment of best offer will be via Combined Scoring method – where qualifications and proposed methodology will be weighted a max. of 70% (40% for methodology and 30% for qualifications) and combined with the financial proposal (price offer) which will be weighted a max of 30%.

Annex B Compliances

The IC committed to comply and complied with the following:

- a. Be guided by the provisions set forth in the **UNDP Evaluation Guidelines**, the **UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation** and **DFAT's Guidelines on Project Evaluation**;
- b. Adhere to the principles outlined in the **UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation**;
- c. Frame the evaluation effort using the OECD-DAC universal criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability including a rating scale for each criterion and overall program performance. The coherence criterion is a recent addition following the guidelines from DAC Network on Development Evaluation of OECD.
- d. Employ both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments, where applicable.
- e. Have the overall responsibility during all phases of the evaluation and ensure the high quality and timely completion of evaluation processes, methodologies, and outputs. In close collaboration with UNDP and PhilDev, the IC will lead the implementation of the evaluation design, guide the methodology and application of data collection instruments, and lead the consultations with stakeholders. At the reporting phase, the IC will put together the first comprehensive draft and the final version of the evaluation report, with inputs from DFAT, UNDP, PhilDev and key stakeholders.
- f. Endorsement of documents to UNDP – At the end of the evaluation, the IC will turn over all reports, statistics, data, and other project documents gathered during the evaluation assignment. All reports, statistics, and other materials, documents and data compiled or produced during the evaluation are considered as exclusive property of UNDP. Upon contract completion, UNDP will retain the exclusive right to publish or disseminate the reports arising from such materials even after the termination of this agreement. The IC will not disseminate any part of the report or data collected to other parties, except with prior permission or authorization from UNDP.

Annex C Features of Selected SEs and HEIs

Table 1. Features of 15 selected SEs.

Region/SE	Specific Location	Enterprise Focus	Notes
National Capital Region (Metro Manila)			
1. Bambuhay	Mandaluyong City	Manufacture of bamboo straws and other products	1 st Batch
2. Cleaning Lady	Manila City	Cleaning service	1 st batch
3. Pascal Resources	Pasig City	Gas lamps	1 st batch
4. Hiraya	Quezon City	Water management	1 st batch
5. Solar Solutions	Quezon City	Renewable energy	1st batch
6. Taxumo	Taguig City	Taxation	1 st batch
7. Filipina	Taguig City	Home based services	2 nd batch
8. Magwayan	Taguig City	Reef safe sunscreen	2 nd batch
9. People Pods	Makati City	Shelter for employees	2 nd batch
10. Make a Difference (MAD Travel)	Quezon City	Travel	2 nd batch
Region III (Central Luzon)			
1. Fame	Plaridel, Bulacan	Fisheries monitoring	1 st batch
Region IV A (Southern Luzon)			
1. Uproot	Antipolo, Rizal	Agriculture (hydroponics)	1 st batch
2. Hi GL	Cainta, Rizal	Renewable energy	2 nd batch
Region 11 (Davao Region/Southern Mindanao)			
1. Coffee for Peace	Davao City	Coffee production and processing	1 st batch
2. Virtualahan	Davao City	PWD employment	1 st batch

Table 2. HEIs and their location

Region/HEIs	Location
Cordillera Autonomous Region (CAR)	
1. St. Louie University	Baguio City
Region 1 (Ilocos Region)	
1. Mariano Marcos State University	Batac, Ilocos Norte
Region III (Central Luzon)	
1. Central Luzon State University	Munoz, Nueva Ecija
Region IV A (CALABARZON)	
1. University of the Philippines at Los Banos	Los Banos, Laguna
2. Batangas State University	Batangas City
Region VI (Western Visayas)	
1. Central Philippines University (CPU)	Iloilo City
Region VII (Central Visayas)	
1. University of San Carlos (USC)	Cebu City
Region VIII (Eastern Visayas)	
1. Eastern Visayas State University (EVSU)	Tacloban City
Region X (Northern Mindanao)	
1. University of Science and Technology of the Philippines (USTP)	Cagayan de Oro City
Region XI	
1. Ateneo de Davao University	Davao City
Region XIII (Caraga Region)	
1. Caraga State University	Butuan City
National Capital Region (Metro Manila)	
1. De La Salle University (DLSU)	San Juan City
2. University of the Philippines, Diliman	Quezon City

Annex D Project Cost Estimates

Component/Cost Item	Amount (US\$)	Donor	Notes
A. Component 1 - Project Management			Under PhilDev
1. Output 1. Financial and Technical Support to SEs provided	235,190	DFAT	
2. Output 2. Capacities of HEIs developed	708,600	DFAT	
3. Output 3. Policy Agenda on SE ecosystem	212,175	DFAT	
4. Baseline Study and M&E	29,300	DFAT	
5. Personnel and Admin	814,334	DFAT	
Sub-total	1,999,599	DFAT	
B. Component 2. Support and Oversight and Mgt Fee	279,973	DFAT	Under UNDP
Sub-total	279,973	DFAT	
TOTAL	2,279,572	DFAT	
C. Unfunded Financial Assistance			To come from financial institutions to be negotiated by the project.
1. Financial Assistance to SEs	2,400,000	Private Financial Institutions	

2. Guarantee Cover	480,000	Private Financial Institutions	
Sub-total	2,880,000	Private Financial Institutions	
GRAND TOTAL	5,159,572		

Annex E Criteria and Key Evaluation Question

Relevance

1. To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change relative to the project's results?
2. To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality and the empowerment of women and the marginalized sector?
3. To what extent is each project component contributing to the project outcomes/results?
4. How relevant is ISIP's interventions to the stakeholders' needs?

Coherence

1. To what extent is the project aligned with GOP policy economic reform initiative?
2. To what extent is the project aligned with DFAT's and UNDP's development objectives in the Philippines?
3. Are the ISIP interventions consistent with GOP programs and projects on MSME? To what extent do they complement, support or undermine them?
4. To what extent do ISIP interventions add value to existing GOP interventions without duplicating them?

Effectiveness

1. In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
2. Are the strategies, tools, interventions used in ISIP's implementation effective to achieve the planned results?
3. Is ISIP effective in responding to the needs of the stakeholders? What are the evidences to show this?
4. What were the contributing and hindering factors in achieving the planned results of ISIP?
5. To what extent have the project and its individual components helped the target beneficiaries?
6. Did ISIP change the behavior or the practices of the beneficiary entities with which it worked? What are the evidences to show this?

Efficiency

1. Did the actual or expected results justify the cost incurred?
2. How did the project structure affect ISIP's attainment of planned results?
3. Have the project components been implemented efficiently? Why or why not?
4. Did the project M&E system produce evidences relevant to decision making?
5. Did the project make decisions based on evidence?

Sustainability

1. What are the conditions under which project outcomes will have enduring benefits?
2. To what extent are these preconditions met?

3. To what extent are the benefits of ISIP likely to be sustained after its completion?
4. What factors should be monitored or assessed to improve potential sustainability of ISIP results e.g. replication of best practices?

Impact

1. To what extent are the ISIP interventions generating significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher level effects on the stakeholders and the SE ecosystem? How?
2. Is the ISIP project addressing the ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of its interventions? How?
3. What social, environmental or economic effects that are broader than those captured under effectiveness, are likely to result from ISIP's interventions?

Annex F Persons Met

Organization/Name	Position	Email Address	Contact No.
Australian Embassy			
1. Chris Fulluck	Sr. Programme Officer		
2. Ron Santos	M&E Consultant		
UNDP			
1. Titon Mitra	Resident Representative/ Country Director		
2. Artak Melkonyan	Chief Operation Officer, UNDP SDG Impact Finance		
3. Maria Luisa Isabel Jolongbayan	Outcome Lead, Institutions and SDG Partnership		
4. Lyndon Pajaro	Program Officer		
5. Karen Brillantes	M&E Officer		
PhilDev			
1. Becky Pio de Roda	Executive Director		
2. Mariel Josh Tiongson	M&E Coordinator		

3. Monica Mabaylan	Program Manager/Educational Coordinator	
4. Emil Tapnio	Program Director	
5. William Padre Jr	Finance Officer	
6. Katherine Khoo	Entrepreneurship Coordinator	
7. Trixia Bravo	Program Coordinator	
8. Markus San Gabriel	Policy Coordinator	
9. Lemuel Sugui	M&E Officer	
10. Angelo Dawa	Program Assistant	
11. Adriel Nisperos	Communications Assistant	
Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)		
Ateneo de Davao University (ADDU)		
1. Edward Descalseta	Techub Manager	
2. Jason Ocridental	ITSO Director/Asst Techub Manager	
3. Cedric Gader	Faculty	
Batangas State University (BatSU)		
1. Irene Maralit	Associate Dean	
2. John Richard Esguerra	CTI Staff	
3. Maylen G. Eroa	Faculty	
4. Jecamarie Pasay	Faculty	
5. Maria Lourdes Balansay	Program Coordinator	
6. Saika Alminar Agena	Faculty	
7. Shaneley Anonuevo	Student	
8. Michael Joshua Ayano	Student	

9. Gabriel Angelo Perales	Student	
10. Jerio Atienza	Student	
11. Terrence Jake Montealegre	Student	
12. Darren Vince Cardona	Student	
Central Philippines University (CPU)		
1. Dany C. Molina	Dean, College of Engineering	
2. Caesar Rico Acanto	Dept. Head, EE	
3. Yeseil Sacramento	Dept Head, ECE	
4. Sharon Rose Duman-ag	Faculty, ChemEngg	
5. Gelvie Lagos	Faculty, ECE	
Central Luzon State University (CLSU)		
1. Jeffrey Lavarios	Faculty Member	
2. Pablo Rutales, Jr	Do	
3. Judith Teano	Do	
Caraga State University (CarSU)		
1.	Dean, College of Engineering	
2. Jeffrey Dellosa	TBI Project leader	
3. Melbert Bonotan	Navigatu (Tech Hub) Faculty	
4. Charmange Arnublo	Incubatee	
Saint Louie University (SLU)		
1. Cynthia Posadas	Dean, College of Engineering	
2. Maria Corazon Ocampo	Techhub manager	
3. Ella Olpico	Staff, Techhub	
4. Jeffrey Des Binwag	Faculty member, SEA	
5. Marie Kathlyn de Guzman	Do	

6. Caroline Moncada	Do	
7. Salih Yasser	Student, SLU	
8. Jordan Leo Cezar	Do	
University of the Philippines at Los Banos (UPLB)		
1. Arnold Elepano	Dean, College of Engg and Agro-Industrial Technology	
2. Clarissa Resigan	Asst Professor	
3. Kevin Yaptenco	Professor	
4. Myra Borines	Associate Professor	
5. Jose Marie Abilay	Development Officer 3 (UPLB TTBD0)	
6. Michelle Maja	Student	
7. Yemie Dapin	Student	
8. Jocel Marie Guatlo	Student	
9. Ramel Fabon	Student	
University of Science and Technology of the Philippines		
1. Bronson Mabulay	Faculty	
2. Kristina Badec	Faculty, Special Asst to the Dean	
3. Shoraliah Macalbe	TBI manager	
4. Ma. Eliza Santander	Faculty, Social Science Dept	
5. Goliza Sierra	Do	
6. Fritzie Salado	Head, Center for Entrepreneurship and Technology	
7. Marbeth Jael	Staff, Center for Entrepreneurship and Technology	
8. Ira Acorin	Students/Incubate s	
9. Christian Pagaspas		
10. Leo Malaran		
11. Edsella Cardenas		

12. Dan Nino Fabro			
13. Alzer Casino			
14. Gamalil Rosales			
Western Visayas State University (WVSU) [Includes incubates/startups]			
1. Rayjand Gellamuchio	General manager		
2. Fidel Ramos	Founder,VIQUA		
3. Marites Ho	Co-founder,SESTRA		
4. Lorenz Olivares	Operations Manager, Mulave Studios		
5. Angelica Belarmino	Founder, IHEARD		
6. Daryl Lasafin	Creative Director, DAME DIGITAL		
Incubator			
Co.lab Xchange			
1. Erika Tatad	Director		
Social Enterprises (SEs and Beneficiaries)			
Bambuhay			
1. Leonardo Udeno	Admin Officer		
2. Analyn Gapingan	Quality Control Officer		
3. John Carlo Lomboy	Engraver		
4. Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries		
- Myna Udanliso			
- Angela Hamgadan			
- Sally Bacuag			
- Amita Askag			
- Antonio Ascardiso			
- Evelyn Miranes			
- Carlito Marquez			
- Alex Mondalson			
- Marlo Bacuag			

- Raymond Haloda			
Coffee for Peace			
1. Joji Pantoja	CEO		
2. Rosie Gonzaga	IP workers cum beneficiaries at Coffee for Peace		
3. Sonny Boy Bautista			
4. Helen Malit			
5. Marivic Dulaira	Chair Person, BACOFA Coop		
6. Marites Arellano	Bookkeeper, BACOFA Coop		
7. Sergio Loon	Member, BACOFA Coop		
8. Teresita Dulsira	Do		
FAME			
1.(Lost attendance sheet)	Founder		
Gazlight			
1. Matthew Par	COO, Gazlight		
2. Beneficiaries -Evangeline Deciar -Angelita Deciar -Leonila Amain -Ligaya Bolante -Nassey Samson -Berta Esguerra -Leonisa Ojascantor -Josephine Belinor -Lourdes Arganibal	Nine women beneficiaries in Sapang, Talim Island, Binangonan, Rizal.		
Magwayen			
1. Czar Carbonel	Co-founder		
People Pods			
1. Daniel Layug	Co-founder		