

STREEM Terminal Evaluation

I. Opening Page

Title of UNDP Supported Project	Strengthening Coordination for Effective Environmental Management (STREEM)
UNDP Project ID	3627
GEF Project ID	
Evaluation Time Frame	Three (3) Months
Date of Evaluation Report	27 December 2013
Region and Countries Included in the Project	Asia/Philippines
GEF Operational Program/ Strategic Program	Capacity-Building
Implementing Partner and Other Partners	Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)
Evaluation Team Members	Ronaldo R. Gutierrez

II. Executive Summary

As a developing country, the Philippines is dependent on its abundant natural resources for its economic growth. However, instead of prosperity, varying intensities of poverty are experienced throughout the country. To partly address these problems, the Philippine Government signed on to the UNCBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC. However, coordination among the agencies tasked to implement these MEAs was deemed problematic. In a National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) study, institutional/organizational barriers to the effective delivery of the country's obligations in the cross-cutting thematic areas of the MEAs were identified.

The STREEM Project ("Project") was designed to address these problems. It rested on two pillars. First was the phasing of national and local activities by developing mechanisms so that the FPAs and their national level constituents can coordinate. This was to be followed by the development of tools that can support coordination at the local level. The coordination aimed for was operational, i.e., geared towards the delivery of MEA tasks.

The second pillar involved the testing of these tools in a pilot site, i.e., the Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park (PPSRNP). The pilot-testing was expected to generate lessons and best practices for replication and dissemination in other sites, locally and internationally.

The key stakeholders of the Project were the various government agencies, both national and local, that have significant roles in the implementation of the MEAs throughout the country. By end of 2009, a new major stakeholder to the Project has emerged, i.e., the Climate Change Commission (CCC) created by virtue of R.A. 9729.

There were three (3) project outcomes and ten (10) expected outputs to be evaluated:

Outcome 1: National Rio Convention Stakeholders are effectively coordinating the preparation and implementation of related policies, program and project activities.

Expected Outputs:

1. A National Technical Coordinating Committee and Office
2. A Business Plan for the NTCC
3. Initial Incentive System
4. Potential tools to promote local level coordination

Outcome 2: Local and National Stakeholders are addressing key global environmental issues in and around the PPSRNP in a coordinated manner.

Expected Outputs:

1. Priorities and sequences of activities for MEA implementation are identified in the LGU pilot site
2. Application/pilot testing of tools for enhanced MEA implementation at the local level
3. Increased understanding on incentive system and the potential tools

Outcome 3: International, national and local partners have adopted the tools prepared under the project.

Expected Outputs:

1. Finalized tools for promoting local level coordination
2. Institutionalized Incentive System
3. Tools, incentive systems, and all Project outputs disseminated to local, national and international partners

Based on the expected outputs, the Project is given an overall SATISFACTORY rating. For Outcome 1, the revival of the CCMRD complied with the requirement for a NTCC. The Project scored its major achievement in its integration of the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) in the barangay development plans (BDPs) of the four (4) communities comprising the pilot site. Although the Project largely met the expected outputs, the operational coordination envisioned remains a work in progress, having reeled from major changes that drastically revised the institutional landscape from its baseline scenario—the creation of the CCC.

LogFrame Analysis. The Evaluation found that the LogFrame leaned towards an organizational approach by focusing on institutional indicators, rather than those that demonstrated reduced inefficiencies or coordination problems solved. As regards Outcome 3, the LogFrame design was overly optimistic in the success of the tools and incentives developed under the Project and may have unreasonably demanded the institutional adoption of said tools.

Assumptions and Risks. Although the Project Document mentions several assumptions, a significant one overlooked was the impending creation of the CCC. Considering that it was intended to be another interagency body, it begged the question of whether or not the creation of a similar entity can work as a solution to coordination problems. In other words, there was simply one too many. Outcome 3 also had an unwritten assumption—that the tools and incentives developed for the Project are ready for replication. This Evaluation took a more cautious view of the current success of the tools developed given the unique circumstances of PPSRNP as the chosen pilot site.

Lessons from Other Relevant Projects. Institutional sustainability was definitely in mind in the deliberate adoption of measures to ensure project continuity. However, in the sense that this Project is novel (addressing a more sophisticated aspect of natural resource conservation management—i.e., effective operational MEA coordination), this is very much uncharted territory and there is only so much that can be incorporated from other relevant projects.

Overall Results. Based on the ten expected outputs, the Project was given an overall SATISFACTORY rating. For Outcome 1, the revival of the CCMRD complied with the requirement for a NTCC and the passage of several resolutions and orders in furtherance thereof. A Business Plan was developed for the CCMRD and a system of incentives for local coordination was attempted although for now, this remained a major work in progress and far from being finalized. Lastly, the Project cites the following tools to promote local level coordination, namely, the development of a MEA web portal, a national and local IEC strategy,

a module on the Rio Conventions, a speakers' bureau on MEAs, a manual for the mainstreaming of MEAs in local development planning, and a facilitator's handbook for mainstreaming MEAs in BDPs.

For Outcome 2, three BDPs for Bgys. Marufinas, New Panggangan and Tagabenit, all from PPSRNP in Puerto Princesa Palawan, were evaluated. These *substantially complied* with the expected output to identify priorities and sequences of activities for MEA implementation in the pilot site. Lastly, for Outcome 3, the Project largely "failed" but this needs to be qualified.

Relevance. The Evaluation gave the Project a rating of SATISFACTORY for this criterion. The effective and efficient implementation of the country's obligations under the MEAs by way of better coordination among the MEA stakeholders, both national and local, is a highly relevant undertaking. Where it even excelled, not only did these outcomes become relevant to the MEAs, the MEAs themselves became relevant to their local constituents.

Effectiveness. The Evaluation rating varied over each of the project outcomes. Under Outcome 1, this was difficult to gauge. The creation of the CCC simply knocked the sail out of this outcome and there was no way at that time to determine how best to take advantage of, or ride-out this development. On the other hand, Outcome 2 was replete with superlatives. Several tools were developed and the MEAs found local relevance and even achieved institutional sustainability. If ever there is one caveat is that the pilot site chose was socio-politically less complex comprised of only four (4) barangays and encompassed by only one city (Puerto Princesa) and one province (Palawan). Furthermore, the MEA issues were also not as acute. Lastly, for Outcome 3, the Project would appear as a failure. However, this outcome was burdened by an unreasonable expectation that the tools were already ready for replication. Given that this outcome is relatively minor compared to the first two, the Evaluation gives a rating of SATISFACTORY on this aspect of the Project.

Efficiency. The Evaluation gave a rating of MODERATELY SATISFACTORY for this criterion. At the national level, horizontal coordination remained patchy and susceptible to changes in personnel composition. Coordination as a system, process or attitude has yet to gain a firm foothold in all three FPAs. For Outcome 2, its cost-effectiveness may be put into question when applied to other sites with more politically complex structures (i.e., more component LGUs) like Mt. Apo and Mt. Kanla-on. For Outcome 3, this has been delayed and as a result, its cost-effectiveness is beyond the reach of this Evaluation.

Financial Sustainability. There were several factors to consider on the likelihood of continued benefits even after project end. With the annual allocation by the DENR of P1.0 million for CCMRD meetings, this provided sufficient financial resources that could be further leveraged. As regards local level coordination, the PPSRNP experience will be difficult to sustain because the pilot site had the benefit of STREEM budgetary support. The incentive system developed under the Project also entailed significant costs although one incentive that could emerge over time are the socio-economic benefits that may accrue by incorporating MEAs values in their

development strategies. Overall, the sustainability of financial resources is given a rating of MODERATELY LIKELY.

Socio-Political Sustainability. At the national level, it is a matter of developing systems and processes to attain the full coordination envisioned. Locally, there was stakeholder ownership over the Project. However, the development plans prepared for the Project are tied to future financing. Whether or not this would materialize poses a slight risk to the Project. For this reason, this aspect of sustainability is given a rating of MODERATELY LIKELY.

Institutional Sustainability. The legal landscape has already settled. Accountability and transparency are not necessarily issues of this Project. It is therefore rated LIKELY.

Environmental Sustainability. This is the main goal of the Project so a rating of LIKELY is given.

Overall, the Project is given a rating of MODERATELY LIKELY for sustainability.

Adaptive Management. There were a couple of management decisions that at first glance, would appear as adaptive. First was the decision to revive the CCMRD instead of creating a new body as NTCC. Second was tapping local development councils (LDCs) for the local level coordination rather than create new local joint management committees. These two management decisions took different paths. Only the latter served as an excellent example of adaptive management and stakeholder participation that is truly meaningful.

M&E Design. The Evaluation graded the M&E design as SATISFACTORY. The Project incorporated several tools for M&E, many of which are standard for UNDP-sponsored projects. However, there were also some that were unique to this Project, namely, the capacity-development scorecard taken before and after the Project is implemented; and a survey to be undertaken by an independent specialist to determine objectively the mutual appreciation of MEAs by the FPAs.

As stated in the *LogFrame Analysis and Assumptions and Risks* sections, the uneven formulation of indicators for the success of the Project vis-à-vis the desired outcomes created an odd situation from an M&E perspective where accomplishment of outputs did not necessarily reflect attainment of substantive goals. There was a lack of a reflexive assessment process wherein the adequacy of the M&E indicators could have been evaluated vis-à-vis overall project objectives.

M&E Budget. An amount of roughly \$50,000 was allocated for M&E activities and nothing in the Project indicated that this amount was insufficient or that a specialized form of M&E was needed that would justify a higher budgetary allocation. For these reasons, the M&E budget and funding was rated HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

M&E implementation. The Evaluation rated this criterion as SATISFACTORY since all the prescribed M&E steps have been undertaken thus far except one—the independent survey.

- Project Summary Table

Goal: To generate global environmental benefits through improved coordination in the implementation of the MEAs in the Philippines.

Objectives/Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification
<u>Objective</u> To strengthen cross-convention institutional and coordination structures and mechanisms.	National sectoral plans cover the coordinated implementation of the three Rio Conventions in the region on the use of the tools. ¹	National sectoral plans reflect the Rio conventions.
	The level of mutual appreciation of the conventions across the three stakeholder groups. ²	Survey reflecting increase by 100% by end of year 3 based on an independent specialist agency.
	Capacity development monitoring scorecard ratings.	Scorecard ratings.
<u>Outcome 1</u> National Rio Convention's key stakeholders are effectively coordinating the preparation and implementation of related policies, programmes, projects and activities.	Recommendations for Committee/s Reactivation approved by the PCSD.	Defined distinctive role of PCSD and DFA in MEA formulation, implementation and monitoring.
	One of DA/DENR performance indicators reflects the effective functioning of the Committee/Office. ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance indicator. • Established functional coordination mechanism functioning within 2 years.
	Level of budget allocated to the Committee at \$10,000/year by end of year 2.	Budget or memo
<u>Outcome 2</u> Local and national stakeholders are addressing a key global environmental issue in PPSRNP pilot site in a coordinated manner.	Water quality in the subterranean river fully in line with Philippines' standards for national park by project end.	Water sampling results in 4 sites. ⁴
	Signed agreements between FPAs and LGUs and other concerned agencies establishing coordination mechanisms.	Signed agreements; memorandums; LDC resolutions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locally established joint management committees, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operations Manual for Local Coordination and

¹ All government Regional Offices have several (typically 5) KRA on which their performance is assessed by the national Department. These KRA are the regional equivalent of MFOs and drive the activities and agenda over the medium term.

² An independent, specialist agency in surveys will be hired to undertake an annual, sophisticated survey of mutual appreciation.

³ All government Departments have several (typically 5) Major Final Outputs, on which their performance will be assessed by Congress. These MFO drive the Department activities and agenda over the medium term. DENR currently has five MFOs, each of which has 2-3 Objectively Verifiable Indicators.

⁴ Site 1: Cabayugan River Bridge; Site 2: Inflow; Site 3: 1.5 km. from PPUR entrance; Site 4: PPUR cave entrance.

Objectives/Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification
	involving all three FPAs and all concerned LGUs (NO NEED) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MEA Concerns incorporated into existing committees by end of Year 2 	Mainstreaming of MEAs in the Local Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LDC environment committee resolutions Barangay Development Plans
	Puerto Princesa LGU and other concerned agencies' allocate at least 3% of their environment budget to programmes related to all three Conventions and/or related to mainstreaming concerns of all three Conventions.	Puerto Princesa Budget
<u>Outcome 3</u> International, national and local partners have adopted the Tools prepared under the project.	Issuance of joint administrative order from DA/DENR and DILG to implement and replicate the tools developed.	Joint administrative order/memorandum circular from DA/DENR and DILG
	Issuance by the national agencies of an appropriate legal instrument (i.e. AO) to local level counterparts targeting the joint implementation of the three Conventions.	Administrative orders from DENR & DA.
	Tools are incorporated into the performance indicators system of key stakeholders. ⁵	Annual work plans of 3 agencies.
	Dissemination of tools developed and pilot tested nationwide.	IEC materials; proof of dissemination & pilot-testing

- Project Description (Brief)

The Project was an offshoot of the results of a National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) previously undertaken by MEA stakeholders and was designed to generate global environmental benefits through improved coordination with respect to the implementation of cross-cutting issues among the three Rio Conventions (i.e., UNCBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC). It involved an interconnected package of activities targeted at both national and local levels including the establishment of a national interagency coordination mechanism and the development of tools designed to support coordination and implementation activities at local levels, including a system of incentives for local stakeholders, and the means for further replication thereof. The Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park (PPSRNP) and surrounding areas was chosen as pilot site for these tools.

One important point which the Project emphasized is that the coordination aimed for is operational, i.e., geared towards the delivery of MEA tasks, specifically in the areas of: (a) information, education and communication, (b) research and development, (c) information

⁵ DILG monitors and evaluates performance of LGUs through a system of performance indicators, in part addressing sustainable development.

system networking, (d) monitoring and evaluation and reporting, (e) national communications and country papers' preparation, (f) policy and guidelines formulation and implementation, (g) enforcement of laws and regulations, (h) sustainable financing and financial mechanisms, and, (i) planning and investment programming.

- Evaluation Rating Table

PROJECT RESULTS	
Relevance	Satisfactory
Effectiveness	Satisfactory
Efficiency	Moderately Satisfactory
OVERALL	Satisfactory

SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES	
Financial Resources	Moderately Likely
Socio-Political	Moderately Likely
Institutional Framework & Governance	Likely
Environmental	Likely
OVERALL	Moderately Likely

MONITORING & EVALUATION	
Design	Satisfactory
Implementation	Satisfactory
Budget & Funding	Highly Satisfactory
OVERALL	Satisfactory

- Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

Hindering Factors

1. Institutional challenges brought about by the creation of the Climate Change Commission (CCC)
2. Replication requirements for a mechanism that has been tested only once
3. PPSRNP as pilot site does not fully highlight all MEA issues

Contributing Factors

1. Receptiveness of local stakeholders in PPSRNP
2. Existing coordinative efforts of FPAs
3. Relatively less complex geopolitical status of PPSRNP

Lessons Learned

1. More adaptive management response is needed to institutional changes.

2. Coordination is a result of an inclusive and iterative process.
3. Coordination is a two-way street.
4. FPAs are the MEA champions.
5. Ensure success first before replication, and constantly test the tools and products developed.

Recommendations

1. Sit down and address the institutional problem that currently characterizes the existing set-up and then identify and discuss the possible common agenda for the MEAs.
2. Extend the Project to allow the production of tools and improve web portal content.
3. Consider a STREEM 2nd Phase but focus on MEA integration in local development plans of more sites. Choose sites where MEA issues/concerns are more pronounced (e.g. Occidental Mindoro, Mt. Kanla-on, Central Cebu, Samar-Leyte provinces) and attempt higher levels of local integration (i.e., provincial and city/municipal).
4. Engage more CSOs.
5. Exert more conscious effort at identifying the gender components of the project.

Future Direction: Pursue projects that portray MEA relevance to day-to-day lives of ordinary citizens.

Best Practice: Development of skills for local MEA integration.

Worst Practice: None.

III. Acronyms and Abbreviations

List of Acronyms

BDP	Barangay Development Plan
BSWM	Bureau for Soil and Water Management
BLGS	Bureau for Local Government Supervision
CCC	Climate Change Commission
CCMRD	Committee on the Conservation and Management of Resources for Development
DA	Department of Agriculture
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DFA	Department of Foreign Affairs
DILG	Department of the Interior and Local Government
DOST	Department of Science and Technology
EMB	Environmental Management Bureau
FASPO	Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects Office
FPA	Focal Point Agency
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IACCC	Interagency Committee on Climate Change
LDC	Local Development Council
LGU	Local Government Unit
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NTCC	National Technical Coordinating Committee
NTCO	National Technical Coordinating Office
PAWB	Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau
PAWS	Protected Areas and Wildlife & Coastal Zone Management Service
PCSD	Philippines Council for Sustainable Development
PENRO	Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office
PMO	Project Management Office
PPSRNP	Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park
RA	Republic Act
STREEM	Strengthening Coordination for Effective Environmental Management
TOR	Terms of Reference for the STREEM Terminal Evaluation
TWG	Technical Working Group
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

IV. Discussion

1. Introduction

▪ Purpose of the Evaluation

The aim of the STREEM Terminal Evaluation (“Evaluation”) is to assess and rate the project results, the sustainability of project outcomes, the catalytic effect of the project, and the quality of the Project’s M&E systems. It also aims to identify lessons learned and best practices and offer recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF Projects.

▪ Scope & Methodology

Scope. Based on the Evaluation TOR, the following aspects of the project will be evaluated: (a) project results, sustainability of project outcomes and monitoring and evaluation system (M&E).

Project Results. The evaluation assessed the Project’s achievement in terms of its objective, outputs and outcomes through corresponding ratings for each target based on the means of verification indicated in its logistical framework (LogFrame). It also assessed if the Project has led to any other short-term or long-term and positive or negative consequences, and determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching its objective as stated in the project document.

Based on the TOR, the criteria used are: **relevance**,⁶ **effectiveness**⁷ and **efficiency**.⁸ It used the rating system provided in the TOR using the following marks: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**, **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)** and **Highly Unsatisfactory**. Relevance and effectiveness criteria were given the most weight per TOR.

Additionally, steps were taken to assess long-term impacts especially on the population, global environment, replication effects and other national and local impacts. Other areas assessed were capacity development, leveraging of the project and awareness raising.

Sustainability of Project Outcomes. The likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination was also assessed following the TOR rating system. This included an analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes and explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. The Evaluation assessed whether certain activities pose a threat to the sustainability of the project

⁶ Consistency of project outcomes with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities.

⁷ How project outcomes measure up with original or modified project objective.

⁸ Cost-effectiveness of the project. Among the questions to be explored are whether the project is the least-cost option, how the project delay has affected its cost-effectiveness, and possible cost-comparison with similar projects.

outcomes. Specifically, the aspects of sustainability examined were: **financial resources, socio-political, institutional framework & governance, and environmental.**

Based on the TOR, the following rating system was used: **Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU) or Unlikely (U).** As all risk dimensions of sustainability are critical, the overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest rating.

Catalytic role of the project. This portion described the catalytic or replication effect of the Project. Per TOR, no rating is required for this item.

M&E system. This section assessed whether the Project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the implementation of the project M&E plan. This included determining the adequacy of the funding for the M&E plan, its execution, and how the project managers utilized the results of the M&E to adjust or improve the Project during its implementation.

The assessment sought to determine whether the Project considered the long-term monitoring provisions to measure mid-term and long-term results such as global environmental effect, replication effects, and other local effects, after project completion. The Evaluation includes separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of the project's M&E plan and its implementation. More specifically, the areas examined were: **M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and budgeting & funding for M&E activities.**

Similar to the assessment for Project Results, the M&E assessment followed a similar ratings system provided in the TOR: **Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).**

The overall rating of M&E during project implementation will be solely based on the quality of M&E plan implementation. The ratings on quality at entry of M&E design and sufficiency of funding both during planning and implementation stages were used as explanatory variables.

The Evaluation includes a section on monitoring of long-term changes which describes the actions and accomplishments of the Project in the establishment of a long-term monitoring system, to possibly include determination of environmental baselines, specification of indicators, provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis and use.

Finally, this portion of the Evaluation attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Did the project contribute to the establishment of a long term monitoring system? If not, should the project have included such a component?
2. What were the accomplishments and short comings in establishment of this system?
3. Is the system sustainable, i.e. is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and has financing?
4. Is the information generated by this M&E system being used as originally intended?

Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results. Although no rating is required, the Evaluation includes observations on the following project-related aspects:

- Preparation and readiness
- Country ownership/drivenness
- Stakeholder involvement
- Financial planning
- Implementing/Executing agency's supervision and backstopping
- Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability
- Delays and project outcomes and sustainability

Other Matters. The Evaluation will have a section on lessons and recommendations for the project which will analyze the factors that contributed or hindered the following aspects of the project particularly on the (a) attainment of project objectives, (b) sustainability of project benefits, (c) innovation, (d) datalytic effect and replication, and (e) project monitoring and evaluation.

Methodology. The Evaluation relied on an extensive review of pertinent documents, key informant interviews and stakeholder interview/field visit conducted in Puerto Princesa, Palawan for PPSRNP, the pilot site.⁹ The evaluator also browsed websites and other electronic sources identified in the project LogFrame.¹⁰ Since the STREEM project was LogFrame-based, its built-in M&E tool was used primarily to rate project achievements, specifically, the means of verification for objectively-verifiable indicators.

To facilitate the interview process, a questionnaire was designed and uniformly asked to all interview respondents which was also furnished email to the PMO. Another set of questions was designed for the Puerto Princesa batch of interviewees. One significant constraint of this Evaluation is that despite allocating seventeen (17) possible dates with the respondents identified for the interview, only seven (7) dates were actually availed of. Owing further to this difficulty in securing appointments, the Puerto Princesa batch of stakeholder interviews had to be administered by an associate of the undersigned as it coincided with the dates assigned to the FPAs.

After the interviews were terminated by end of October, a presentation of the initial findings was set on November 5, 2013. However, due to the unavailability of a number of project partners, this was reset to November 18, 2013 at the DENR-FASPO function room. The comments of those were present were considered in the Final Draft.

Afterwards, copies of the Final Draft was distributed to the members of the National Steering Committee (NSC) and other project partners. On December 12, 2013, a presentation of this Evaluation was made before the members of the NSC. This Final Report incorporates the comments and observations made by the NSC members during the said meeting.

- Structure of the Evaluation Report

⁹ See *List of Interviewees*.

¹⁰ See *List of Documents Reviewed*.

The Evaluation follows the outline/structure provided under the TOR. Additionally, it will use the LogFrame table to facilitate the determination of project accomplishments. For facility, the Evaluation will delve into six (6) major aspects of the Project. These are:

- Project Results
- Sustainability of Project Outcomes
- Catalytic Role of the Project
- Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) System
- Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results
- Other Matters

2. Project Description and Development Context

As a developing country, the Philippines is dependent on its abundant natural resources for its economic growth. However, instead of prosperity, varying intensities of poverty are experienced throughout the country. Ironically, an oft-cited reason is the widespread degradation of the same natural resource base which largely supports the economy. Compounding the problem is the high significance the global community regards these threatened ecosystems.

To address these problems, the Philippine Government has adopted a plethora of legal and institutional measures to reverse this trend. Among these, it signed on to the UNCBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC. The STREEM Project was designed to generate global environmental benefits through improved coordination with respect to the implementation of cross-cutting issues among the three MEAs being implemented in the country, specifically, the three Rio Conventions (i.e., UNCBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC). The Project was an offshoot of the results of the NCSA, wherein respondents determined that many committed stakeholders at all levels undertake various tasks related to the MEAs but lack coordination leading to wastages, loss of synergy, loss of economies of scale and duplication.

To partly address this problem, the Project designed an interconnected package of activities targeted at both national and local levels. This includes the establishment of a national interagency coordination mechanism and the development of tools designed to pragmatically support coordination and implementation activities at local levels, including a system of incentives for local stakeholders. The PPSRNP was chosen as pilot site to test these tools.¹¹ Optimistic of a generally positive outcome, the Project took a further step by including in its design the replication of the above tools for their use by other local and international partners.

¹¹ The PPSRNP is located on the central west coast of Palawan, some 80 kilometers northwest of Puerto Princesa City consisting of an area of 22,209 hectares. It features a spectacular limestone karst landscape with an underground river. One of the river's distinguishing features is that it emerges directly into the sea, and its lower portion is subject to tidal influences. The area also represents a significant habitat for biodiversity conservation. The site contains a full "mountain-to-sea" ecosystem and has some of the most important forests in Asia. It was recently voted as one of the new 8 wonders of the natural world based on an online poll.

One important point which the Project took pains to emphasize was that the coordination¹² aimed for was operational, i.e., it is meaningful only if applied to the delivery of specific tasks under the MEAs in the areas of: (a) information, education and communication, (b) research and development, (c) information system networking, (d) monitoring and evaluation and reporting, (e) national communications and country papers' preparation, (f) policy and guidelines formulation and implementation, (g) enforcement of laws and regulations, (h) sustainable financing and financial mechanisms, and, (i) planning and investment programming.

- Project Start and Duration

This medium-sized project was originally slated to start on June 2009 and had a duration of three (3) years, or until June 2012. However, due to political and administrative developments within the DENR (which hosts the PMO) as a consequence of the May 2010 elections,¹³ it did not commence until almost a year later. The Project has since been extended until end of December 2013.

- Problems that the Project Sought to Address

As stated, the lack of coordination among the MEA stakeholders (i.e., horizontally, among FPAs at the national level, or their local counterparts at the LGU level; and vertically, between national FPAs and their local counterparts) has led to wastages, loss of synergy, loss of economies of scale and duplication, based on results of the NCSA. At best, baseline efforts were deemed as ad-hoc, incoherent and fragmented, or insufficiently focused on the MEAs.

Based on the Project Document ("ProDoc"), these translated operationally to institutional/organizational barriers to the effective delivery of the country's obligations in the nine cross-cutting thematic areas of the MEAs. Specifically, these are in the form of:

- The FPAs have not designated working level units responsible for the MEAs;
- The FPAs have treated MEA's as external issues, and have not fully integrated them into planning and institutional arrangements;
- The low priority accorded by FPA and other agencies to coordination and coordination committees;

¹² For the project, coordination is broadly defined as the harmonizing of the policies, programmes and actions of stakeholders. In this proposal, coordination is restricted to situations where stakeholders are both *willing* and *able* to work together in harmony. In order to optimize implementation of the Rio Conventions, strong coordination is required:

- Amongst the constituency of stakeholders responsible for each individual Convention. This includes coordination within the respective FPA;
- Across and between the constituencies for each of the three Conventions. This includes across the three FPA and their partners; and,
- Vertically over the municipal, provincial, regional and national level stakeholders.

The STREEM project aims to strengthen the second and third of the above. (p.15-16, ProDoc)

¹³ Within the first year from the time the Project commenced in 2009, there were four (4) persons who occupied the position of DENR Secretary. Another impact of the May 2010 elections was a ban on hiring new personnel in government offices, on top of an earlier unsuccessful application process in hiring of project staff.

- The low level interest from of concerned agencies in the MEAs;
- The lack of awareness on MEAs, in LGUs and even in FPAs;
- The overlapping and conflicting mandates, policy positions and functions of the cooperating organizations – even within Departments;
- The absence of dedicated tools and mechanisms for inter-MEA coordination;
- The absence of dedicated tools and mechanisms for vertical coordination;
- The poor communication and networking among FPAs, their field offices and partner organizations, and;
- The frequent changes in leadership in the FPAs.

- Immediate and Development Objectives that the Project Sought to Address

Given the high global significance of Philippine biodiversity and the indispensable socio-economic role of the environment and natural resources in achieving the country's economic growth targets and poverty alleviation aims amidst a changing climate, the goal of the Project is to generate global environmental benefits through improved coordination in the implementation of the MEAs in the Philippines, consistent with the primary objectives of the Rio Conventions.

Its objective ***is to strengthen cross-Convention institutional and coordination structures and mechanisms at local and national levels*** to comply with the country's commitments under the three (3) MEAs. This will lead to reduced overlap and maximized efficiencies, particularly in the cross-cutting thematic areas earlier mentioned.

By way of strategy, the Project rests on two pillars. First is the phasing of national and local activities by developing mechanisms so that the FPAs and their national level constituents can coordinate, followed by the development of tools that can support coordination at the local level with respect to the nine cross-cutting thematic areas earlier listed.

The second pillar is testing these tools at the pilot site, i.e., PPSRNP. This was expected to generate lessons and best practices for replication and dissemination in other sites, locally and even internationally.

- Baseline Indicators Established

The ProDoc discussed extensively the legal and institutional landscape that characterized the lack of coordination referred to. At the national level, this consisted of various laws that created different government agencies which by virtue of their respective legal mandates, now serve as the separate (and uncoordinated) FPAs for the MEAs.

It was for this reason that a National Technical Coordinating Committee and a National Technical Coordinating Office were initially recommended as means to achieve institutional/ interagency coordination. The document also discussed the various country development plans

(e.g., MTPDP¹⁴, Philippine Agenda 21, etc.) to which MEA objectives were envisioned to integrate.

At the local level, the ProDoc described the situation as LGU-driven but with very limited technical capacities especially with regard to the MEAs. This was aggravated by the inability of the national-based FPAs to respond to this technical gap. As a result, MEA objectives are barely reflected in LGU development plans. Expectedly, local level contributions to the country's MEA obligations have been marginal.

With regard to the pilot site, the ProDoc predicted that without the Project, the area will decline because of unstructured (albeit determined) efforts of its stakeholders. Gaps and lack of synergies meant that the communities would be unable to sustainably manage the resources, and the threats would be too great.

▪ Main Stakeholders

The Project identified the key stakeholders, namely, the various government agencies, both national and local, that have significant roles in the implementation of the MEAs throughout the country. The fact that this Project was an offshoot of the NCSA wherein the same stakeholders were the respondents, imbued the Project with a high level of stakeholder involvement. At this point, it is worth mentioning that at the time the ProDoc was designed, the stakeholders were the following:

1. DENR
 - i. FASPO
 - ii. PAWB
 - iii. EMB
 - iv. Regional Offices-PAWS
 - v. Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office (PENRO)
 - vi. City Environment and Natural Resources Office (CENRO)
2. DA
 - i. BSWM
 - ii. Regional Field Units
3. DILG
 - i. BLGS
 - ii. Regional Offices
4. DFA
5. LGU
 - i. Provincial Agriculture Office (PAO)
 - ii. Municipal Agriculture Office (MAO)
 - iii. Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office (PENRO)
 - iv. Municipal Environment and Natural Resources Office (MENRO)
 - v. City Environment and Natural Resources Office (CENRO)
6. PCSD

¹⁴ Medium Term Philippine Development Plan, since renamed simply as Philippine Development Plan.

7. League of Provinces/Cities/Municipalities
8. CSOs
9. Private Sector

By end of 2009, a new major stakeholder has emerged, i.e., the CCC created by virtue of Republic Act (R.A.) 9729.

▪ Expected Results

The TOR identified three (3) project outcomes with ten (10) expected outputs for consideration in this Evaluation:

Outcome 1: National Rio Convention Stakeholders are effectively coordinating the preparation and implementation of related policies, program and project activities.

Expected Outputs:

1. A National Technical Coordinating Committee and Office
2. A Business Plan for the NTCC
3. Initial Incentive System
4. Potential tools to promote local level coordination

Outcome 2: Local and National Stakeholders are addressing key global environmental issues in and around the PPSRNP in a coordinated manner.

Expected Outputs:

1. Priorities and sequences of activities for MEA implementation are identified in the LGU pilot site
2. Application/pilot testing of tools for enhanced MEA implementation at the local level
3. Increased understanding on incentive system and the potential tools

Outcome 3: International, national and local partners have adopted the tools prepared under the project.

Expected Outputs:

1. Finalized tools for promoting local level coordination
2. Institutionalized Incentive System
3. Tools, incentive systems, and all Project outputs disseminated to local, national and international partners

3. Findings¹⁵

3.1 Project Design/Formulation

¹⁵ In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated.

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project Logic/Strategy; Indicators)

The Project was clear in its objective to achieve horizontal and vertical coordination that functions operationally in terms of delivery of the Country's obligations under the three MEAs in an efficient and effective manner. How the attainment of this objective was to be measured and monitored in the LogFrame is a different matter, however.

For Outcome 1, for instance, the LogFrame leaned towards an organizational approach by focusing on the creation (or as what actually transpired, the revival) of an interagency body as indicator. However, setting up an interagency body offers no guarantee that the desired coordination will take place. It may just end up exactly as that, an entity comprised of different agencies. Fact is, at the time the Project was being designed, two of the FPAs (i.e., EMB and PAWB) were already subsumed under one department, the DENR. It may be worthwhile to ask then why, despite being part of a single agency, the two bureaus still failed to achieve the level of coordination desired by the Project as reflected in the NCSA? In short, simply bringing the three FPAs under one roof may not be the answer as the case of PAWB and EMB had shown.

For this Evaluation, considering that the Project was based on the premise that there were wastages, loss of synergy, loss of economies of scale and duplication according to the results of the NCSA, the more appropriate design should have been to identify these inefficiencies (e.g., costs or number of hours to prepare country reports) and make these the basis for the LogFrame indicators (e.g., reduced time required to prepare country reports by 25%) and make the same process- or systems-based (e.g., number of pre-negotiations consultations held among FPAs).

To be fair, it should be added that Outcome 1 was overtaken by subsequent events that changed the entire ballgame. This refers to the creation of the CCC. More will be said on this matter. Suffice to state, this, in a way, bolsters the point earlier made regarding the mere act of putting different agencies under one roof because the CCC is *another* interagency body comprised of different agencies of government, including current stakeholders like the DENR, DA and the DILG. Did the CCC creation make the CCMRD redundant or did it simply make matters more complicated for the Project?

As regards Outcome 3, the LogFrame design was overly optimistic in the success of the tools and incentives developed under the Project and may have unreasonably demanded the institutional adoption of said tools. As will be discussed, the reality is that these tools need further testing in conditions different and possibly more complex than what the PPSRNP had to offer before a more widespread adoption by way administrative edicts is espoused. In fact, this institutionalization may be rightfully done as next phase activity for the project.

- Assumptions and Risks

One significant assumption that was overlooked was the impending creation of the CCC. Whether or not this could have been foreseen at the time the Project was being designed is open for debate considering that at that time, there were at least three entities of the

Philippine Government engaged in climate change concerns.¹⁶ However, R.A. 9729 changed the project baseline scenario as it not only pushed one of the initial stakeholders, the EMB, into the sidelines, it may have even rendered the CCMRD irrelevant or at best, redundant.

Similarly, as stated, considering that the CCC is another interagency body, it begs the question of whether or not the creation of another interagency entity works as a solution to coordination problems. In a word, there was simply one too many. Fact is, given the clear mandate of the CCC, it had every reason to give legal pause on whether or not it should allow itself to be subsumed by the CCMRD. On the one hand, this created an awkward scenario that persisted throughout the project. On the other, the built-in coordination mechanisms within the CCC went largely untapped by the Project because there was the CCMRD.

Outcome 3 also had an unwritten assumption—that the tools and incentives developed for the Project are ready for replication—such that the institutionalization thereof by way of administrative orders was already prescribed. As will be discussed, this Evaluation takes a more cautious view of the current success of the tools developed given the unique circumstances of PPSRNP as the chosen pilot site. (See discussion on *Effectiveness & Efficiency*)

- Lessons from Other Relevant Projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design

There were clear indicators that the Project certainly incorporated a number of general lessons from capacity-building projects. For instance, institutional sustainability was definitely in mind in the deliberate adoption of measures to ensure project continuity (e.g., allocation of budget by the DENR, promulgation of pertinent administrative orders, etc.).

However, in the sense that this Project is novel (addressing a more sophisticated aspect of natural resource conservation management—effective operational MEA coordination), this is very much uncharted territory and there is only so much that can be incorporated from other relevant projects. In fact, as was discussed in the section on *Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project Logic/Strategy; Indicators)*, some of these best practices may have actually worked against this Project, or created unreasonable expectations.

For instance, the creation of an interagency body is a textbook recommendation to problems of lack of coordination. However, the nuances of the present problem actually demanded an out-of-the-box solution because the baseline scenario is one where there is already one too many interagency bodies, such that the creation of another merely complicates interagency relationships, imposes additional responsibilities to the already burdened FPAs, and contributes little to achieving actual operational coordination.

- Planned Stakeholder Participation

The Project can be described as sufficiently participatory. At the national level, the direct stakeholders for the Project are the FPAs, the different agencies involved in the MEAs, while at

¹⁶ Inter-Agency Committee on Climate Change (IACCC) under the auspices of the DENR, the Presidential Task Force on Climate Change (PTFCC) headed by the Secretary of the Department of Energy (DOE), and the Office of the Presidential Task Force on Global Warming and Climate Change (OPACC) directly under the Office of the President.

the local level, it included CSO participants such as local community members. By practice and by legal requirement, a number of the FPA processes include CSO representation so stakeholder participation is fairly broad.

With regard to the planned stakeholders' engagement, this was another aspect of the Project that was affected by the creation of the CCC. Under the ProDoc, the FPA for climate change was the EMB and this remained throughout under the Project. In reality however, the CCC has steadily taken the prominent role on climate change issues¹⁷ and where it stands vis-à-vis the CCMRD will be a constant source of institutional awkwardness that will hamper the full and effective coordination at the national level among the FPAs.

- Replication Approach

The replication approach taken by the Project was very deliberate, to a fault. As earlier stated, there was a tacit assumption that the tools and incentives developed for the Project for MEA coordination would be immediately successful and readily replicable that its dissemination was included among the project deliverables. This Evaluation thinks that this is premature as the applicability of these tools to other conditions or more complex settings than PPSRNP has yet to be tested.

- UNDP Comparative Advantage

The existing partnership between UNDP and the MEA stakeholders, and the local, national and international linkages of UNDP are the comparative advantages for the Project. Its openness to innovative institutional approaches to address environmental problems allowed this Project to push through.

- Linkages between Project and Other Interventions within the Sector

The three MEAs cover a very wide ground and the lessons that could be learned from this Project stand to benefit other interventions in the sector. This is because at the national level, better coordination among the FPAs can translate to a more cohesive articulation of environmental policies for the government in its various plans and programmes (e.g. Philippine Development Plan). In turn, given the status of the Philippines from the perspective of the three MEAs, the experiences and lessons it can share to the global community can translate to greater global environmental benefits.

With regard to current linkages with other projects, given the time constraints of this Evaluation and the limited number of interview respondents, only documents relating to this Project were reviewed.

- Management Arrangements

¹⁷ To be sure, the EMB retains some important functions relating to climate change but this is now anchored less on the EMB but more on the inherent, implied and incidental functions of its mother-organization, the DENR. Unless and until the DENR redefines the role of the Climate Change Office of the EMB, its role among the FPAs will remain marginal.

In general, the Project followed the typical UNDP prescribed management arrangements with a National Steering Committee, a Project Management Office and a Technical Working Group, as described in the ProDoc, all in place to administer and monitor the Project. It was implemented under the National Execution modality of UNDP which puts the responsibility and accountability of managing the Project to the DENR-FASPO as the Implementing Partner. At the pilot site, the DENR-FASPO entered into a MOA with the Puerto Princesa City LGU for the joint management of the Project.

Considering the extensive experience of the FASPO in handling UN-funded projects both in the past and in the present, there is no question as to its expertise in financial management. One wonders, however, why this notwithstanding, it was not chosen to backstop the CCMRD when it was eventually identified as the effective NTCC. Instead, the DENR's Planning Office was identified as the Secretariat to the CCMRD (see below), adding an added layer of bureaucracy especially in the financial aspects of the Project with one DENR office handling funds while the other is doing administrative support when it could have just as easily been one.

According to FASPO, the Planning Office simply provides Secretariat functions to the CCMRD. How then is this different from what FASPO currently does for the Project considering that the only concern of the CCMRD at the moment, as earlier discussed, is this Project? Moreover, if this is simply secretariat work, is this something that the project staff of FASPO could not have taken on? The point is, this administrative-financial disjoint is another area for coordination that the Project just added to its already long list. If the Project decides to continue with the CCMRD option, then FASPO should be its Secretariat/Finance support.

3.2 Project Results¹⁸

- Overall Results (Attainment of Objectives) (*)

Based on the ten expected outputs, the Project is given an overall SATISFACTORY rating.

For Outcome 1, the revival of the CCMRD complied with the requirement for a NTCC and several resolutions and orders were passed to institutionalize the same. PCSD Resolution No. 1, series of 2011 reactivated the CCMRD as the NTCC for the Project while DENR Special Order No. 2011-246 designated USec. Demetrio Ignacio and USec. Analiza R. Teh as the chair and alternate chair of the CCMRD. Lastly, DENR Special Order No. 2011-699 designated the Planning Office of the DENR as head secretariat of the CCMRD.¹⁹

A Business Plan was actually developed for the CCMRD. Aside from including an extensive discussion of the legal and institutional backdrop of the different agencies having to do with the MEAs, it provided for the CCMRD's vision, mission and goal, composition and structure, internal rules and a 5-year proposed workplan for the CCMRD.²⁰

¹⁸ Subsections 2.2 and 2.3 were swapped from what was prescribed in the TOR Outline upon request by UNDP.

¹⁹ Whether or not the Planning Office as CCMRD Secretariat represents the NTCO is not clear though. According to the DENR, the primary reason for DENR SO #2011-699 was because the Planning Office was under the DENR undersecretary heading the CCMRD.

²⁰ See Appendix A, Business Plan.

A system of incentives for local coordination was also attempted for the Project but this remains a major work in progress and far from being finalized. Lastly, as regards the tools to promote local level coordination, the Project cites the development of the following as its major accomplishments:

- a. Philippine MEA web portal²¹
- b. National and Local Information, Education and Communication Strategy
- c. Omnibus Module on the Rio Conventions
- d. Speakers' Bureau on MEAs
- e. Operations Manual for the Mainstreaming of MEAs in Local Development Planning
- f. Facilitator's Handbook for Mainstreaming MEAs in Barangay Development Plans

The last two items is where the Project attained its high marks although these have yet to be printed in hard form. The web portal, on the other hand, has the most potential but remains largely limited in content. This is bothersome as the web portal is the face of the Project to the outside world and the lack of working links with the other FPA websites is a clear example of how far the FPAs still are from the desired coordination by the Project. This clearly needs to be addressed.

For Outcome 2, this Evaluation was able to go over three (3) Barangay Development Plans (BDPs) for Bgys. Marufinas, New Pangangan and Tagabenit, all from PPSRNP in Puerto Princesa Palawan. Aside from the usual content of BDPs,²² they now include MEA-oriented action and investment plans.

The BDPs *substantially complied* with the expected output to identify priorities and sequences of activities for MEA implementation in the pilot site. Similarly, the formulation of these BDPs was made possible through the tools enumerated above, particularly the last two. With regard to increased understanding of the incentive system and potential tools, as previously mentioned, the incentive system is still quite raw while the tools, as will be discussed, needs to be further tested under more robust conditions.

Lastly, for Outcome 3, the Project largely “failed” in the delivery of the expected outputs. Under the TOR, the expected outputs under this outcome are: (a) tools for promoting local level coordination finalize, (b) incentive system institutionalized, and (c) the same tools, incentive systems, and all Project outputs disseminated to local, national and international partners.

These did not happen. While some of the tools have been finalized, the important ones for replication purposes like the training manual have yet to be printed. The web portal needs to be significantly improved. On the other hand, the administrative orders required for institutionalization of the incentive system are not in place. Lastly, the dissemination of these tools, incentives and other project outputs had been fairly limited.

²¹ Accessible at: http://mea.denr.gov.ph/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=98&Itemid=95.

²² These are the pertinent barangay resolution adopting said BDP, physical, socio-demographic, economic profiles, vision, mission, goal and objectives and maps.

- Relevance (*)

The Evaluation gives the Project a rating of SATISFACTORY for this criterion. There is little doubt that the effective and efficient implementation of the country's obligations under the MEAs by way of better coordination among the MEA stakeholders, both national and local, is a highly relevant undertaking. Where it even excelled is that not only did these outcomes become relevant to the MEAs, the MEAs themselves finally became relevant to their local constituents, the lack of which has been a long-running issue that has plagued international conservation efforts. In other words, the Project was able to provide an answer to the question why should MEAs matter to local stakeholders.

The shortcoming lies in the relevance of Outcome 3 on replication. As earlier stated, although it is but a small component of the Project, it might still be too premature for the tools developed herein to be replicated. Perhaps the more appropriate term is to conduct further "test-runs" to tweak and refine these tools. This takes an altogether different approach from replicating because of the inherent openness to criticisms, keen awareness over the conditions that could spell success/failure, among others.

- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)

In terms of effectiveness, the rating varies over each of the project outcomes. Under Outcome 1, this is difficult to gauge. While on the one hand, this Evaluation is critical of the recommended action to form a new coordinative body (or as actually the case, the revival of the CCMRD), the legal-political developments culminating in the creation of the CCC simply knocked the sail out of this outcome and there was no way at that time to determine how best to take advantage of, or ride-out this development.²³ Suffice to state, the revival of the CCMRD did not insulate the Project from the attendant problems and may have only added to the complications. Moreover, it may even be argued that as a pre-existing (albeit moribund) entity, it is the CCMRD that is benefiting from the Project and not the other way around. Fact is, why the CCMRD became inactive in the first place has never been fully addressed and the same dynamics may still be at work to slow down the Project. In other words, there was simply no immediately discernible advantage in reviving the CCMRD versus creating a new NTCC. Having been inactive for quite some time, its lack of momentum and resources as an interagency body only added another responsibility to the project managers—i.e., how to make it work.

This is evident from its current status. At present, the CCMRD conducts regular meetings but the appreciation of its value swings widely among the FPAs. The BSWM, for instance, sees greater relevance on its subcommittees while the CCC has yet to designate a higher level representative to this body, if ever it is finally convinced to do so. Hence, it would seem that only the DENR is invested in this entity.

On the other hand, Outcome 2 is replete with superlatives. Several tools were developed. The MEAs found local relevance among stakeholders and even achieved a level of institutional sustainability in the form of their incorporation in the local development plans. The FPAs, as

²³ It must be recalled that the CCC had its own share of birthpains.

national agencies, managed to find a way to connect to the local level at the pilot site and the latter are now able to tap the expertise from a pool of FPA speakers (i.e., Speakers' Bureau) in the formulation of their development plans.

If ever there is one caveat to this list of accomplishments is that the pilot site chosen, despite its superb natural features, is socio-politically less complex than most Philippine sites, comprised of only four (4) barangays and encompassed by only one city (Puerto Princesa) and one province (Palawan). This is a significant consideration because the political complexities attendant with having numerous LGUs are generally absent here. Moreover, as will be discussed in the portion on project sustainability, preparing local development plans in PPSRNP is much easier here with only four (4) barangays compared to other sites where there could be tens, if not hundreds, of constituent LGUs.

Furthermore, the MEA issues and their interplay are also not as acute in PPSRNP as in other sites. The fact that it recently won recognition as one of the new 7 wonders of nature attests to its good ecological condition. It would thus be interesting how these new tools would fare when tested in areas where socio-political-legal issues are more dynamic like in Mt. Kanla-on or in Samar. It would also be interesting to see what kind of calibration would be needed to make them applicable to these sites.

Lastly, as far as Outcome 3 is concerned, the Project would appear as a dismal failure with no administrative order or departmental performance indicator in sight in the near future adopting these tools, not even the dissemination thereof for pilot-testing nationwide.²⁴ However, as earlier stated, for this Evaluation, this was an unreasonable expectation on the part of the project design. At best, this is a premature activity that is more appropriate in a second or third phase of the Project, assuming there is even one. Given that this outcome is relatively minor compared to the first two, the Evaluation gives a rating of SATISFACTORY on this aspect of the Project.

Per TOR, efficiency refers to cost-effectiveness of the Project, delays and how such delays may have affected its cost-effectiveness, among others. The Evaluation gives this aspect a rating of MODERATELY SATISFACTORY. Despite investing in some big ticket items to foster coordination among the FPAs at the national level, horizontal coordination remains patchy and susceptible to changes in personnel composition. Coordination as a system, process or attitude has yet to gain a firm foothold in all three FPAs. Coordination with CCC, in particular, leaves much to be desired with a staff connected to website development being designated as the CCC's representative to the Project's TWG.

On the other hand, as far as Outcome 2 is concerned, given the level of intervention the Project provided to come up with a development plan for each of the four barangays that comprise the PPSRNP, its cost-effectiveness may be put into question when applied to other sites where there are hundreds of barangays, covered by two or more cities/municipalities, or even by two or more provinces or regions. Mt. Apo and Mt. Kanla-on are cases in point. In fact, the more

²⁴ Some IEC materials on the three MEAs have been disseminated (fans, shirts, etc.) but this does not seem to be the distribution contemplated under Outcome 3.

complex the biodiversity, climate change or land degradation issues are of a site, it is likely that the geographic considerations would also get bigger. This translates to having more LGUs in the picture. Would MEA coordination at the barangay level remain feasible? Where will the budget come from?

Lastly, as far as Outcome 3 is concerned, this has been delayed and if implemented, the cost-effectiveness thereof is beyond the reach of this Evaluation. Suffice to state, at this point, a significant portion of the budget (approx.. US\$60,000) remains unutilized as of date.

- Country Ownership

Country ownership remained strong throughout the Project. As an offshoot of the results of the NCSA, this persisted till the very end. The peculiarities of the local circumstances determined many of the activities undertaken such as tapping the local development councils, the replicability of which is suited in local circumstances. And despite the international pull of the MEAs, the Project outcomes remained grounded in the local setting.

- Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming is an inherent feature of the Project design especially at the local level with the development of tools and incentives as an expected result. These tools and incentives were precisely “pilot-tested” because they were intended to be used not just in PPSRNP but in other sites, both locally and internationally. Replication through the adoption of administrative orders was even sought. For various reasons however, the Project has yet to achieve the latter although this Evaluation believes that this is not necessarily indispensable in the mainstreaming process. It may actually be a prudent approach to try-out these tools and incentives first in differing circumstances before institutionalizing them by way of executive issuances.²⁵

At the national level, mainstreaming of the planned coordination would be implied considering the interagency nature of the institutional arrangement sought to be achieved. However, as the coordination has yet to be fully realized, its mainstreaming is limited at the moment. For instance, the usefulness of the web portal as a one-stop platform for MEA information is still incomplete.

- Sustainability (*)

Sustainability is defined as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. There are several considerations. Financially, with the annual allocation by the DENR of P1.0 million for CCMRD meetings, this would, at least on paper, provide sufficient financial resources that could be leveraged in pursuing the desired coordination at the national level. Considering that this Evaluation is pushing for a more systems- or process-oriented coordination thrust, this amount would more than suffice on top of possible in-kind counterpart contributions that the FPAs can offer. One risk that should be noted however is that even with a bigger budget, unless the institutional issues that resulted from the creation of the CCC are addressed, the CCMRD as the catalyst for coordination would remain underutilized.

²⁵ See *Effectiveness & Efficiency*.

As regards local level coordination, the sustainability envisioned by the Project is in its replication in other sites, nationally or even internationally. From a financial perspective, the PPSRNP experience will be difficult to sustain because the pilot site had the benefit of STREAM budgetary support. As discussed earlier, engaging at the barangay level for the pilot site made total sense because of its unique geopolitical configuration. However, PPSRNP is more of the exception rather than the rule and whether or not replication at the level of barangays would be advisable in other sites, is doubtful.

Further, the incentive system developed under the Project (e.g., educational tours for members of the Speakers' Bureau) entails significant costs. It has in fact been expressed why such an incentive system was needed considering that what was required of them is part and parcel of their jobs to which they are already compensated.

Whether or not this was the incentive system envisioned for the Project, one incentive that could emerge over time are the socio-economic benefits that can accrue because the PPSRNP stakeholders incorporated the MEA values in their development strategies. This is because PPSRNP is an ecotourism site and the main basis for their revenue inflows is because tourists appreciate the natural amenities found inside their barangays. Absent the subterranean river, the area would be hard-pressed to compete with other tourism destinations if based on its beaches or waterfalls alone. Based on the above, the sustainability of financial resources is given a rating of MODERATELY LIKELY.

In terms of socio-political sustainability, at the national level, the FPAs see the value in the Project and it is a matter of developing systems and processes to attain the full coordination envisioned. In this respect, sustainability is assured. At the local level, on the other hand, there is stakeholder ownership of the Project. However, it must be noted that development plans prepared for the Project are tied to future financing and whether or not this actually materializes poses a slight risk such that a negative outcome may dampen the communities' sense of ownership or other form of backlash. For this reason, this aspect of sustainability is given a rating of MODERATELY LIKELY.

Institutionally, the legal landscape seems to have settled and no future changes among FPAs can be seen in the political horizon so they can now concentrate in attaining operational coordination as envisioned by the Project. Accountability and transparency are not necessarily issues in this respect. The Project is therefore rated LIKELY.

Lastly, in terms of environmental sustainability, this is the main goal of the Project so no risk is seen for the Project and a rating of LIKELY is given.

Overall, the Project is given a rating of MODERATELY LIKELY for sustainability.

- Impact

This section deals with the midterm and long-term impacts of the Project. In this regard, the Project holds significant promise because if coordination at the national level is fully achieved, this will augur well for the environment and the bigger "coordination" problem—not just among FPAs—but with the policies and priorities of the Government vis-à-vis its other goals. In

other words, the environmental sector will have a stronger voice in the programmes and policies of the Government if the environmental agencies are able to act and speak in unison.

The vertical coordination envisioned and for which reason, the tools and incentives were developed, also holds much promise in the medium term. The Project acknowledges that local agencies have limited capacities when it comes to the MEAs or even in environmental planning in general. The Project's accomplishments in the pilot site can be further tested, refined and/or improved in other sites. Again, this would contribute to the overall goal of the Project. Similar to the national level, local development plans will also now reflect environmental objectives and policies.

It is worth stating that each of the MEAs require the formulation of local action plans but the risk of these ending up as stand-alone instruments that compete for attention with more relevant development plans is high. Policy coordination is therefore essential and this is the promise that the Project provides in the medium term.

The impacts of the Project in the long-run cannot be assessed at this point because its outcomes are still at their early stages. However, for future reporting purposes, the following benchmarks can be used as basis to measure long-term project impacts:

- a. National – A functional e-based system for MEA reporting by the FPAs that is linked with their counterparts at the LGU level is developed; web portal that is up-to-date and complete with all MEA-related resource materials is heavily utilized
- b. Local – Number of regions where local experts in MEAs have been established; number of LGUs that incorporate MEAs in their local development plans; list of sites outside of the Philippines that have adopted the tools developed under the Project.

Per TOR, other areas for assessing results are likewise included, namely, capacity development, leveraging and awareness raising.

In terms capacity development, this is where the Project has strong potential if properly sustained. The Project was able to tap on a rich vein by harnessing the LDCs for promoting the MEAs. With so many areas all over the country vulnerable to climate change, facing the problems of biodiversity loss and susceptible to land degradation, the need to address these problems is severe. And yet, despite the tools offered by the MEAs, local expertise is still wanting especially among the different local bodies/offices that are the natural counterparts of the FPAs; hence, MEA capacity development has a very large potential. It is for this reason that this Evaluation identified as a future long-term impact the number of regions where local MEA experts are established as a good indicator. Corollarily, awareness raising is achieved with enhanced capacity development. This is because the local MEA stakeholders have a lot to contribute to the enrichment of MEA policy discussions.

Lastly, in terms of leveraging, at the national level, the allocation of funds by the DENR to the CCMRD can be used to leverage funds to further the Project beyond its term. Locally, it will be interesting as to who among the LGUs will be able to do the same and leverage using their local funds to enhance, revise or improve their local development plans that are responsive to MEA concerns.

3.3 Project Implementation

- Adaptive Management (Changes to the Project Design and Project Outputs during Implementation)

There were a couple of changes made to the LogFrame that at first glance, would appear as adaptive-style of management. First was the decision to revive the CCMRD instead of creating a new office as NTCC. Second was tapping local development councils (LDCs) for the local level aspect of the Project rather than create new joint management committees locally.

Considering though that both CCMRD and the LDCs were already existing even before the Project started (although at different levels of activity), one can only surmise whether this was simply a case of incomplete baseline analysis. Fact is, these bodies were already in existence and could have been readily identified as the institutional vehicles for the project outcomes. More importantly, their inherent advantages and disadvantages could have already been discussed at the ProDoc stage. This is particularly true with regard to the choice of CCMRD as NTCC.

These two management decisions took different paths. On the one hand, as this Evaluation has expressed, the creation of the CCC including the formation of cabinet clusters by the Philippine President (E.O. 43, series of 2011) including one relating to the environment, drastically changed the institutional landscape to the point that it may even be argued that given its widespread impacts on the daily lives of millions of Filipinos, Congress, as the main policymaking body of the country, opted to elevate the issue of climate change over and above the two other MEAs. Fact is, ask any person on the street what climate change is and one is likely to get a correct response compared to the relatively less perceived urgencies of biodiversity loss or land degradation. In other words, by establishing the CCC, Congress has explicitly pushed the climate change issue at the forefront of national environmental agenda, arguably past Agenda 21 which has already seen its prime. While sustainable development remains a valid policy objective, climate adaptation, mitigation and resilience are now the policy frameworks that resonate more to the general populace. This is where adaptive management would have been beneficial because the CCC had more institutional momentum than the CCMRD.

On the other hand, the decision to focus the local MEA interventions in the barangay development planning for the pilot site is an excellent example of adaptive management and stakeholder participation that is truly meaningful. The original Project design was simply to put the local MEA stakeholders on board in the delivery of country outputs under the MEAs in this form of vertical coordination. The NSCA survey was not clear whether or not this lack of vertical coordination (i.e., between national and local) was also resulting in wastages, lack of synergies, etc. at this level. Suffice to state, the adaptive management taken under the Project actually involved a more profound form of coordination—integration. It made the MEAs more relevant locally, institutionalized in development plans and consequently, very sustainable.

- Partnership Arrangements (with Relevant Stakeholders involved in the Country/Region)

Partnership arrangements was very much inherent in this Project and was actively sought for. Several agreements were entered into by FASPO with the FPAs and with the LGU of Puerto Princesa.

- Feedback from M&E Activities used for Adaptive Management

At the outset, it must be stated that an M&E system was in place and this allowed the Project to plod through the many challenges that it faced at the start of implementation. But as earlier discussed in the *Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project Logic/Strategy; Indicators)* and the *Assumptions and Risks* sections, the uneven formulation of indicators for the success of the Project vis-à-vis the desired outcomes has resulted in an odd situation from an M&E standpoint. This is because if one simply takes the expected results at face value, then Outcome 1 would appear as having been successfully implemented while Outcome 3 still needs a lot of work to be done, when it is the other way around. To such an extent then, the feedback from M&E activities becomes limited because it gives a false sense of accomplishment or failure.

- Project Finance

The Project had a total financing of US\$990,000. Of this, the GEF shouldered US\$475,000 in cash while the Philippine Government provided in-kind contribution worth US\$515,000 consisting mostly of office space, counterpart staff and involvement in studies and activities in relation to the Project.

In terms of actual fund utilization, the results are uneven and hard to measure especially from a coordination perspective. This is best explained through an example. Compared to the two other FPAs, the BSWM would seem to have taken full advantage of the financial facility under the Project especially in the consultation process for its updated land degradation plan. Upon query however as to why the two other FPAs did not avail of such facility, the response was because their own consultations processes were already being funded. To this extent then, it would appear that Project funding is underutilized but on the other hand, it is because horizontal coordination at the national level was already taking place and wastages in the form of double-funding for the same activity was being avoided.²⁶

As regards the financial management, as earlier discussed, the set-up adopted was unusual with the PMO not being subsumed by the CCMRD as its NTCO after the latter was resolved by the National Steering Committee to be the entity that will act as the coordinating committee for the Project. On the one hand, there is the CCMRD that determines what activities/programs will be undertaken, and on the other, the FASPO decides which ones were to be bankrolled. At worst, it could lead to conflicting priorities. At best, this led to another sense of interagency

²⁶ Whether or not this should be considered as counterpart funding of the Philippine Government to the Project needs to be studied further as the interview respondents did not identify their funding source. If it is also another GEF-funded project, it would be inappropriate to count it as counterpart contribution. If not, then the counterpart should be adjusted accordingly.

awkwardness and immobility. In the words of the Project, this situation could have been better “coordinated”.

- Monitoring and Evaluation: Design at Entry and Implementation (*)

In general, the Project incorporated several tools for M&E, many of which are standard for UNDP-sponsored projects. But there were also some that were unique to this Project.

Among the standard ones are regular meetings with the UNDP staff to check the progress of the Project, the regular meetings of the Steering Committee based on results indicated in the submitted quarterly and annual progress reports. A look into the annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) submitted by the FASPO for 2010, 2011, 2012 and mid-2013 provide an adequate description of the problems faced by the Project and the actions taken to address the same. Changes in the expected outputs from the original ones were also reflected in these reports.

This terminal evaluation is also part of the M&E design to provide an independent assessment of the Project’s delivery of desired outputs. It was also bidden-out to ensure both cost-effectiveness and evaluator capacity. Lastly, the Evaluation TOR is also quite detailed as to which items it wants to measure and assess.

As regards M&E tools which are unique to this Project, one is the capacity-development scorecard taken before and after the Project is implemented utilizing seven capacity-development indicators. Another is a survey to be undertaken by an independent specialist agency to determine mutual appreciation of the MEAs by the FPAs. It is not clear whether or not the latter was done.

Budget-wise, an amount of roughly \$50,000 was allocated for M&E activities for the Project and nothing in the project documents would indicate that this amount was insufficient for the purpose intended. The project activities themselves do not require any specialized form of M&E that would entail higher budgetary allocation. For these reasons, the M&E budget and funding is rated HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

Taking the above into consideration, the Evaluation grades the M&E design as SATISFACTORY. In the context of the Project, the above-described UNDP template is more than adequate to monitor its progress. Where the shortcoming lies is in the lack of a reflexive assessment process wherein the M&E indicators can be evaluated on whether or not they were sufficient to determine if the overall project objectives are being met vis-à-vis the indicators.

For instance, the coordination strived for among the FPAs at the national level under the current set of indicators would result in an unqualified success since the CCMRD was reactivated as NTCC, a Business Plan was formulated and regular budget for the CCMRD was allocated. However, during the course of the interviews for this evaluation, two of the other FPAs were not even aware that the UNCCD was actually holding its Conference of Parties (COP) last September. To be fair, the FPAs attended the UNCBD COP-10 in Nagoya, Japan last 2010 and the UNFCCC COPs were well-publicized. But this lack of awareness even when the UNCCD

COP was being held is hard to dismiss especially since the coordination that the Project was explicitly striving for was in the delivery of the country's obligations under all three MEAs.

- UNDP and Implementing Partner Implementation/Execution (*) Coordination, and Operational Issues

Lastly, as far as M&E implementation by the UNDP and FASPO is concerned, the Evaluation rates it as SATISFACTORY since all the prescribed steps have been undertaken thus far. This qualification is important because at the time this Evaluation was written, one of the M&E indicators designed specifically for this Project is the conduct of a survey by an independent specialist agency to determine objectively the mutual appreciation of the MEAs by the FPAs, as earlier mentioned. Per current assessment, this activity has yet to be done.

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

In implementing the Project, some factors were found by this Evaluation to have hindered or facilitated the same.

Hindering Factors. Among the hindering factors, first and foremost was the legal/institutional change brought about by the creation of the CCC. This has already been extensively discussed and suffice to state, it threw the Project off balance from which it never fully recovered. It not only placed both the CCC and the EMB (the original stakeholder) in a continuously awkward position, it also placed a constant cloud of doubt on the wisdom and relevance of the CCMRD.

Lest it be misunderstood, it is not a question of choosing between the CCC or the CCMRD. It is a question of how to tap the CCC as another venue for FPA coordination. There is no dispute that especially with the recent tragedy wrought by Typhoon Yolanda (T.S. Haiyan), climate change is at the forefront of the Philippine zeitgeist especially in the context of disaster risk reduction and management. With rehabilitation efforts underway, MEA coordination is urgent and how best to get involved in the new plans and strategies for rebuilding the towns of both Samar and Leyte provinces regardless of the institutional vehicle.²⁷

The focus on replication is also considered a hindering factor with the failure to secure the necessary administrative orders or memorandum circulars from the DENR or DILG serving as dampeners to an otherwise successful result achieved by the Project at the local level.

Lastly, the Evaluation considers the choice of the PPSRNP as a minor hindering factor. This is because despite the justification in the ProDoc in the choice of the area as a pilot site, it is really more of a biodiversity showcase and it is not the first site to come to mind when issues and concerns related to land degradation and climate change are discussed. To be sure, the local stakeholders in PPSRNP played a major role in the success of the Project as recognized here. However, this is not totally insurmountable and by way of recommendation, other sites where

²⁷ Fact is, the National Government recently created another interagency body that would oversee the rehabilitation of the areas hard-hit by the super typhoon, seemingly bypassing the legislatively ordained agencies like the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC) created by virtue of R.A. 10121 (2010).

all three MEA issues are more pronounced could be chosen as next sites for further pilot-testing. Already, Occidental Mindoro and Central Cebu are some of the sites that immediately come to mind.

Facilitating Factors. With regard to factors which contributed to the success of the Project, as stated, the sheer receptiveness of the local stakeholders (community and LGUs) of PPSRNP was a major factor. They brought much needed focus to the Project. Heretofore, the vertical and horizontal coordination which the Project sought to become efficient and effective seemed to be a network of one-way streets, all feeding into and heading towards the requirements of the international MEA bodies. The local stakeholders turned things around and identified the real incentive that should be discussed, not just in for the Project but for the entire MEA system, i.e., what is in it for the local communities to strive for MEA goals and objectives and contribute to the global environmental benefits? By fitting MEA priorities to their own local development priorities, they gave the MEAs an urgency and relevance that is worth investing upon on a broad scale.

The other important facilitating factor are the FPAs themselves. This is because despite the legal and institutional hurdles that the Project faced at the very outset on top of their own limitations at the local level, they managed to pull through for the Project. Especially at the national level, they showed that the project intervention should have been more likely process- or systems-driven, than organizational, because regardless of the set-up, the FPAs tried to cope and adapt.

Lastly, with regard to the pilot site, it helped that PPSRNP is less complex from a geopolitical perspective, being comprised of only four barangays and covered by only one city and province and the Project implementors were able to achieve the desired outcome sans the layers of bureaucracies and other problems associated with multiple or complex jurisdictions.

- Corrective Actions for the Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Project

In order to determine the necessary corrective actions, a short discussion of the lessons learned from the Project is in order. First, a more adaptive management response is needed to institutional changes. To be sure, the proverbial expressions that “This is easier said than done” and that “Everything is 20/20 on hindsight”, both apply. Nonetheless, the only reason this is being brought up is because the Business Plan developed for the Project (which ironically was to serve as a roadmap for the CCMRD), identified the institutional challenges from the establishment of the CCC.

Second lesson is that coordination is a result of an inclusive and iterative process. There must be a deliberate effort to invite and include other stakeholders because it is only in divergence of views, schedules, etc. that coordination problems emerge and can be potentially addressed. Organizational solutions are good but when, as in this case, there are already overlapping functions and jurisdictions, setting up another one may only hinder, not facilitate.

Third, as earlier discussed in the context of MEA relevance at the local level, coordination is a two-way street. The Project assumed that the *effective* coordination should be able to *efficiently* serve treaty needs but relevant coordination is the more sustainable one.

Fourth, the FPAs are the MEA champions. As the Project has shown, nobody else is in a better position to advance the MEA causes than the FPAs themselves, whether at the national or local level.

Lastly, ensure success first before replication, and constantly test the tools and products developed. While it has become trendy for project designs to incorporate or even institutionalize modes of replication, they may unnecessarily burden the project implementor or even worse, create future problems, especially if the products and services developed are still quite novel, and where there is still a large potential for error and lessons learned. Their early institutionalization and replication can pose greater risks unless subjected to rigorous testing than if simply further pilot-tested for tweaking and refinement.

- Actions to Follow-up or Reinforce Initial Benefits from the Project

From these lessons, the following actions are recommended to follow-up or reinforce the initial benefits from the Project.

First is to sit down and address the institutional problem that currently characterizes the existing set-up. This translates to the DENR as Implementing Partner and the UNDP as Implementing Agent having to sit down with the CCC in order to work out this conundrum. At this point, whether it is the CCC or the CCMRD which will serve as the coordination vehicle,²⁸ what is more important is to get a more substantial representation from the CCC in the Project. Understandably, each of the major stakeholders have a preferred option, with the DENR already invested in the CCMRD. There are also certain dynamics that come into play in choosing which body will act as the interagency coordinating body. (This was probably why a new NTCC sans political/institutional baggage was originally proposed in the ProDoc.) But what is interesting for this Evaluation is that regardless of which option is chosen, only the name of the entity will change but it is predicted that it is still going to be the same set of faces that will comprise their membership. Hopefully, the FPAs can overcome this coordination challenge.

Second, the Project needs to be extended given the very limited time left. Where it excelled is in Outcome 2. However, at the moment, a hard copy of the most important tool developed—the integration of MEAs in local development plans—has yet to be produced. The web portal also needs to be significantly improved and stacked with relevant materials and web links. These are tasks for the DENR.

During this extension period, it is recommended that a second phase for the STREEM project or the expansion of the Project's local level coordination be considered. This time, the focus should be less nationally-oriented and more on integrating MEAs in the local development plans by the inclusion of even more sites. The role of the FPAs this time will be in strengthening

²⁸ Other possible platforms to discuss this issue could be the cabinet cluster for the environment, or during one of the interagency meetings of the CCC.

the vertical integration with its local counterparts at the LGU level and enhancing their skills. This can be done through the existing Speakers' Bureau. Meantime, it is recommended that the sites to be chosen should have more varied conditions and characteristics in order to test how flexible and adaptable the tools developed through this Project, are. Further, integration with provincial and municipal/city development plans should be attempted. If considered, the DENR as Implementing Partner should be able to identify the sites and LGUs that it will partner with and prepare the appropriate project proposal before the project extension ends.

Considering that the Project still has a significant amount of remaining funds that could be used for printing, web portal improvement, etc. and the P1.0 million allocated by the DENR for the CCMRD, sustainability does not pose a major problem at least during the extension period. However, should the Project take on the proposed second phase of the project, as discussed in the Financial Sustainability portion of this Evaluation, this needs to be thought out further. Suffice to state, the merit of the Project is beyond doubt including its relevance in the light of recent calamities that hit the country.

Third, more CSOs should be engaged in projects of this nature especially since both the FPAs and NGOs can enhance their respective skills when working together. Considering that FPAs operate mostly at the national and international levels, grassroot presence is often lacking but this is where CSOs are particularly strong.

Lastly, the gender component should be more deliberately identified. This is largely missing in the current Project although one of the questions in the PIR does raise this aspect. Unfortunately, the responses, if any, have been vague.

- Proposals for Future Directions underlining Main Objectives

The importance of the MEAs in preserving and enhancing global environmental benefits is beyond doubt. However, it is the role of MEAs in the day to day lives of ordinary citizens that is in question. At the moment, one of the MEA concerns—climate change—is a byword for everyone. Most likely, it is because its impacts have intruded into the very lives of every person in the country at great cost in terms of lives lost and property damaged, rather than from capacity-building efforts of the MEAs' main stakeholders. However, it is also because of these tragedies that MEA awareness is raised and where they find meaning in such concepts as "climate-proofing", "disaster risk management", and the like.

In terms of future directions then, the next projects should be about how MEAs can be made even more relevant to the needs of local stakeholders be it in the form of how to climate-proof evacuation centers, how to build natural resilience to climate change, devising grassroots means for benefit-sharing of biodiversity, or preventing land degradation while enhancing biodiversity.

For the short-term, an extension of the Project is sought. There are a number of important activities/outputs that still need to be done that are more than halfway through. These include the web portal, the training module, and the printing and distribution of several knowledge materials. The independent survey also still needs to be conducted.

- Best and Worst Practices in Addressing Issues Relating to Relevance Performance and Success

The Project scored a significant achievement at the local level in integrating the MEAs in the barangay development plans of the pilot site. However, this success should be qualified because the pilot site has certain facilitating factors that may or may not be present in other sites and for which reason, further pilot testing of the tools developed is strongly recommended.

Nonetheless, how the implementors were able to achieve such integration, under circumstances which can best be described as challenging, should be documented, emulated and even this early, be considered a best practice. From a perusal of the workshop records, a certain level of skill was evident in order to float the local development issues vis-à-vis MEA concerns and the process could have easily fallen through absent skilful facilitation.

Given the institutional changes that the Project had to undergo and the limited time available for a thorough review, there are no worst practices that this Evaluation was able to find.

5. List of Annexes

- TOR
- Itinerary and List of Persons Interviewed
- List of Documents Reviewed
- Questionnaire Used
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Submitted by:



Ronaldo R. Gutierrez

TERMS OF REFERENCE

STREEM Terminal Evaluation

Background

The Government of the Philippines, through the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) received a grant from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to implement the project entitled “Strengthening Coordination for Effective Environmental Management (STREEM)”. The STREEM project was designed to generate global environmental benefits through improved coordination with respect to the implementation of cross-cutting issues among the three Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) being implemented in the country. Specifically, this includes the three Rio Conventions namely the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The STREEM project conducted a series of consultation and coordination activities at the national down to the local level to develop potential tools to support horizontal and vertical coordination mechanism for MEAs. At the national level, the project utilized existing mechanism for effective coordination among three Focal Point Agencies (FPAs) and consequently developed systems to pragmatically support the coordination and implementation at their level. At the local level, the project developed tools to mainstream MEAs at the local development plans and piloted these tools at the Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park (PPSRNP) in Palawan to strengthen local capacity for coordination. The final component of the project is the refinement and finalization of these tools generated from experience and lessons learned for dissemination and replication across the country.

The project has three project outcomes and ten expected outputs to be delivered. These are:

Outcome 1 - National Rio Convention Stakeholders are effectively coordinating the preparation and implementation of related policies, program and project activities

Expected Outputs:

- A National Technical Coordinating Committee and Office
- A Business Plan for the NTCC
- Initial Incentive System
- Potential tools to promote local level coordination

Outcome 2 - Local and National Stakeholders are addressing key global environmental issues in and around the PPSRNP in a coordinated manner.

Expected Outputs:

- Priorities and sequences of activities for MEA implementation are identified in the LGU pilot site
- Application/pilot testing of tools for enhanced MEA implementation at the local level

- Increased understanding on incentive system and the potential tools

Outcome 3 - International, national and local partners have adopted the tools prepared under the project

Expected Outputs:

- Finalized tools for promoting local level coordination
- Institutionalized Incentive System
- Tools, incentive systems, and all Project outputs disseminated to local, national and international partners

The above outputs were expected to be delivered within the three-year project implementation period (i.e. June 2009 to June 2012) with a total fund support of USD990,000.00. This consists of USD475,000.00 grant support from the GEF, and USD515,000.00 in-kind contribution from the Philippine government. However, since the project's actual ground implementation commenced only last April 2010, a no-cost extension until December 2013 was requested by the Implementing Partner to the UNDP last January 31, 2012. This was approved by the UNDP and the GEF last February 2012.

Similar to the other project monitoring and evaluation of UNDP-GEF funded projects, the final evaluation for the STREEM project will be conducted in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF guidelines and procedures. This shall be undertaken by the Project Coordinating Team and the UNDP Country Office with the support of an independent consultant. The M&E process will utilize the existing Logical Framework matrix of the project which provides the performance and impact indicators for the project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. This LogFrame along with the project's objectives will serve as the main basis for the proposed final evaluation of the project.

Purpose

The main objective of the terminal evaluation of the STREEM Project is to assess and rate the project results, the sustainability of project outcomes, the catalytic effect of the project, and the quality of the project's monitoring and evaluation systems. The evaluation will also identify "lessons learned and best practices" from the STREEM Project and offer recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF Projects.

Scope of the Terminal Evaluation

1) Assessment of Project Results

This includes the assessment of the project's achievement in terms of its objective, outputs and outcomes through corresponding ratings for each target. The assessment of project results aims to determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other short term or long term and positive or negative consequences. Furthermore it seeks to determine the extent of the achievement and the shortcomings of project in reaching its objective as stated in the Project Document.

Any changes with respect to the project design and whether those changes were approved will be also identified in this activity. In the absence of the baseline (initial conditions) data, an approximation of the baseline condition would be conducted to ensure that achievements and results are properly established.

Part of assessing the project results is the assessment of project outcomes. Outcomes are the likely achieved in short-term or in medium-term depending on the extent of the intervention of the project outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not limited to: stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behavior), transformed policy framework, and others. An assessment of the impact of these outcomes is encouraged when appropriate. This will be assessed using the appropriate indicators and relevant tracking tools.

To determine the level of achievement of the project's objective and outcomes, the following criteria will be assessed in the final evaluation:

- ✚ **Relevance:** Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
- ✚ **Effectiveness:** Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objective?
- ✚ **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of the above criteria will be conducted in an objective manner supported by sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. This could be done through the project monitoring records that would indicate quantifiable information. The above criteria will also be rated as follows:

- **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Unsatisfactory (U)** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

In rating the project's outcomes, the relevance and the effectiveness of the project will be considered as critical criteria. Thus, if ratings are provided separately on relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, the overall rating for the outcome of the project should not be higher than the lowest rating on relevance and effectiveness. To achieve an overall satisfactory rating for the outcomes, the project must therefore demonstrate an at least satisfactory rating on both relevance and effectiveness.

The project will also be assessed according to its results or impacts that include actual or anticipated impacts (could be negative or positive) or emerging long-term effects. However, since impacts are measured in long terms, it is understandable that the project's impacts might not be fully assessed. The evaluators of the project

should therefore indicate the steps to be taken to assess long-term project impacts, especially impacts on local population, global environment (e.g., reduced greenhouse gas emissions), replication effects and other national and local impacts. Wherever possible evaluators should indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future. Other areas for assessing the project's results are as follows:

- **Capacity Development-** The effects of the STREEM Project activities on strengthening the capacities of key relevant government bodies, private sectors, peoples'/community organizations or civil society organizations will be assessed.
- **Leverage** - An assessment of STREEM Project's effectiveness in leveraging funds that would influence larger projects or broader policies to support its goal will have to be conducted.
- **Awareness Raising**
 - STREEM Project's contribution to raise awareness of environmental issues and of the GEF will be examined;
 - STREEM Project's contribution to promote policy or advocacy activities and collaboration among communities will be assessed.

2) Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

Sustainability is defined as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The final evaluation will therefore assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination with corresponding rating. This includes an analysis on the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment would also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. The following are the four dimensions or aspects of sustainability that will be assessed:

- ❖ **Financial resources:** Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining the project's outcomes)?
- ❖ **Socio-political:** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/ benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- ❖ **Institutional framework and governance:** Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
- ❖ **Environmental:** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The final evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project, outcomes will be rated as follows:

- ✚ **Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- ✚ **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- ✚ **Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- ✚ **Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

3) **Assessment of the Catalytic Role of the project**

The final evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings will be requested for the catalytic role.

4) **Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation System**

The final evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the implementation of the Project M&E plan. This includes adequately funded M&E plan, and its execution or implementation. The final evaluation will look into how the Project Managers have utilized the results of the M&E to adjust or improve the project during its implementation. The assessment will also seek to determine whether the projects have considered the long-term monitoring provisions to measure mid-term and long-term results (such as global environmental effect, replication effects, and other local effects) after project completion. The final evaluation report will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of the project's M&E plan and its implementation.

Among the areas that will be looked at during the M&E assessment are as follows:

- **M&E design.** Projects should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- **M&E plan implementation.** The final evaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress towards the project objective and outcomes by collecting information on chosen indicators continually through the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and, projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.

- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E Activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, a separate mention will be made of: whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted at the project planning stage; and, whether M&E was adequately and timely funded during implementation.

Project monitoring and evaluation systems will be rated as follows on quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation:

- 🚩 **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Satisfactory(S):** There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Unsatisfactory (U):** There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- 🚩 **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The Project had no M&E system.

The overall rating of M&E during project implementation will be solely based on the quality of M&E plan implementation. The ratings on quality at entry of M&E design and sufficiency of funding both during planning and implementation stages will be used as explanatory variables.

Monitoring of Long Term Changes

M&E of long term changes is often incorporated in GEF supported projects as a separate component and it may include determination of environmental baselines, specification of indicators, provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis and use. This section of the final evaluation will describe the actions and accomplishments of the project in the establishment of a long term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

- Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
- What were the accomplishments and short comings in establishment of this system?
- Is the system sustainable, i.e. is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and has financing?
- Is the information generated by this M&E system being used as originally intended?

5) Assessment of Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results

There are other factors or processes that might have affected the attainment of the project results. These factors will be considered in the performance and results section of the report although evaluators are not expected to provide ratings. This include as follows:

- ❖ **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was

- designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
- ❖ **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks that are in line with the project's objectives?
 - ❖ **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities?
Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved?
 - ❖ **Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize?
 - ❖ **Implementing/Executing Agency's supervision and backstopping.** Did Implementing/ Executing Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did the Implementing/Executing Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the GEF projects?
 - ❖ **Co-financing and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
 - ❖ **Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

6) Lessons and Recommendations

Lessons learned and recommendations on all aspects of the project that are considered relevant will be reported in the Final Evaluation Report. Factors that contributed or hindered the following aspects of the project will also be analyzed: 1)

attainment of project objectives, 2) sustainability of project benefits, 3) innovation, 4) catalytic effect and replication, and 5) project monitoring and evaluation. Instead of providing recommendations to improve the project, this section will provide a well formulated lesson applicable to existing and relevant GEF projects or to GEF's overall portfolio.

7) Overall assessment or General evaluation

The Final Evaluation report will include information on when the evaluation took place, places visited, people involved, key questions utilized, and methodology. The report will likewise include the evaluation team's TOR or the individual consultant's TOR including all responses from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings. Further, the Final Evaluation Report shall not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification, for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, the final evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will consist of a desk review of relevant project documents and reports related to the proposed evaluation including, but not limited to, project periodic reports, technical reports/documents, etc. The Evaluation Expert is expected to conduct focused group discussions, meetings, and interviews with the relevant agencies, stakeholders and other partners on topics and issues that relate to the implementation and impact of the project. He/she must also familiarize himself/herself with the objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, project activities, and documented "lessons learned" of the project. Document review, group and individual interviews and site visits are some of the approaches that the Evaluation Expert may do. He/she may also conduct the following:

- Review of documents related to the project such as project document, quarterly and annual progress reports, other activity/component specific deliverables, reports and evaluation, if there are any, etc.
- Structured interview with knowledgeable parties, i.e., Project Director, Project Personnel, Sub-Contracting Parties/Entities, National Consultants, UNDP Country Office Counterparts, members of the Project Steering Committee/s/ Project Board, Community-Based/Peoples Organization/s, Project Beneficiaries, etc.
- A number of visits to project sites, if feasible. The site visits should be discussed with the STREEM Project Coordinating Team and the UNDP.

Timing and Submission of the Report

The STREEM Project evaluation will begin on **September 2013** and should be completed by the **November 2013**. A first draft evaluation report will be prepared by the Evaluation Expert within the evaluation period. This will initially be shared with the Implementing Partners and the other stakeholders for further deliberations and feedbacks. A final report will be prepared and delivered within one month after the evaluation exercise highlighting important observations, analysis of information and key conclusions including recommendations. Five sets of reports (i.e. electronic and hard copies) will be prepared and submitted to the UNDP Country Office and the DENR-FASPO. Below is the schedule and timing for the submission of the report:

Deliverables	Description	Proposed Date of Submission	% Payment
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method and submits to UNDP Country Office	September 15, 2013	10%
First Draft	Presentation of the initial findings to the Project Management Office and the UNDP Country Office at the end of the evaluation mission	October 15, 2013	20%
Draft Final Report	Submission of draft Full report following the outline in Annex A.	November 15, 2013	40%
Final Report	Submission of revised report to UNDP Country Office for uploading to UNDP ERC	November 30, 2013	30%

All the costs incurred for the conduct of the evaluation shall be charged against project funds.

Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation team will be composed of an independent national consultant. The Implementing Partner shall provide in advance copies of the necessary documents needed by the National Consultant during the evaluation period. Likewise, the DENR-FASPO shall provide the list of contact persons representing the various stakeholders of the project, which will be the basis for the tentative itinerary/schedule of activities, which the expert will prepare. The DENR-FASPO will finalize the schedule of activities in consultation with the expert and UNDP CO staff. The DENR-FASPO and UNDP-Country Office, Manila will coordinate the logistical arrangements for the evaluation.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (**Annex B**) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluators are conducted in accordance with the principles outlines in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

TOR of the National Consultant

He/she must have extensive knowledge in the environmental planning and institutional frameworks in the Philippines. He/she must have experience in developing performance indicators, project appraisal and evaluation of development projects. He/she will be part of the Evaluation Team that would assess the project's results, sustainability of project outcomes, project's M&E system, processes in achieving project's results, and identify lessons learned and recommendations. Specifically, he/she will provide analysis of the project's overall performance vis-à-vis its replicability and sustainability in the Philippine context.

Qualification Requirements

- 1) The Evaluator must be independent of both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance to the STREEM Project. He/she should not have been engaged in the activities to be evaluated, or responsible in decision-making roles for the design, implementation or supervision of the project. In cases where a member of an evaluation team has been involved with some aspects of the project, this member should refrain from evaluating those aspects. In cases where project evaluation team members are not independent, are biased and are not free of conflict of interest, UNDP will put in place a final evaluation quality control review by its independent evaluation office.
- 2) The Evaluator must be impartial and must present a comprehensive and balanced appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the project or activity being evaluated.
- 3) The Evaluator must be professional with strong evaluation experience, with requisite expertise in the subject matter of the project, and with experience in economic and social development issues.
- 4) The Evaluator must be knowledgeable about the relevant policies of the GEF.
- 5) The Evaluator must ensure that in conducting the final evaluation, the views of all relevant stakeholders are accounted. The TORs for this GEF project's final evaluation and its schedule should be made known to key stakeholders.
- 6) The Evaluator must familiarize himself with the project document and must use the information generated by the project including, but not restricted to, baseline and information generated by its M&E system. The Evaluator must also seek the necessary contextual information to assess the significance and relevance of results.

Minimum qualifications of the Terminal Evaluator/Consultant are as follows:

At least 5-10 years of proven experience with:

- Legal and policy analysis in natural resource management
- The logical framework approach and other strategic planning approaches;
- M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory);
- Planning, design and implementation of M&E systems;
- Training in M&E development and implementation and/or facilitating learning-oriented analysis sessions of M&E data with multiple stakeholders;
- Data and information analysis
- Report writing.

She/He must also have:

- A solid understanding of environmental management , with a focus on participatory processes, joint management, and gender issues;
- Familiarity with and a supportive attitude towards processes of strengthening local organizations and building local capacities for self-management;
- Willingness to undertake regular field visits and interact with different stakeholders, especially primary stakeholders;
- Computer skills;
- Leadership qualities, personnel and team management (including mediation and conflict resolution);
- Language skills as required

Desirable:

- Knowledge of the biodiversity, climate change and land degradation - focal areas in which the project operates;
- Understanding of UNDP and GEF procedures;
- Experience in data processing and with computers.
- Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and major donors. If possible, experience in the evaluation of GEF-funded capacity building projects.

Application Process

Applicants/individual consultants interested to undertake the evaluation are requested to send their CV and covering letter in English to registryph@undp.org.

Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

Evaluation Report Outline

i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual³²)

1. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated³³)

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

³¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

³² UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

³³ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Annex B

EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³⁴

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

Name of Consultant: Ronaldo R. Gutierrez

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at (place) on _____
Signature: 

³⁴ www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ITINERARY AND LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Manila

Interview Dates (2013)	Respondent (Office)	Venue
Sep 26	Amelia Supetran (UNDP) Dr. Gina Nilo (BSWM)	AIM Hotel BSWM
Oct 3	Grace Tena (UNDP)	UNDP
Oct 4	Gigi Merilo (EMB)	EMB
Oct 8	Dir. Teresita Mundita-Lim & Nancy Corpuz (PAWB)	DENR
Oct 23	Dir. Cristy Regunay (FASPO)	FASPO
Oct 24	USec. Manuel Gerochi (DENR)	DENR
Oct 29	Donna Sanidad (CCC)	CCC

No respondent expressed his/her availability for interview on the other interview dates made available for this Evaluation on September 24, 25, 27 and 30, and October 1, 11, 21, 22, 25 and 30.

▪ Summary of Field Visits

Puerto Princesa

Interview Dates (2013)	Respondent	Office
Oct 8	Elsie M. Cacho	Haribon-Palawan
	Bgy. Capt. Ramil C. Gonzales	Bgy. Cabayugan
	Kgd. Dario C. Cacho	Bgy. Cabayugan
	Bgy. Capt. Arnold F. Cayaon	Bgy. Tagabinet
	Kgd. Samson D. Almoroto	Bgy. Tagabinet
	Kgd. Mario O. Juderial, Sr.	Bgy. Tagabinet
	Kgd. Vicente D. Bacutun	Bgy. New Panggangan
	Kgd. Armando L. Dumaran	Bgy. New Panggangan
	Kgd. Gilbert I. Obenza	Bgy. New Panggangan
	Kgd. Rodolfo M. Caballema	Bgy. Marufinas
	Kgd. Manuel Bernas	Bgy. Marufinas
	Kgd. Alfredo Cacho	Bgy. Marufinas
	Melissa U. Macasaet	City Agricultural Office
Oct 9	PASu Gaspar D. Bactol	PPSRNP
	Daniel G. Tejada	Project Evaluation Officer IV
	James Albert Mendoza	Former PPC PASu
	Elizabeth A. Maclang	Current PPC PASu
Oct 10	Atty. Gregorio O. Austria	City Councilor, Committee on Environment, Sangguniang Panlungsod, Puerto Princesa

	Atty. Regidor Tulali	City ENRO
	Gerald Opiala	Forest Ranger
	Mercedes Limsa	NATRIPAL

List of Documents Reviewed

- Bgy. Marufinas, Puerto Princesa City (2013). 2013 Barangay Development Plan.
- Bgy. New Panggangan, Puerto Princesa City (2013). 2013 Barangay Development Plan.
- Bgy. Tagabenit, Puerto Princesa City (2013). 2013 Barangay Development Plan.
- DA-BSWM, DAR, DENR and DOST (2010). The Updated Philippine National Action Plan to Combat Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought (DLDD): FY 2010-2020.
- DENR-FASPO (2013). Capacity-Development Monitoring Scorecards (of BSWM, EMB and PAWB).
- DENR-FASPO (2013). Strengthening Coordination Tools for Effective Environmental Management: An Assessment Report.
- DENR-FASPO, UNDP and Ateneo School of Government (2010). Documentation Report: Mainstreaming Gender Responsiveness in Project Development and Management.
- DENR Special Order No. 246, series of 2011.
- DENR Special Order No. 699, series of 2011.
- MEA Website. Available at: http://mea.denr.gov.ph/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=98&Itemid=95.
- PCSD (2011). Resolution No. 1, series of 2011. Providing for the Reactivation of the Committee on the Conservation and Management of Resources for Development (CCMRD).
- PCSD (2012). CCMRD Business Plan.
- PCSD (2012). Resolution No. 1, series of 2012. Adoption of the Business Plan for the Committee on the Conservation and Management of Resources for Development (CCMRD) as the National Technical Coordinating Committee (NTCC) for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).
- PPSRNP-PAMB (2009). PAMB Resolution No. 140, s. 2009. A Resolution Endorsing the Implementation of STREEM (Strengthening Coordination for Effective Environmental Management) Project in Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park.
- PPSRNP-PAMB (2010). PAMB Resolution No. 05, s. 2010. A Resolution to Inform and Request All Concern (*sic*) Government Agencies to Properly Coordinate with the Protected Area Management Board Before Conducting any Activities within the Boundary of the Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park.
- Republic Act No. 9729 (2009). An Act Mainstreaming Climate Change into Government Policy Formulations, Establishing the Framework Strategy and Program on Climate Change, Creating for this Purpose the Climate Change Commission, and for Other Purposes.

UNDP (2009). UNDP Project Document. PIMS 3627: Strengthening Coordination for Effective Environmental Management.

UNDP (2010). 2010 Annual Project Review-Project Implementation Report (APR-PIR).

UNDP (2011). 2011 Annual Project Review-Project Implementation Report (APR-PIR).

UNDP (2012). 2012 Annual Project Review-Project Implementation Report (APR-PIR).

UNDP (2013). 2013 Annual Project Review-Project Implementation Report (APR-PIR).

UNDP (2013). Terms of Reference: STREEM Terminal Evaluation.

Other Documents

Date	Document	Author	Subject
15 Mar 2010	Memorandum of Agreement	DENR & Pto. Princesa LGU	STREEM Project
12 Apr 2010	Memorandum	PASu-PPSRNP	Submission of the Annual Work and Financial Plan 2010 of the STREEM Project for Implementation at Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park
17 Jun 2010	Letter to UNDP	FASPO	Proposed Budget Revision for STREEM 2010
23 Jun 2010	Memorandum	PAWB	STREEM Work and Financial Plan for 2010
25 Jun 2010	Letter to FASPO	BSWM	Work and Financial Plan (2010)
25 Jan 2011	Letter to FASPO	BSWM	Work and Financial Plan for 2011
25 Feb 2011	Letter to FASPO	EMB	Work and Financial Plan for 2011
13 Apr 2011	Memorandum	PAWB	PAWB-STREEM Work and Financial Plan for CY 2011
22 Jun 2011	Letter to UNDP	FASPO	Revised Annual Work and Financial Plan (AWFP) 2011 for the STREEM Project
25 Jan 2012	Letter to FASPO	BSWM	Work and Financial Plan for 2012
27 Feb 2012	Memorandum	PAWB	PAWB-STREEM Work and Financial Plan for CY 2012
31 Jul 2012	Letter to Pto. Princesa	FASPO	Acknowledging receipt of Bgy. Cabayugan Barangay Development Plan
26 Sep 2012	Letter to UNDP	FASPO	Budget Realignment of the 2012 Annual Work and Financial Plan (AWFP) of the STREEM Project
22 Nov 2012	Letter to UNDP	FASPO	Budget Realignment of the 2012 Annual Work and Financial Plan (AWFP) of the STREEM Project
Nov 2013	List	FASPO	STREEM Project Accomplishment/Activities Conducted

QUESTIONNAIRE USED

LogFrame Indicators

1. Do the national action plans (NAPs) for each of the MEA provide for coordinated implementation?
Cite examples.
2. Has the level of mutual appreciation of the conventions across the three stakeholder increased over the last 3 years?
What method was used to gauge the change in level of appreciation among stakeholders?
Cite documentation.
3. Have the capacities of the stakeholders/FPAs improved as a result of the project based on Scorecard Ratings?

Outcome 1

- 1.1 What is the role of PCSD-CCMRD in terms of coordinating the functions of the FPAs? Cite activities.
- 1.2 What performance indicator has been identified in the DA or DENR to determine the effective functioning of the PCSD-CCMRD?
- 1.3 In what specific ways can it be said that there is effective functioning of the coordination mechanism among the MEA stakeholders? Cite examples.
- 1.4 Has budget (\$10,000/year) been allocated for MEA coordination?
- 1.5 How sustainable is this allocation?

Outcome 2

- 2.1 What water quality standard was used for the Underground River?
- 2.2 Has the water quality in the Underground River improved or deteriorated by 2013?
- 2.3 What arrangements have been made for vertical coordination between national FPAs and their local counterparts in Puerto Princesa?
- 2.4 What arrangements have been made for horizontal coordination among local agencies in Puerto Princesa for the MEAs?
- 2.5 Has the Operations Manual for Local Coordination and Mainstreaming of MEAs in the Local Development been finalized? Has it been utilized?

Outcome 3

- 3.1 What tools have been developed for the project?
- 3.2 An IEC Strategy was mentioned. Was this actually developed?
- 3.3 What incentive schemes have been developed for the project?

- 3.4 Has a joint administrative order/memo circular been promulgated for the adoption and replication of these tools/incentives?
- 3.5 What legal instruments have been issued by national agencies to their local counterparts for the joint implementation of the MEAs?
- 3.6 Have these tools been incorporated in the performance system of the key stakeholders?
- 3.7 Are these performance indicators reflected in the Annual Work Plans of the key stakeholders?
- 3.8 What materials have been developed for the dissemination & pilot-testing of these tools nationwide?
- 3.9 How were they disseminated?
- 3.10 Where were they pilot-tested?

Other Questions

- Do you agree with the results of the survey taken prior to the STREEM project that there was generally a lack of awareness, duplication of efforts, no synergy, etc. among the FPAs over the MEAs?
- How has the Business Plan actually been implemented?
- How has the creation of the Climate Change Commission (as an inter-agency coordination body) affected the implementation of the project?
- How has the role of the EMB been affected by the CCC?
- How has the change in political leadership in Puerto Princesa affected the STREEM project?
- With regard to the website, is online reporting already operational?
- Has there been inter-agency coordination in the formulation of PHI positions in recent and upcoming COPs of the 3 different conventions?
- What are the project activities?
- What would you consider as project accomplishments?
- What is your overall self-rating for the project in terms of relevance, sustainability and efficiency?

The evaluator reserves the right to ask additional questions not included above related to the project evaluation.

Barangay Representatives

- Are you aware of the STREEM project?
- In your opinion, has your awareness of the MEAs improved because of the project?
- Are you aware of the MEAs (UNFCCC, UNCBD, UNCCD)?
- Are you aware of the importance of PPSRNP to the MEAs?
- Are you aware of any problems with regard to climate change within PPSRNP?
- Are you aware of any problems with regard to biodiversity within PPSRNP?
- Are you aware of any problems with regard to land degradation within PPSRNP?
- Enumerate activities have you done in relation to the STREEM project (try to be specific on dates, venues, other participants)
- What do you consider as project accomplishments?
 - Would you not have been able to do these without STREEM?
- Do you now have mechanisms to coordinate the concerns of the 3 MEAs (i.e. land degradation, climate change & biodiversity)?
 - What are these mechanisms/processes/committees/activities?
 - Are they formally institutionalized (i.e. resolutions, monthly meetings, special committees?)
- Does your barangay incorporate the MEAs in your development plans?
- In your opinion, has water quality improved in
- Do you have copies of all the documents you earlier mentioned?

FOR BARANGAY CABAYUGAN

- Bgy. Reso. 12-21 seems general, which are the portions really pertaining to MEA goals?

DENR PASu, Puerto Princesa PASu & Other Personnel

- Please enumerate the activities done in relation to the project.
- What would you consider as project accomplishments?
- What documentation do you have of all of these?
- What is your self-rating of the project's relevance?
- What is your self-rating of the project's sustainability?

(MAY BE ASKED TO PASu BUT BEST ADDRESSED LOCAL EMB PERSONNEL)

- Is the water quality of PPSRNP up to the standards?
 - What is the water quality standard applicable to PPSRNP?

- What parameters did you measure?
 - What do the values of the tests mean in terms of water quality for PPUR?
 - Why was Turbidity test not taken in 2012?
 - Do you have the 2013 results?
 - Do you have copies of the 2013 results?
- Have the different National Action Plans (NAP) of MEAs been mainstreamed in LGU plans? Example.
 - After dispensing with "joint management committees" in favor of integration with existing local development councils, have MEA concerns been incorporated in these committees?
 - What coordination arrangements were developed between FPAs and their local counterparts as a result of STREEM?
 - Who do you consider as the local counterpart of PAWB?
 - Who do you consider as the local counterpart of BSWM?
 - Who do you consider as the local counterpart of CCC?
 - How is the coordination mechanism you just described different from the situation prior to the STREEM project?
 - What documentation do you have, if any, of these new coordination mechanisms?
- How are the MEAs being mainstreamed in Puerto Princesa?
 - What are MEA-related programmes in Puerto Princesa?
 - Are you aware if the Puerto Princesa city government has allocated at least 3% of its environment budget to MEA-related programmes or MEA-mainstreaming?
- What tools have been developed as a result of the STREEM project?
 - Did the Operations Manual for LGU mainstreaming push through? Example.
 - What incentives have been developed as a result of the STREEM project?

Puerto Princesa City Agricultural Officer

- Are you aware of the STREEM project?
 - If yes, since when?
 - If yes, how?
 - If yes, how extensive is your participation?
- Are you aware of the MEAs (UNFCCC, UNCBD, UNCCD)?
- What are the problems of land degradation in PPSRNP?
- Are you aware of the interconnection between the problems of land degradation, climate change and biodiversity?
- What type of coordination do you have, if any, with the pertinent agencies for biodiversity and climate change in Puerto Princesa, in general?

- What are these local agencies?
- What type of coordination do you have, if any, with the pertinent agencies for biodiversity and climate change in PPSRNP?
 - What are these local agencies?
 - What about the 4 barangays?
- What coordination do you have, if any, with BSWM?
- What are the activities of your office in relation to MEA-mainstreaming?
- What activities of your office are related to any of the MEAs?
- Has your office allocated any budget for MEA-related programmes or MEA-mainstreaming?
 - How much?
 - What are these programmes or activities?

Puerto Princesa Climate Change Officer

- Are you aware of the STREEM project?
 - If yes, since when?
 - If yes, how?
 - If yes, how extensive is your participation?
- Are you aware of the MEAs (UNFCCC, UNCBD, UNCCD)?
- What are the problems of climate change in PPSRNP?
- Are you aware of the interconnection between the problems of land degradation, climate change and biodiversity?
- What type of coordination do you have, if any, with the pertinent agencies for biodiversity and land degradation in Puerto Princesa, in general?
 - What are these local agencies?
- What type of coordination do you have, if any, with the pertinent agencies for biodiversity and land degradation in PPSRNP?
 - What are these local agencies?
 - What about the 4 barangays?
- What coordination do you have, if any, with the Climate Change Commission (CCC)?
- What are the activities of your office in relation to MEA-mainstreaming?
- What activities of your office are related to any of the MEAs?
- Has your office allocated any budget for MEA-related programmes or MEA-mainstreaming?
 - How much?
 - What are these programmes or activities?

Sangguniang Bayan ng Puerto Princesa AND/OR City Administrator

- Are you aware of the STREEM project?

- If yes, since when?
 - If yes, how?
 - If yes, how extensive is your participation?
- Are you aware of the MEAs (UNFCCC, UNCBD, UNCCD)?
- Are you aware of the interconnection between the problems of land degradation, climate change and biodiversity?
- What type of coordination do you have locally with regard to the issues of biodiversity, land degradation and climate change in Puerto Princesa?
- What type of coordination do you have locally with regard to the issues of biodiversity, land degradation and climate change in PPSRNP?
 - What about the 4 barangays?
- What coordination do you have, if any, with the Climate Change Commission (CCC), Bureau of Soil and Water Management (BSWM) and the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB)?
- Was the recent successful campaign to declare PPSRNP one of the 7 Wonders of Nature related to the STREEM project?
- Has the Sangguniang Bayan allocated any budget for MEA-related programmes or MEA-mainstreaming?
 - How much?
 - What are these programmes or activities?

Local NGO

- Are you aware of the STREEM project?
- Are you aware of the interconnection between the problems of land degradation, climate change and biodiversity?
- In your opinion, what are the problems/threats facing PPSRNP?
- In your opinion, will better coordination between local and national agencies on issues related to land degradation, climate change and biodiversity help address these problems/threats to PPSRNP?
- Have you noticed any activity related to MEA-mainstreaming?
- Have you noticed any MEA-related programmes by local agencies?



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Contract for the services of an Individual Contractor

No. PAS-IC-2013-062

This Contract is entered into on **29 July 2013** between the United Nations Development Programme (hereinafter referred to as "UNDP") and **Ronaldo Gutierrez** (hereinafter referred to as "the Individual Contractor") whose address is at Unit 201, TDS Building, 72 Kamias Road, Quezon City.

WHEREAS UNDP desires to engage the services of the Individual Contractor on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, and:

WHEREAS the Individual Contractor is ready and willing to accept this Contract with UNDP on the said terms and conditions,

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Nature of services

The Individual Contractor shall perform the services as described in the Terms of References which form an integral part of this Contract and are attached hereto as *Annex I* in the following Duty Station(s): Manila, Philippines.

2. Duration

This Individual Contract shall commence on **15 August 2013**, and shall expire upon satisfactory completion of the services described in the Terms of Reference mentioned above, but not later than **15 November 2013**, unless sooner terminated in accordance with the terms of this Contract. This Contract is subject to the General Conditions of Contract for Individual contractors which are available on UNDP website at www.undp.org/procurement and are attached hereto as *Annex II*.

3. Consideration

As full consideration for the services performed by the Individual Contractor under the terms of this Contract, including, unless otherwise specified, his/her travel to and from the Duty Station(s), any other travel required in the fulfillment of the Terms of Reference in Annex I, and living expenses in the Duty Station(s), UNDP shall pay the Individual Contractor a total of **Philippine Peso Two Hundred Seventy Nine Thousand Seven Hundred (PhP 279,700.00) only** in accordance with the table set forth below. Payments shall be made following certification by UNDP that the services related to each Deliverable, as described below, have been satisfactorily performed and the Deliverables have been achieved by or before the due dates specified below, if any.

Deliverables	Amount (PhP)
10% upon submission and acceptance of Inception Report	27,970.00
20% upon submission and acceptance of First Draft report	55,940.00
40% upon submission and acceptance of Draft Final Report	111,880.00
30% upon submission and acceptance of Final Report	83,910.00

If unforeseen travel outside the Duty Station not required by the Terms of Reference is requested by UNDP, and upon prior written agreement, such travel shall be at UNDP's expense and the Individual Contractor shall receive a *per diem* not to exceed United Nations daily subsistence allowance rate in such other location(s).

Where two currencies are involved, the rate of exchange shall be the official rate applied by the United Nations on the day the UNDP instructs its bank to effect the payment(s).

4. Rights and Obligations of the Individual contractor

The rights and obligations of the Individual Contractor are strictly limited to the terms and conditions of this Contract, including its Annexes. Accordingly, the Individual Contractor shall not be entitled to any benefit, payment, subsidy, compensation or entitlement, except as expressly provided in this Contract. The Individual Contractor shall be solely liable for claims by third parties arising from the Individual Contractor's own acts or omissions in the course of performing this Contract, and under no circumstances shall UNDP be held liable for such claims by third parties.

5. Beneficiary

The Individual Contractor selects Lourdes R. Gutierrez as beneficiary of any amounts owed under this Contract in the event of death of the Individual Contractor while performing services hereunder. This includes the payment of any service-incurred liability insurance attributable to the performance of the services for UNDP.

Mailing address, email address and phone number of beneficiary:

15A Metro Ave., Bgy. Culiati, Quezon City 1128 rrg721@gmail.com 02 259 2653

Mailing address, email address and phone number of emergency contact (if different from beneficiary):

Unit 201 TDS Bldg., 72 Kamias Road, Quezon City 1102 mail.ulan@gmail.com 02 927 7306

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Contract.

By signing below, I, the Individual Contractor, acknowledge and agree that I have read and accept the terms of this Contract, including the General Conditions of Contracts for Individual contractors available on UNDP website at www.undp.org/procurement and attached hereto in Annex II which form an integral part of this Contract, and that I have read and understood, and agree to abide by the standards of conduct set forth in the Secretary-General's bulletins ST/SGB/2003/13 of 9 October 2003, entitled "Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse" and ST/SGB/2002/9 of 18 June 2002, entitled "Regulations Governing the Status, Basic Rights and Duties of Officials other than Secretariat Officials, and Experts on Mission".

☐ The Individual Contractor has submitted a Statement of Good Health and confirmation of immunization.

AUTHORIZING OFFICER:
United Nations Development Programme

Name: Toshihiro Tanaka
Country Director

Signature: _____

Date: 20 July 2013

INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR:

Name: Ronaldo Gutierrez

Signature: _____

Date: 03 August 2013

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

FOR THE SERVICES OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTORS



1. LEGAL STATUS: The Individual contractor shall have the legal status of an independent contractor vis-à-vis the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and shall not be regarded, for any purposes, as being either a "staff member" of UNDP, under the UN Staff Regulations and Rules, or an "official" of UNDP, for purposes of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 13 February 1946. Accordingly, nothing within or relating to the Contract shall establish the relationship of employer and employee, or of principal and agent, between UNDP and the Individual contractor. The officials, representatives, employees or subcontractors of UNDP and of the Individual contractor, if any, shall not be considered in any respect as being the employees or agents of the other, and UNDP and the Individual contractor shall be solely responsible for all claims arising out of or relating to their engagement of such persons or entities.

2. STANDARDS OF CONDUCT: In General: The Individual contractor shall neither seek nor accept instructions from any authority external to UNDP in connection with the performance of his or her obligations under the Contract. Should any authority external to UNDP seek to impose any instructions regarding the Individual contractor's performance under the Contract, the Individual contractor shall promptly notify UNDP and shall provide all reasonable assistance required by UNDP. The Individual contractor shall not take any action in respect of his or her performance of the Contract or otherwise related to his or her obligations under the Contract that may adversely affect the interests of UNDP. The Individual contractor shall perform his or her obligations under the Contract with the fullest regard to the interests of UNDP. The Individual contractor warrants that she or he has not and shall not offer any direct or indirect benefit arising from or related to the performance of the Contract or the award thereof to any representative, official, employee or other agent of UNDP. The Individual contractor shall comply with all laws, ordinances, rules and regulations bearing upon the performance of his or her obligations under the Contract. In the performance of the Contract the Individual contractor shall comply with the standards of conduct set in the Secretary General's Bulletin ST/SGB/2002/9 of 18 June 2002, entitled "Regulations Governing the Status, Basic Rights and Duties of Officials other than Secretariat Officials, and Expert on Mission". The Individual contractor must comply with all security directives issued by UNDP.

Prohibition of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse: In the performance of the Contract, the Individual contractor shall comply with the standards of conduct set forth in the Secretary-General's bulletin ST/SGB/2003/13 of 9 October 2003, concerning "Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse". In particular, the Individual contractor shall not engage in any conduct that would constitute sexual exploitation or sexual abuse, as defined in that bulletin.

The Individual contractor acknowledges and agrees that any breach of any of the provisions hereof shall constitute a breach of an essential term of the Contract, and, in addition to any other legal rights or remedies available to any person, shall give rise to grounds for suspension or termination of the Contract. In addition, nothing herein shall limit the right of UNDP to refer any alleged breach of the foregoing standards of conduct or any other terms of the Contract to the relevant national authorities for appropriate legal action.

3. TITLE RIGHTS, COPYRIGHTS, PATENTS AND OTHER PROPRIETARY RIGHTS: Title to any equipment and supplies that may be furnished by UNDP to the Individual contractor for the performance of any obligations under the Contract shall rest with UNDP, and any such equipment and supplies shall be returned to UNDP at the conclusion of the Contract or when no longer needed by the Individual contractor. Such equipment and supplies, when returned to UNDP, shall be in the same condition as when delivered to the Individual contractor, subject to normal wear and tear, and the Individual contractor shall be liable to compensate UNDP for any damage or degradation of the equipment and supplies that is beyond normal wear and tear.

UNDP shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights, including, but not limited to, patents, copyrights and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how or documents and other materials which the Individual contractor has developed for UNDP under the Contract and which bear a direct relation to, or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of the Contract, and the Individual contractor acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for UNDP. However, to the extent that any such intellectual property or other proprietary rights consist of any intellectual property or other proprietary rights of the Individual contractor: (a) that pre-existed the performance by the Individual

contractor of his or her obligations under the Contract, or (b) that the Individual contractor may develop or acquire, or may have developed or acquired, independently of the performance of his or her obligations under the Contract, UNDP does not and shall not claim any ownership interest thereto, and the Individual contractor grants to UNDP a perpetual license to use such intellectual property or other proprietary right solely for the purposes of and in accordance with the requirements of the Contract. At the request of UNDP, the Individual contractor shall take all necessary steps, execute all necessary documents and generally assist in securing such proprietary rights and transferring or licensing them to UNDP in compliance with the requirements of the applicable law and of the Contract. Subject to the foregoing provisions, all maps, drawings, photographs, mosaics, plans, reports, estimates, recommendations, documents and all other data compiled by or received by the Individual contractor under the Contract shall be the property of UNDP, shall be made available for use or inspection by UNDP at reasonable times and in reasonable places, shall be treated as confidential and shall be delivered only to UNDP authorized officials on completion of services under the Contract.

4. CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION: Information and data that are considered proprietary by either UNDP or the Individual contractor or that are delivered or disclosed by one of them ("Discloser") to the other ("Recipient") during the course of performance of the Contract, and that are designated as confidential ("Information"), shall be held in confidence and shall be handled as follows. The Recipient of such Information shall use the same care and discretion to avoid disclosure, publication or dissemination of the Discloser's Information as it uses with its own similar information that it does not wish to disclose, publish or disseminate, and the Recipient may otherwise use the Discloser's Information solely for the purpose for which it was disclosed. The Recipient may disclose confidential Information to any other party with the Discloser's prior written consent, as well as to the Recipient's officials, representatives, employees, subcontractors and agents who have a need to know such confidential Information solely for purposes of performing obligations under the Contract. Subject to and without any waiver of the privileges and immunities of UNDP, the Individual contractor may disclose Information to the extent required by law, provided that the Individual contractor will give UNDP sufficient prior notice of a request for the disclosure of Information in order to allow UNDP to have a reasonable opportunity to take protective measures or such other action as may be appropriate before any such disclosure is made. UNDP may disclose Information to the extent required pursuant to the Charter of the United Nations, resolutions or regulations of the General Assembly or its other governing bodies, or rules promulgated by the Secretary-General. The Recipient shall not be precluded from disclosing Information that is obtained by the Recipient from a third party without restriction, is disclosed by the Discloser to a third party without any obligation of confidentiality, is previously known by the Recipient, or at any time is developed by the Recipient completely independently of any disclosures hereunder. These obligations and restrictions of confidentiality shall be effective during the term of the Contract, including any extension thereof, and, unless otherwise provided in the Contract, shall remain effective following any termination of the Contract. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Individual contractor acknowledges that UNDP may, in its sole discretion, disclose the purpose, type, scope, duration and value of the Contract, the name of the Individual contractor, and any relevant information related to the award of the Contract.

5. TRAVEL, MEDICAL CLEARANCE AND SERVICE INCURRED DEATH, INJURY OR ILLNESS: If the Individual contractor is required by UNDP to travel beyond commuting distance from the Individual contractor's usual place of residence, and upon prior written agreement, such travel shall be at the expense of UNDP. Such travel shall be at economy fare when by air.

UNDP may require the Individual contractor to submit a "statement of good health" from a recognized physician prior to commencement of services in any offices or premises of UNDP, or before engaging in any travel required by UNDP, or connected with the performance of the Contract. The Individual contractor shall provide such a statement as soon as practicable following such request, and prior to engaging in any such travel, and the Individual contractor warrants the accuracy of any such statement, including, but not limited to, confirmation that the Individual contractor has been fully informed regarding the requirements for inoculations for the country or countries to which travel may be authorized.

In the event of death, injury or illness of the Individual contractor which is attributable to the performance of services on behalf of UNDP under the terms of the Contract while the Individual contractor is traveling at UNDP expense or is

16. AUDITS AND INVESTIGATIONS: Each invoice paid by UNDP shall be subject to a post-payment audit by auditors, whether internal or external, of UNDP or by other authorized and qualified agents of UNDP. The Individual contractor acknowledges and agrees that UNDP may conduct investigations relating to any aspect of the Contract or the award thereof, and the obligations performed thereunder.

The Individual contractor shall provide full and timely cooperation with any post-payment audits or investigations hereunder. Such cooperation shall include, but shall not be limited to, the Individual contractor's obligation to make available any relevant documentation and information for the purposes of a post-payment audit or an investigation at reasonable times and on reasonable conditions. The Individual contractor shall require his or her employees, subcontractors and agents, if any, including, but not limited to, the Individual contractor's attorneys, accountants or other advisers, to reasonably cooperate with any post-payment audits or investigations carried out by UNDP hereunder.

If the findings or circumstances of a post-payment audit or investigation so warrant, UNDP may, in its sole discretion, take any measures that may be appropriate or necessary, including, but not limited to, suspension of the Contract, with no liability whatsoever to UNDP.

The Individual contractor shall refund to UNDP any amounts shown by a post-payment audit or investigation to have been paid by UNDP other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Contract. Such amount may be deducted by UNDP from any payment due to the Individual contractor under the Contract.

The right of UNDP to conduct a post-payment audit or an investigation and the Individual contractor's obligation to comply with such shall not lapse upon expiration or prior termination of the Contract.

17. SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES:

AMICABLE SETTLEMENT: UNDP and the Individual contractor shall use their best efforts to amicably settle any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of the Contract or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof. Where the parties wish to seek such an amicable settlement through conciliation, the conciliation shall take place in accordance with the Conciliation Rules then obtaining of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law ("UNCITRAL"), or according to such other procedure as may be agreed between the parties in writing.

ARBITRATION: Any dispute, controversy or claim between the parties arising out of the Contract, or the breach, termination, or invalidity thereof, unless settled amicably, as provided above, shall be referred by either of the parties to arbitration in accordance with the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules then obtaining. The decisions of the arbitral tribunal shall be based on general principles of international commercial law. For all evidentiary questions, the arbitral tribunal shall be guided by the Supplementary Rules Governing the Presentation and Reception of Evidence in International Commercial Arbitration of the International Bar Association, 28 May 1983 edition. The arbitral tribunal shall be empowered to order the return or destruction of goods or any property, whether tangible or intangible, or of any confidential information provided under the Contract, order the termination of the Contract, or order that any other protective measures be taken with respect to the goods, services or any other property, whether tangible or intangible, or of any confidential information provided under the Contract, as appropriate, all in accordance with the authority of the arbitral tribunal pursuant to Article 26 ("Interim Measures of Protection") and Article 32 ("Form and Effect of the Award") of the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules. The arbitral tribunal shall have no authority to award punitive damages. In addition, unless otherwise expressly provided in the Contract, the arbitral tribunal shall have no authority to award interest in excess of the London Inter-Bank Offered Rate ("LIBOR") then prevailing, and any such interest shall be simple interest only. The parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of any such dispute, controversy or claim.

18. LIMITATION ON ACTIONS: Except with respect to any indemnification obligations in Article 9, above, or as are otherwise set forth in the Contract, any arbitral proceedings in accordance with Article 17, above, arising out of the Contract must be commenced within three (3) years after the cause of action has accrued.

The Parties further acknowledge and agree that, for these purposes, a cause of action shall accrue when the breach actually occurs, or, in the case of latent defects, when the injured Party knew or should have known all of the essential elements of the cause of action, or in the case of a breach of warranty, when tender of delivery is made, except that, if a warranty extends to future performance of the goods or any process or system and the discovery of the breach consequently must await the time when such goods or other process or system is ready to perform in accordance with the requirements of the Contract, the cause of action accrues when such time of future performance actually begins.

19. PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES: Nothing in or relating to the Contract shall be deemed a waiver, express or implied, of any of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations, including its subsidiary organs.