

**EVALUATION OF THE INTEGRATED PROGRAMME FOR THE
EMPOWERMENT OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT OF ANCESTRAL DOMAINS (IP-EIPDADS)
PROJECT - PHASE II**

FINAL REPORT

Submitted to:
UNDP Philippines

Submitted by:
Conchita M. Ragragio

Acknowledgments

A number of persons gave their time, insights, opinions and ideas so that this evaluation can take place. The evaluator thanks them all and hopes that the Evaluation Report reflects the frank discussions we had. A special mention goes to the EIPSDAD staff for their help in notifying NCIP and DAR officials about my scheduled interviews with them and for organizing our field visits and meetings with the NCIP field staff and IP leaders. I acknowledge the UNDP *“Poverty Reduction and Support for the MDGs”* staff who provided the logistical support as well as guidance at the outset. I would also like to thank the ERPR for their valuable help during the field visits. Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude to the IP leaders, the NCIP field personnel and the NCIP and DAR officials who took part in the exercise. It is my hope that this report provides them useful information for future projects and hope that they achieve continued success in all their endeavors.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AD	Ancestral Domain
ADMP	Ancestral Domain Management Plan
ADSDPP	Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CADT/CALT	Certificate of Ancestral Domain/Land Title
COA	Commission on Audit
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
EIPSDADS	Empowering Indigenous Peoples for Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IPRA	Indigenous Peoples Rights Act
IRR	Implementing Rules and Regulations
GOP	Government of the Philippines
MMR	Monthly Monitoring Report
MTPDP	Medium Term Philippine Development Plan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAPC	National Anti-Poverty Commission
NCIP	National Commission on Indigenous Peoples
NPC	National Programme Coordinator
NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
NGO	Non-government Organization
NZAID	New Zealand Agency for International Development
PAC	Programme Advisory Committee
PMO	Project Management Office
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Project Sites Included in the Evaluation

Table 2. Summary of Project Targets

**Table 3. Status of ADSDPP Formulation in 26 Project Sites as of 15
March 2010**

Table 4. Projects in AD Areas Awarded Grants

Table 5. 26 Ancestral Domain Sites in 23 Provinces

Table of Contents

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	ii
TABLES AND FIGURES	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
1.0 Executive Summary	1
1.1 Major Findings	1
1.2 Key Recommendations	3
2.0 Introduction	4
2.1 Context of the Evaluation	4
2.2 Sites Covered	4
3.0 The Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADS)	6
3.1 Project Design and Intervention Strategies	6
3.2 Development problem addressed by the EIPSDADS	8
3.3 Linkage to the UNDP Country Programme and Focus Areas	8
4.0 Objectives of the Evaluation	9
5.0 Scope and Limitation of the Evaluation	9
6.0 Approach and Methodology	9
7.0 Findings and Conclusions	11
7.1 Project Achievements	11
7.2 Project Implementation	14
7.3 Finance and Administration	20
8.0 Recommendations	22
9.0 Challenges for Future Work: Lessons from the EIPSDAD	26

ANNEXES

ANNEX A. PERSONS CONTACTED, PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS AND INTERVIEWEES BY ORGANIZATION

ANNEX B. EVALUATION ITINERARY

ANNEX C. PROJECT ANNUAL REPORTS FOR 2007, 2008 AND 2009

ANNEX D. STATEMENTS OF CASH POSITION FOR 2007, 2008 AND 2009; STATUS OF NCIP CASH ADVANCES

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the End-of-Project Evaluation of the Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADS) is to assess the results of the project and to draw lessons from its implementation to guide similar endeavors in the future. Specifically, the objectives of the evaluation are:

- To determine the role collaboration played in achieving the intended results;
- To determine how inputs, activities and outputs were delivered within each geographic area and if direct results can be attributed to the project; and
- To suggest ways to scale up efforts in the future.

During the course of the evaluation, the following activities were undertaken:

1. Project-related documents as well as relevant background materials were reviewed and their content analyzed;
2. Participatory evaluation workshops were conducted;
3. Small group discussions and one-on-one interviews with key informants were undertaken;
4. Deliverables were reviewed and assessed; and
5. The efficiency and effectiveness of project methodology, strategies, outputs and outcomes were examined.

Major findings of the evaluation are given below, followed by key recommendations that address the gaps and shortcomings experienced by the project and which, hopefully, would provide direction for similar projects in the future.

Section 8 of this document provides more detailed observations and recommendations.

1.1 Major Findings

Most of the EIPSDAD Project targets have been achieved.

Nearing the end of the project's three-month extension period, the overall progress rate of Component 1 (ADSDPP formulation) is 94.19%. Capacity building efforts (Component 2) have exceeded the targets set at the beginning of the project. All trainings that were targeted have been undertaken and only two major outputs are still in the process of completion.

The Project is acknowledged to have provided the opportunity for the IP communities to maximize participation among members and to build consensus and forge unity.

As participants in the ADSDPP formulation process, IP leaders and community members appreciate the singular opportunity the project afforded them to come together and collectively decide on the future of their ancestral domain. The unity that they built as a result strengthened their resolve to push ahead with their plans. The project experience served the NCIP field staff members not only in terms of building their technical capability but also in renewing their commitment to serve the IP communities.

The Project has added value to IP self-governance.

The Component 2 activities bolstered the confidence of the IP leadership, thus adding value to self-governance being practiced by the IPs. Among the training courses they underwent, IP leaders value the para-legal training the most, and among the values that the project imparted, collaboration found its way to the IP leaders' practice. They have learned from the project how best to relate to local governments, as well as corporate giants and investors.

A major letdown, however, among IP communities ready to implement their priority projects, was the Project's inability to facilitate access to substantial project funding.

The biggest source of the IP communities' disappointment is their inability to implement projects that they consider crucial to the sustenance of their communities. They were all geared up for Component 3 and expected to have their projects funded straightaway. Instead, funding materialized only for a few small projects and came in the last year of the project, way behind schedule.

The project was plagued with conflict (both at the institutional and personal levels), severe delays in implementation and impaired financial management systems.

The NCIP was laboring under a cloud of doubt even prior to the inception of the project. That it chose to resist the authority of DAR as Implementing Partner (DAR was the Implementing Partner of the project from 2007-2008) has been most unfortunate as the conflict led to serious delays in project implementation. Collaboration during project implementation, however it must have been everyone's desire, was sorely lacking at the management and decision-making levels. In contrast, cooperation was more apparent at the ground level, between NCIP field staff and IP communities, and between them and the local governments.

1.2 Key Recommendations

During the participatory evaluation workshops, NCIP field staff and IP leaders put forward numerous recommendations. An often repeated clamor was "EIPSDAD 2!", meaning a continuation of support for the 26 AD areas.

The following recommendations have a direct bearing on sustaining the project's activities:

1. NCIP organizational strengthening
2. Continuous community organizing and capacity-building of Indigenous People's Organizations
3. Enhancement of relationships among project cooperating agencies
4. Alternative resource mobilization
5. Articulation of a clear Exit Plan
6. Documentation and publication of good practices

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Context of the Evaluation

The Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADS) is a three-year project that constitutes Phase II of an initial Indigenous Peoples project (the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples for Governance and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains) that was implemented by the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) from 2002 to 2005. With funding from the New Zealand Agency for International Development and the United Nations Development Programme, the IP EIPSDADS project has focused on the development of Ancestral Domains Sustainable Development and Protection Plans (ADSDPPs) and the capacity building of Indigenous Peoples leaders and women.

2.2 Sites Covered

Table 1. Project Sites Included in the Evaluation

Project Sites Included in the Evaluation	REGION
BATCH 1	
• Happy Hallow, Baguio City	CAR
• Sugpon, Ilocos Sur	Reg. I
• Boston, Davao Oriental	Reg. XI
• Laak, Compostela Valley	Reg. X
BATCH 2	
• Kalasungay, Malaybalay	Reg. X
• Porac, Pampanga	Reg. III
• Dumingag, Zamboanga del Norte	Reg. XII
BATCH 3	
• Siayan, Zamboanga del Sur	Reg. XII
• Mabini, Compostela Valley	Reg. X

The sites covered in the evaluation represent both those that experienced problems with implementation and those that are considered to have met with considerable success.

3.0 THE INTEGRATED PROGRAMME FOR THE EMPOWERMENT OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF ANCESTRAL DOMAINS (IP-EIPSDADS)

3.1 Project Design and Intervention Strategies

The Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADS) sought to build on the outputs of the UNDP-NZAID-co-funded “Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples for Governance and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domain” (EIPSGAD) Project and the UNDP-ILO funded “Support to Policy and Programme Development Towards Full Implementation of the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act” (SPPD) Project.

The EIPSGAD sought to assist Indigenous Peoples’ (IP) communities in the titling of their Ancestral Domains and in preparing to formulate their Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plans (ADSDPPs). The SPPD Project produced the draft “IP Sectoral Agenda and MediumTerm Development Plan” (subsequently approved by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and case studies outlining the basic steps of ADSDPP formulation and relating the experiences of IP communities.

The objectives of the project are to:

- Support the full and effective implementation of the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) of 1997, in particular through the formulation and implementation of the ADSDPPs;
- Improve the development of IP communities and their ancestral Domain (AD) through the formulation and effective implementation of ADSDPPs;
- Increase the capacity of IP communities for self-governance and more sustainable management of resources, through the formulation and implementation of the ADSDPPs; and
- Increase the capacity of IPs and IP communities as well as relevant institutions such as the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC), the Local Government Units (LGUs) and Non-government Organizations (NGOs) in policy formulation and project design, implementation and

management in support of the development of IPs through the ADSDPP process.

The IP-EIPSDAD’s three major components were to be implemented over a three-year period. These are:

Component 1: Formulation of Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plans for Ancestral Domains with Certificate of Ancestral Domain Titles;

Component 2: Strengthening of IP Governance, particularly in community development, para-legal functions and project planning and management; and

Component 3: ADSDPP Implementation.

The targets set for the project are summed up as follows:

Table 2. Summary of Project Targets

PROJECT COMPONENTS	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Component 1	ADSDPP for at least 13 AD areas with CADTs	ADSDPP for at least 13 AD areas with CADTs	
Component 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TNA Capacity building for IP communities on cross-cutting topics 	Capacity building for IP leaders and communities on area-specific topics	Capacity building for IP leaders and communities on area-specific topics
Component 3	Pilot implementation of ADSDPPs for 3 AD areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dissemination of best practices in ADSDPP implementation ADSDPP implementation for at least 13 AD areas 	ADSDPP implementation for at least 13 AD areas

3.2 Development problem addressed by the EIPSDADS

National priorities have highlighted prominently the recognition, protection and promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples of the country. Indigenous Peoples' rights are:

- Enshrined in the 1987 Philippine Constitution;
- Strengthened by Republic Act No. 8371, known as the "Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA); and
- Mentioned prominently in Chapter 12 of the Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) 2004-2010.

In exercising these rights, indigenous peoples have the opportunity to decide on the development directions they will take through their self-formulated Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plans, as provided for in the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of the IPRA.

The EIPSDADS project has thus sought to provide the steps towards the formulation and implementation of the ADSDPPS in 26 priority sites and to strengthen the capacity of IP leaders and communities as well as the various stakeholders of the project.

3.3 Linkage to the UNDP Country Programme and Focus Areas

In accordance with its mandate, the UNDP has focused on achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), among which are those of reducing human poverty, fostering democratic governance and managing energy and environment for sustainable development. Its assistance to indigenous peoples is in recognition of the sector as comprising a significant part of the poor and disadvantaged. Estimates place 10% of the Philippine population as indigenous, covering 110 ethno-linguistic groups.

Support to the IPRA implementation also falls within the framework of the Country Action Programme Action Plan of 2005-2009 of the UNDP and the Government of the Philippines (GOP). Developed from the Country Programme Document (CPD) and the Common Country Assessment-United Nations Development Assistance Framework (CCA-UNDAF). In the CPD, indigenous peoples are cited as one of the poverty groups in the Philippines.

4.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The objectives of the evaluation (outlined in the Terms of Reference as part of the evaluation plan of the UNDP in 2010) are as follows:

- To determine how the different project elements were integrated to achieve the intended outputs, what can be learned from the added value of the collaboration, and how these outputs are linked to the intended outcome;
- To determine how inputs, activities and outputs were delivered within a sector or a geographic area and if direct results occurred and can be attributed to the project; and
- To provide direction to future projects in the same area of concern to allow for upscaling.

5.0 SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation effort had only a little more than a month to complete the activities. A more comprehensive review would have entailed more time to do interviews, to visit more sites than the two (Porac, Pampanga and Happy Hallow, Baguio City) that the limited time allowed. Insights from the local experiences of the field staff and IP communities are thus culled only from a sample (nine out of the 26 target sites). Interviews of key players in the project were likewise confined to only a few.

Because of the lack of appropriate turnover of project files and documents, among other reasons, important financial information needed for the evaluation was being sought, up to the last week of the revision of the Final Report.

6.0 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The mix of activities, specific resources, operational constraints, personalities and other issues directly affect a project's abilities to meet its stated objectives. The Evaluation gathered facts, gained insights and solicited opinions about the IP-EIPSDADS project's progress in achieving the targets associated with its objectives. Information was gathered from:

- Meetings with appropriate officials;
- Interviews with key informants;

- Participatory evaluation workshops and small group discussions with project participants;
- Project documents; and
- Direct observation during the field site visits.

Background documents, especially quarterly and annual reports, annual work plans, monitoring and evaluation plans and results matrices, provided the baseline of data for the evaluation. The information provided in the project reports and documents that was generated through interactions with project implementers, partners and beneficiaries, formed the basis upon which insights regarding project implementation were drawn.

One-on-one and group interviews with key informants utilizing key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions [FGDs] provided valuable insights and viewpoints about project implementation and yielded information unique to the sites investigated. Focus group discussions and participatory evaluation workshops were conducted to acquire information in a structured setting within a short time frame. In a few instances, these were complemented by direct observations of project outcomes.

Broad questions that guided the conduct of the evaluation include the following:

1. Have the right things been done? (Were the outcome and project interventions relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and the UNDP mandate?)
2. Have things been done right? (Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?)
3. Are the results sustainable? (Will the outputs and outcome/s lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing project?)
4. How might we do things better in the future? (Which findings may have relevance for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?)
5. Were stated outputs or outcomes achieved?
6. What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
7. What factors contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes?

7.0 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A reluctant DAR, a resentful NCIP, and a wary UNDP and NEDA—these were hardly the ingredients that would spell success for a project. Burdened with a tainted EIPSGAD past, the EIPSDAD project faced major hurdles at the outset and suffered severe handicaps during the course of project implementation. Against many odds, however, the project achieved most of its targeted outputs and outcomes.

7.1 Project Achievements

Component 1: ADSDPP Formulation

As of March 15, 2010, almost all 26 AD sites (or 94.19%) have completed all four phases of the ADSDPP formulation process.

Table 3. Status of ADSDPP Formulation in 26 Project Sites as of 15 March 2010

ADSDPP FORMULATION	TARGET (2007-2009)	ACCOMPLISHMENT	% PROGRESS AS OF 15 MARCH 2010
Phase 1. Social and Institutional Mobilization	26 sites	26 sites	100%
Phase 2. Data Gathering and Assessment	26 sites	25 sites	100%
Phase 3. Planning Proper, Drafting and Validation by IP Community	26 sites	25 sites	96%
Phase 4. Plan Presentation to LGUs	26 sites	21 sites	80.76%
Overall Progress			94.19%

Component 2: Strengthening of IP Governance

The project has assisted in establishing 26 functional IP organizations, one in each project site. There are at least 12 Tribal Councils functioning as legal mechanisms and recognized by formal legal structures.

The project has completed the conduct of various training courses on basic and advanced paralegal skills; leadership and gender; indigenous knowledge systems and practices (IKSP), community organizing and project development and management. In progress are the retrieval of forms for the inventory and profiling of IP organizations and the publication of the IP Book of Cases.

Component 3: ADSDPP Implementation

The targets for Component 3 are: at least 16 projects implemented; 12 ancestral domains implementing their ADSDPPs; and 12 IP leaders fully functioning as project initiators.

At the close of the EIPSDADS, only six projects received funding from NZAID, but not all are operating yet. A handful has been able to source financing from outside sources, while a few are being supported by their local governments.

The activities under Component 3 that were undertaken include the following:

- Conduct of writeshops to generate project concepts;
- Preparation of 54 project concept papers (compiled into a 1-volume document);
- Conduct of Donors' Roundtable Meetings (March 2008 and December 2009) to present the project concepts;
- Preparation of five project proposals (out of corresponding project concept papers) and submission to UNDP and the Japan Grant Assistance for Grassroots Human Security; and
- Awarding of small grants to six projects .

The six projects were in the AD areas as indicated in Table 5 below.

Table 4. Projects in AD Areas Awarded Grants

PROJECT/AD SITE	FUND SOURCE & AMOUNT	COUNTERPART
1. Disaster preparedness / Buhi, Camarines Sur	NZAID : P600,000	Provincial Government: P600,000
2. Promotion of use of megazinc/ Tinoc, Ifugao	NZAID: 300,000	IPO: 104,500 LGU: 120,000
3. Rice production/ Lacub, Abra	NZAID: 300,000	IPO: 104,500 LGU: 120,000
4. Cassava development/Dumingag, Zamboanga dell Sur	NZAID: 300,000	LGU: 300,000
5. Abaca production/Makilala, North Cotabato	NZAID: 300,000	IPO: 50,000 LGU: 150,000
6. Carabao dispersal/Porac, Pampanga	NZAID: 300,000	

7.2 Project Implementation

The IP leaders who participated in the evaluation workshops were proud to declare that the EIPSDAD project for them became an exercise in building consensus and forging unity among the IP communities. Ironically, from even before project inception and up to its end, the project was fraught with conflict and tension, and at times, outright hostility.

A clear manifestation of the conflict was the issuance of NCIP *En Banc* Resolution No. 157 dated December 1, 2005 instructing all NCIP offices to refrain from supporting any IP-EISDAD project activity before issues regarding institutional arrangements for project implementation were resolved. The resolution was NCIP's reaction to the decision made by UNDP and NEDA to designate the DAR as the Implementing Partner for the project. This tension between DAR and NCIP a good two years before the project formally began did not augur well for the project.

It is perhaps a good idea to first view the project's historical context and appreciate the turn of events within the life of the project. Project timelines from the years 2005 to 2009 highlight the gaps and delays in project implementation.

- **Project Timelines**

- **Facilitating Factors**

- ❖ **Well-organized communities**

Among the pluses enjoyed by the project was the presence of well-organized communities in the AD areas. Quite a number of these communities took pains to resolve clan conflicts among themselves in order to prepare for the ADSDPP process, and several IPOs have federated themselves.

- ❖ **Leaders' capability, initiative and commitment**

The leaders of the IP communities have taken it upon themselves to give time and effort not only to perform their responsibilities under the EIPSDAD project, but to walk the extra mile to attend to challenges outside the realm of the project. Some of these had to do with facing up to corporate adversaries, dealing with tensions within the communities and establishing partnerships with local governments.

- ❖ **Dedication and commitment of NCIP field staff**

The evaluation workshop participants underscored their appreciation of the effort and commitment of the NCIP field personnel, without whom, they claimed, they would not have completed their plans. It is to the credit of majority of the NCIP field staff that despite the difficulties the project faced during the course of its implementation, they remained steadfast and resolute in their work with the IP communities.

- ❖ **Supportive local governments**

Many communities were blessed to have supportive local governments, and for those communities, these partnerships have resulted in joint endeavors that have greatly benefited the communities (e.g., Sugpon, Ilocos Sur; Mabini, Compostela Valley; and Boston, Davao Oriental)

- **Hindering Factors**

- ❖ **Institutional arrangements for project implementation**

Prior to the initiation of the project, in late 2005, the DAR was designated as the agency responsible for project implementation. While this would have been a welcome opportunity for NCIP to build its capacity while the project took advantage of DAR's more mature systems, the decision was met with severe resistance. It took almost a year for NCIP to finally break down its resistance to DAR's designation and to revoke the infamous *En Banc* Resolution No. 157. Only after this milestone took place during the last quarter of 2006, did planning for the project's first year of implementation get started. Meanwhile, about two years had already passed and numerous opportunities had been missed.

- ❖ **Frequent turnover of NPC**

Within the three years of the project's duration, it had three National Project Coordinators. The first was from DAR and had stayed on the longest (twenty months). After his resignation, a DBM memo asserted that his replacement should be organic to NCIP. In compliance with this memo then, the PAC chose the NCIP Director from the Office of Policy, Planning and Research to head the EIPSDAD project office. Her stay, however, was short-lived, as a year after her designation, another coordinator was engaged. These frequent NPC changes and NPCO staff resignations greatly affected the continuity of project implementation and contributed further to the delays the project had been suffering.

- ❖ **Lack of absorptive capacity of NCIP**

The NCIP field offices that served as the project implementation "frontliners" were mostly undermanned and overloaded. Ideally, each Service Center should have a staff complement of six, but usually only has two to three. Aside from the regular NCIP activities, the field personnel are responsible also for activities of foreign-assisted projects. Hence,

during project implementation, the field staff found difficulty with even simple matters that had to do with project reporting.

❖ **Delayed fund releases due to unliquidated cash advances**

In response to the question regarding implementation constraints, an often repeated refrain recited during the evaluation interviews was “unliquidated cash advances”. The problem worsened in 2008 and caused serious delays in fund releases, and consequently, in activity implementation schedules. The NCIP leadership attempted to address this concern in the financial assessment conference held in January 2009 and by issuing a memorandum to the field personnel to “strictly adhere to standard financial management practices in order to prevent delays in the liquidation of EIPSDAD funds...”

The severity of the issue was not uniform, though, across project sites. There were some, e.g., Mindanao AD areas, that submitted timely liquidation reports, while others were notoriously late.

❖ **Peace and order situation and weather conditions**

Peace and security conditions in some areas in Mindanao, notably, North Cotabato and Compostela Valley, hampered project operations at some point, causing further delays in project implementation. Inclement weather conditions also affected project activities in areas that were remote and inaccessible to public transportation.

7.2.1 Component 1: Formulation of the ADSDPPs

OUTPUT:	Increased community participation in the ADSDPP Process
OUTCOME:	Improved tenurial security for IP communities

The target number of ADSDPPs formulated will have been achieved by the end of the project extension period. Representatives of IP communities who participated in the evaluation workshops were one in declaring that the

technical assistance provided by the NCIP field personnel and the ERPR is valuable, timely and relevant. In the first place, the assistance helped increase awareness among the IP leaders and their communities about upholding their rights to their ancestral domains and their right to self-determination. Moreover, it provided the basis and the needed preparation to enable the IP communities and their leaders to act in concert with their local governments towards developing their domain in a culturally appropriate and environmentally sustainable manner. For the IP leaders, participating in the completion of their ADSDPPs gave them a sense of accomplishment and boosted their self-confidence.

Below is a list of the 26 ADs that produced their ancestral domain plans.

Table 5. 26 Ancestral Domain Sites in 23 Provinces

BATCH 1 (2007)	BATCH 2 (2008)	BATCH 3 (2009)
Happy Hollow, Baguio City, Benguet	Lacub, Abra	Alilem, Ilocos Sur
Sugpon, Ilocos Sur	Pennarubia, Abra	Botolan, Zambales
Imugan, Sta. Fe, Nueva Vizcaya	Tinoc, Ifugao	Donsol, Sorsogon
Karahume, San Isidro, San Jose del Monte, Bulacan	Porac, Pampanga	Kabangkalan, Negros Occ.
Laak, Compostela Valley	Tanay, Rizal	Sindangan, Zamboanga del Norte
Boston, Davao Oriental	Buhi, Camarines Sur	Mabini, Compostela Calley
Makilala, North Cotabato	Valderrama, Antique	
Carmen, North Cotabato	Dumingag, Zamboanga del Sur	
Puerto Galera, Oriental Mindoro	Kalasungay, Bukidnon	
Kitaotao, Bukidnon	Mt. Apo, Davao del Sur	

7.2.2 Component 2: Strengthening of IP Governance

OUTPUT:	IP leaders and or IPs capacitated on community organizing and para-legal competency
OUTCOME:	Increased capacity for IP communities for self-governance and management of their resources

At the start of the project, a training needs assessment (TNA) was conducted to determine the needs of the IP communities, specifically their leaders, as well as the other stakeholders, such as NCIP staff. Trainings were designed to enhance the knowledge and skills of IP leaders on paralegal practice, leadership, community development, project development and management and gender sensitivity. The conduct of these trainings was completed for all 26 sites.

7.2.3 Component 3: Pilot Testing of ADSDPP Implementation

OUTPUT :	Community-based livelihood activities implemented
OUTCOME:	Improved and more sustainable utilization of resources in ancestral domain areas

This is where the project hit a snag. At the beginning, the GEF Small Grants Programme had committed US \$300,000 for project funding that would have provided ample resources for the target number of ADs. During one of the PAC meetings, the GEF SGP flagged the need to fast-track project implementation of IP community-based projects to be funded by the GEF SGP. Because of delays in EIPSDADS implementation, the Programme had already re-allocated the funds originally earmarked for the project. Meanwhile, the GEF SGP had also shifted its focus to funding biodiversity conservation projects. The gearing up process

(the writeshops for project concept paper preparation and the conduct of donors' meetings) set high expectations among the IP leadership, only to disappoint them later, when limited alternative funding could be found.

7.3 Finance and Administration

Project financial records were kept in the DAR FAPSO and in the NCIP Accounting Office, with the NPCO holding incomplete data on fund releases, disbursements and planned quarterly budgets for the three years of the project. It would have been easier for an analysis of financial effectiveness if complete data showing budgets and expenditures vis-à-vis specific inputs to activities defined in the project TOR were available. Having simple fund balances gave little room for meaningful assessment.

A review of the Statements of Cash Position (the set of official financial reports furnished the Consultant) pointed to the following:

- The timing of expenditures skewed towards latter quarters of the year (April-June and October-December in 2008 and July-December in 2009), indicating delayed releases for the first half of each year. It has been mentioned that these delays were due to late submissions of liquidation reports, even as the required percentage of liquidated cash advances was lowered to 70% as a pre-condition to subsequent fund releases.

The delayed releases inevitably affected the implementation of project activities scheduled for the corresponding quarters and where these activities were weather-sensitive, further delays would have been experienced.

- High percentages of closing fund balances vis-à-vis funds received from UNDP during the year, ranging from 22% in 2008 to 30% in 2007 and 57% in 2009, signifying the low absorptive capacity of the project, especially during the first half of the year. This means that the time devoted to resolving accounting and liquidation issues deprives the project of a quarter's undertaking of planned activities.

The "Status of NCIP Cash Advances for the IP-EIPSDAD Project "(as of January 25, 2010) shows that:

- The amount of Php 1,643,608.50 remained unliquidated;
- The amount of Php1,298,861.07 was the outstanding amount undergoing the process of liquidation;
- Refund of unutilized cash advances amounting to Php 904,020.79 (22 January 2010) and another amount, Php 445,537, returned by DAR to UNDP that became available as additional funds for the project's extension period.

Juxtaposed with the project funds available for each year, the amount of unliquidated cash advances remaining (as of the beginning of 2010) is almost equal to the fund allotted for each ADSDPP site in 2007 (Php 1,637,685) and is, therefore, substantial. The reason for returned funds is not clear, but, again if viewed from the same perspective, the total amount of Php 1,249,557.70 is also substantial.

The foregoing discussion highlights the inadequate attention paid to the financial management of the project, letting the matter of unliquidated cash advances slide into a tolerated bad habit for more than a year. The lack of close fiscal monitoring has resulted in funds lying unutilized and consequently having to be refunded.

The problematic financial management system of the project has thus seriously impaired project operations. The ERPR Terminal Report sums up the situation well:

“Despite several meetings and workshops of accountants, finance and disbursement officers and auditors of the NCIP, DAR and UNDP...the NCIP system did not have the flexibility to adopt UNDP-NEDA guidelines for financial reporting, receipts and disbursements in a given period of time. The existing financial system used by NCIP delayed fund releases and liquidation that resulted in delayed outputs at both the field and central office levels.”

Conclusions

Overall, the IP-EIPSDAD has made a positive impact towards enhancing the capacity of indigenous peoples to govern their domain and their communities and ensuring the security of tenure of IP communities. While it has made only moderate progress in engaging local governments to provide human capital and financing for ADSDPP priority projects and achieved very little success in accessing funds for ADSDPP implementation, the project has bolstered the IPs' awareness, confidence and assertion of their rights under the law.

The project has also made a positive impact towards enhancing the awareness of NCIP that it has to further strengthen its capacity to ensure that its clients, the Indigenous Peoples of the country, continue to govern their ancestral domain with authority and dignity.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 NCIP ORGANIZATIONAL STRENGTHENING

This is a classic case of the need to enable the “enabler”.

❖ **Increase absorptive capacity of NCIP; strengthen staff complement**

During the first year of project implementation, the NCIP was at first overwhelmed with new knowledge and new technology. NCIP then realized that faced with new issues and new responsibilities, a lot more needed to be done. The adverse experience the NCIP had in the project may thus be considered, in hindsight, as a learning experience. As the sole agency with the mandate to serve the country's indigenous peoples, the NCIP organization has to be strengthened for it to provide excellent service to the IP communities. A step in the right direction is the establishment of a unit tasked with overseeing the implementation of foreign-assisted projects. This unit, therefore, has to be reinforced by equipping it with the appropriate staff and the corresponding skills needed.

❖ **Enhance the capacity of NCIP provincial staff through:**

- **Immersion of focal persons** in the IP communities for a one-year period with the following as suggested outputs of the immersion program:

- Resource inventory
- Survey of migrant settlers
- Identification of hazard-prone areas and areas for rehabilitation

- Conduct of trainings in:

- participatory rural appraisal;
- land use planning/site planning;
- research methods;
- communication development;
- facilitation and writing skills; and
- project proposal preparation.

- ❖ **Equip Service Centers** (these usually cover several municipalities within a province, with only an average monthly operating expense of P3,000) **with more personnel and information and communication technology**

8.2 CONTINUOUS COMMUNITY ORGANIZING AND CAPACITY-BUILDING OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' ORGANIZATIONS

While the IP leaders admitted that they gained a lot from the trainings that they underwent during the course of Component 2 implementation, they expressed the need for more community members to benefit from further training courses and for:

- Trainers' training of IP leaders to echo the lessons to the IP communities;
- Study/observation visits to other AD sites that have established good practices;
- On site training sessions.

8.3 ENHANCEMENT OF RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PROJECT COOPERATING AGENCIES

- ❖ **Working as a collaborating team; more consultative decision-making**

Needless to say, "team building" and "teamworking " are strategies the various project cooperating agencies have to employ, to foster effective collaboration.

- ❖ **Consider in the scheduling of activities the traditional tribal decision-making processes**

The pace with which the IPs undertake traditional decision-making and consultation differs from the usual speed and “time-frame” requirements of project implementation. In the words of an IP leader: “Dili mapaspasan ang pagtiman sa project” (One cannot hurry things up with our way of managing the project.) Working with IPs, one has to view processes and modes of performing activities from their perspective, respecting the rituals and practices that they observe.

❖ **Foster LGU ownership of the ADSDPP process and the product**

A key to sustainability is mainstreaming the ADSDPP into local government planning and budgeting processes. It is unfortunate that because the Project “fell short of effecting the integration of the ADSDPPs into the (local) development plans” it conceded this shortfall by proposing to exclude LGU adoption of the ADSDPP among the Project deliverables. It would have been a clearer step in the direction of attaining sustainability if in subsequent batches, the Project aimed better to foster LGU ownership of the ADSDPP process and develop concrete and conscious strategies to make LGU plan adoption happen, and happen more expeditiously. One strategy would have been to involve LGUs at the outset of plan preparation and building and nurturing the relationship throughout the time period.

❖ **Build better linkages with the donor community** to ensure that activities continue to enjoy financial support, where the IP communities or the NCIP are in no position to provide such support.

8.4 ALTERNATIVE RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

A wider net needs to be cast to capture the interest of potential partners among civil society organizations, corporations (through their corporate social responsibility programs) or even counterpart IP organizations in other countries. Strategies for alternative resource mobilization would include:

❖ Tapping corporations operating within ADs or in areas close to ADs, through their corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs;

- ❖ Exploring other revenue generation modes, other than project funding from international donor agencies, such as:
 - Joint venture schemes,
 - Lease contracts, and
 - User fees; and
- ❖ Incorporating advocacy and social mobilization in project design with the end in view of generating sources of funding and mobilizing technical assistance.

8.5 ARTICULATION OF A CLEAR EXIT PLAN

A project that is about to end needs to outline the next steps needed to pursue follow-on activities immediately after the termination of the project. Ideally, these steps ought to be undertaken by partner institutions of the project, and mainstreamed into these institutions' operations and programs. Responsibilities and the expected outcomes need to be clarified and accepted by the target institutions. These could have been the subject of a close-out conference of the project, but in lieu of that event, a smaller "project review" meeting could be held to discuss the matter.

8.6 DOCUMENTATION AND PUBLICATION OF GOOD PRACTICES

There is a need to conduct a serious search for examples of success stories that can be emulated by other IP communities. A wealth of experiences resides among the communities of Happy Hollow, Baguio City; Porac, Pampanga; Sugpon, Ilocos Sur; Malaybalay, Bukidnon; and Boston, Davao Oriental, for example.

This effort to document, promote and publicize has to be built into the design of future projects, so that it becomes an important project component rather than merely an afterthought. These "models" can then provide the necessary material for resource mobilization, investment promotion and for peer training.

9.0 CHALLENGES FOR FUTURE WORK: LESSONS FROM EIPSDAD

How can the gains of a development project be sustained long after the project is over? This Evaluation Report brings to the fore the following concerns that ought to be considered in the design of similar initiatives in the future:

- ❖ Ensuring self-sufficiency of Indigenous People’s Organizations so that they can continue to mobilize resources to sustain the project gains;
- ❖ Building on and enhancing the traditional leadership structure;
- ❖ Understanding and respecting the cultural practices and rituals of indigenous peoples and recognizing that ensuring IP rights as a continuous struggle;
- ❖ Developing and institutionalizing documentation, performance monitoring and evaluation within the NCIP bureaucracy; and
- ❖ Instilling harmonious inter-agency cooperation and convergence.

Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains

TIMELINE 2005

	Oct	Dec.
	DAR designated as Implementing Partner under UNDP's Empowerment of the Poor Portfolio	NCIP Res. 157

TIMELINE 2006

Aug 16	Sep 13-15	Nov. 21
1 st NPC hired (B. Luz)	Mtgs with NCIP Reg. Dirs cancelled	NCIP transmits to DAR Res. 111 revoking Res. 157

Dec. 12-13
NCIP Work Planning
For EIPSDAD proj

TIMELINE 2007

- | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | June 4-7 | |
| - Nat. Conference DAR | | |
| - General Orientation on EIPSDAD | NCIP staff training in ADSDPP formulation | |
| <hr/> | | |
| - Field visits to all NCIP offices (10 areas) | | Component 2 initiated in 4 AD areas |
| - WF Plans for each AD area | | |
| - WFPlans underwent revisions until Marchi | | |

TIMELINE 2008

April	May 26	July 1
B. Luz resigned	Transfer of NCIP from DAR to DENR	Dir. G. Pascua designated NPC (2 nd)

DBM memo: NPC
replacement should be
organic to NCIP

TIMELINE 2009

June

L. Dionisio engaged as NPC (3rd)

May 11-13	
Memo from NCIP Chair to all field offices to adhere to standard financial mgmt practices to prevent delays in liquidation	Assessment of NCIP organizational capacity: overall “Moderate Risk” rating

ANNEX A. PERSONS CONTACTED, PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS AND INTERVIEWEES BY ORGANIZATION

- **NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES**
 1. Atty. Eugenio A. Insigne, Chairman
 2. Commissioner Roland M. Rivera, NCIP Oversight Official, UNDP IP-EIPSDAD
 3. Director Jose B. Tamani, Finance and Administration Office
 4. Director Myrna Caoagas, Ancestral Domain Office
 5. Director Grace Marie Pascua, Office of Policy, Planning and Research
 6. Director Leilene Marie Gallardo, Office of Socio-Economic and Special Concerns
 7. Ms. Gladys Bilibli, chief Accountant
 8. Mr. Michael Gillies, Accountant III
 9. Ms. Hazel Marjorie Lucas, chief, Internal Management Audit
 10. Ms. Aurora Tolete, OIC, Budget Office
 11. Mr. Emil Purugganan, Supply Officer
 12. Mr. Eddielito Sumangil, Administrative Officer, OPPR
 13. Ms. Regina Panlilio, NCIP Support Staff
 14. Mr. Kennedy Molina, NCIP Support Staff
 15. Mr. James Bautista, NCIP Focal Person, Dumingag AD
 16. Mr. Carl Binayao, NCIP Focal Person, Kalasungay AD
 17. Mr. Roland Buissan, NCIP Focal Person, Siayan AD
 18. Ms. Divina Mae Tula, NCIP Focal Person, Laak AD
 19. Mr. Myrna Orit, NCIP Focal Person, Mabini AD
 20. Mr. Abe Jonathan de la Cruz, NCIP Focal Person, Boston AD
 21. Ms. Lydia Sunggod , NCIP Focal Person, Porac AD
 22. Mr. Junior B. Tiglao, NCIP Pampanga
 23. Ms. Gladys Lasdacan , NCIP Focal Person, Happy Hallow AD
 24. Ms. Agustina Balbino NCIP Focal Person, Sugpon AD

- **COMMISSION ON AUDIT**
 1. Mr. Arnel A. Casanova, Auditor II
 2. Ms. Edna Diokno, Resident Auditor

- **DEPARTMENT OF AGRARIAN REFORM**
 1. Undersecretary Rosalina L. Bistoyong, Support Services Office
 2. Director Herminia San Juan, Foreign-Assisted Projects Office

3. Ms. Rosalia Manuel, Project Development Officer, Foreign-Assisted Projects Office
4. Ms. Caridad Aspiras, Consultant, Monitoring and Evaluation, Foreign-Assisted Projects Office

- **EIPSDAD STAFF**

1. Ms. Elena Lanie Q. Dionisio, National Project Coordinator
2. Ms. Cresencia Comia, Technical Assistant
3. Ms. Cindy Bern Jagmis, Finance and Administrative Assistant
4. Mr. Gregorio Benjamin Luz, former National Project Coordinator

- **INDIGENOUS PEOPLE’S ORGANIZATIONS**

1. Mr. Timuay Osualdo Galcon, IP Leader, Dumingag
2. Mr. Timuay Alejandro Andus, IP Leader, Siayan
3. Mr. Eric Dagawasan, IP Leader, Kalasungay
4. Datu Mangone Sumaliday, IP Leader, Laak
5. Datu Ruben Masig, IP Leader, Mabini
6. Mayor Vic Castellones, IP Leader, Boston
7. Mr. Roman S. King, IP Leader, Porac
8. Mr. Alberto Cordona, AAGAPAY Foreign-Assisted Projects Office
9. Mr. Joseph A. Sacley, IP Leader, Happy Hollow
10. Pacita O. Medina)
11. Ms. Nancy P. Lamsis)
12. Ms. Elvira Estilong)
13. Ms. Elsie D. Bacod)
14. Ms. Mercedes S. Sacley)
15. Ms. Remedios Danglose)
16. Ms. Elizabeth Diwar) Members of the Happy Hollow
17. Ms. Norma Aoanan) Indigenous People’s Organization
18. Mr. Peter G. Paytocan)
19. Ms. Benita Sheley)
20. Mr. Soriano A. Palunan)
21. Ms. Aurora Dangpe)
22. Ms. Felisa Palunan)
23. Mr. Pio O. Damian)

- **LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

Ms. Rosalinda Duterte, Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator, Municipal Government of Mabini

ANNEX B. EVALUATION ITINERARY

10 February to 16 March 2010

DATE	SITE	ACTIVITY	NO. OF PAX
10 February	NCIP Office	EIPSDAD briefing on the Evaluation activity	4
24 February	NCIP Office	Interviews with NCIP officials and staff	19
01 March	Travel from Manila to Cagayan de Oro City		
	Dynasty Hotel, Cagayan de Oro City	Participatory evaluation workshop and group discussion	11
02 March	Travel from Cagayan de Oro City to Manila		
03 March	Travel from Manila to Porac	Interviews with the NCIP Focal Person , staff member, IP Leader and NGO representative	4
	Travel from Porac to Baguio City		
04 March	Happy Hallow, Baguio City	Participatory evaluation workshop and group discussion	15
	Elizabeth Fantasy Resort	Small group discussion with NCIP Focal Persons	
05 March	Travel from Baguio City to Manila		
15 March	Robinson's Galleria	Interview with Mr. Benjamin Luz	1
16 March	NCIP Office	Interview with Ms. Elena Lanie Dionisio and Ms. Cresencia Comia	3
		Interview with Director Grace Pascua	

ANNEX C. ANNUAL REPORTS 2006-2009