

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid Term Evaluation

Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas in the Philippines Project (now known as New Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project – NewCAPP)

BACKGROUND

The importance of the Philippines in the world terrestrial biodiversity map rests in it being one of the seventeen megadiverse countries which host 70-80% of the world's life forms. Because of its size, the country is regarded to harbor more diversity of life than any other country on earth on a per hectare basis. Yet, it is one of the only two countries in the world – Madagascar being the other, which are both a megadiverse country and a biodiversity hotspot. The country has more than 52,177 described species, of which more than half are found nowhere else on earth. Of these, 491 threatened species already are listed in the 2004 IUCN Red List. Of more than 1,130 terrestrial wildlife species recorded for the Philippines, almost half (49%) are endemic; 157 are threatened, and 128 are threatened endemic species. The country is ranked as 5th in the world in terms of the number of plant species.

The archipelago is also now recognized as one of the most important centers of amphibian and reptile diversity in Southeast Asia. An estimated total of 359 species of amphibians (101 species) and reptiles (258 species) are now known in the country. Of the 359 species, 246 (68%) are endemic – currently the highest known percentage endemism among vertebrates. The Philippines is home to 576 species of birds, of which 395 species are resident breeders. Of the resident breeders, 195 species are endemic, while 126 are restricted range species (range size estimated to be < 50,000 sq. km.). This record makes the Philippines the 4th country in the world terms of bird endemism. About 45 species are either extinct in the wild, critical, or endangered. Forty of the 45 are endemic birds, making the Philippines the number one country in the world in terms of threatened endemic species of bird.

The archipelago is also home to one of the greatest concentration of terrestrial mammalian diversity in the world and the greatest concentration of endemic mammals in the world on a per unit basis. The most recent inventory of land living mammals includes 174 indigenous species, 111 of which are endemic, or about 64%. Despite this, the mammal assemblage in the Philippines is the 8th most threatened in the world, with 50 threatened species. The diversity and endemism is believed to be much more than what is reported due to lack of information and knowledge on many of the country's KBAs. The country has one of the highest discoveries in the world, with 36 new species discovered in the last 10 years.

As a middle income country, the Philippines faces major threats to the biodiversity of its terrestrial areas. These include: habitat degradation and land conversion due to logging and increasing population; inappropriate land use planning; overharvesting of resources; mining threats and infrastructure development. The country's National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) has been the main government response to place important biodiversity areas under effective management. To date, a total of 240 protected areas covering 5.4 million hectares have been established, but this represents only 35% of the identified key biodiversity areas (KBAs). In order to protect the remaining biodiversity resources and

ensure their sustainable use, there is a need to address key capacity constraints. These are: (i) biogeographical representativeness; (ii) limited capacity for PA management; and (iii) limited financial sustainability.

The expansion of the national PA system to recognize new conservation areas such as those managed by indigenous peoples (IPs), local communities and local government units (LGUs) is seen as an opportunity to accelerate the coverage of the existing system, before continued degradation set in the important KBAs. In partnership with key organizations, local communities and other stakeholders, the Project will directly address key barriers and establish solid foundations for accelerated expansion of the terrestrial system in the Philippines, supported by strong management capacities, and sustainable financing. It is envisaged that such expansion can be achieved through recognition and/or establishment of new governance mechanisms for establishment of new conservation areas such as indigenous community conserved areas (ICCAs), and LGU managed local conservation areas (LCAs); and make these part or complementary to the national PA system. The expanded PA system will have comprehensive ecological coverage and strengthened links to local and indigenous communities and their domains, surrounding landscape, through the integration of new conservation areas.

The major outcomes envisaged by the Project are: (i) PA system of Philippines has been expanded under new and diverse management regimes (ancestral domain, local government and community managed areas) to cover an additional 400,000 ha. of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and with enhanced potential for further expansion; (ii) improved conservation effectiveness through enhanced systemic, institutional and individual capacities; and (iii) enhanced financial sustainability of the terrestrial PA system. A copy of the Project Document and GEF CEO Endorsement is available at the PAWB and in GEF website.

The Project shall be implemented over a period of five years starting September 2010, covering ten Key Biodiversity Areas as pilot sites. It is managed by the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB) which has established a Project Management Unit (PMU) to implement certain outputs and coordinate the work of partners in pilot sites. The Project will be half way into its implementation by March 2013, and a mid-term evaluation on or around this date is envisaged.

These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the NewCAPP.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Table 1. Project Summary Table				
Project Title : Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas in the Philippines Project (otherwise known as New Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project – NewCAPP)				
GEF Project ID (PIMS #)	3530		At Endorsement (US \$ M)	By end December 2012¹ (US \$ M)
UNDP Project ID:	00071662	GEF Financing:	3.500	???
Country:	Philippines	UNDP	1.044	???
Region:	Asia	Government:	2.741	???
Focal Area:	Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1	Other (NGOs, LGUs, communities)	3.752	???

¹ To be determined in January, 2013.

Operational Program:	GEF-4 Strategic Program: BD-SP3	Total Co-financing:	7.537	???
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	11.037	
Other Partners Involved:	NGOs, local government units, IP and local communities	ProDoc Signature: March 2010 Date Project began: August 2010 (Inception Workshop)		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	September 2014	Proposed: September 2015

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The objectives of this Mid Term Evaluation are:

- To assess implementation progress and evaluate results and any early indication of impact;
- To strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project, to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- To ensure accountability of resource use; and
- To document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned, so as to enhance organizational and development learning around the project.

Key evaluation questions include:

- To what extent have expected results and outcomes been achieved?
- Is there a need or opportunity to refocus any of the planned activities to make the UNDP GEF investment more effective?
- How efficient has been the use of resources to produce outputs and results?
- Which areas of work should the UNDP-GEF investment target to deliver sustainable impact beyond the current programme period?
- Are the management and administrative arrangements necessary and adequate to fully deliver the project?
- How embedded is the project in the implementing partner and in the sector?
- In light of recent developments and other donor activity in the sector, how can the project provide a strategic focus considering the remaining resources and implementation period?
- What important lessons can be brought to bear in the design and implementation of similar programs?
- How can project learnings and experiences enhance the underlying assumptions about the role of conservation areas in biodiversity conservation?
- What are the prospects for sustainability? What are the risks and how can these be effectively managed till the remaining period of implementation?

An indicative list of evaluation questions is presented in Annex D. Based on results of initial analysis, the Consultant/s shall review the list and present the revised questions as focus of the evaluation.

The Mid Term Evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator/s is/are expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF Operational Focal Point, UNDP Country Office, PAWB and PMU, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in Bangkok, Thailand and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Manila, including selected project sites (Annex A). Interviews will be held with the government Implementing Partner (IP) – PAWB of the Department of Environment and

Natural Resources (DENR); as well as other agencies (National Commission on Indigenous Peoples); partner NGOs; local government units; local and indigenous peoples' communities; relevant consultants and other partner organizations. The evaluation will also hold discussions with major donor organizations with on-going and planned activities in the sector, such as GIZ's Protected Areas Management Enhancement (PAME) Project, and USAID's Biodiversity and Watersheds Improved for Stronger Economy and Ecosystems Resilience Project (B+WISER).

The evaluator/s will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex C), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex E.

Table 2. Rating of Project Performance

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Comments	
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M and E	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M & E design at start up	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E Plan Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Executing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 point scale)	
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 2 point scale)	
Effectiveness	(rate 6 point scale)	
Efficiency	(rate 6 point scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).		
Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Financial Resources	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Socio-economic	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Institutional Framework and Governance	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Environmental	(rate: 4 point scale)	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 3 point scale)	
Environmental Stress reduction	(rate 3 point scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3 point scale)	
Overall Project Results	(rate 6 point scale)	

PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE ACTUALS

The Evaluator/s will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and PMU to obtain financial data on co-financing table below, which will be included in the mid-term evaluation report.

Table 3. Status of Co-Financing, NewCAPP, as of Mid-term (March 2013)

Co Financing Type/Source	UNDP Own Financing Million US \$		Government Million US \$		Partners (NGOs, LGUs and Communities) Million US \$		Total Million US \$	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants/Cash	0.939		1.233		1.313		3.485	
Loans/Concessions								
• In kind support	0.104		1.507		2.438		4.049	
• Other								
Totals	1.043		2.740		3.751		7.534	

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed within other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluator/s will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements².

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in the Philippines. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator/s and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROTI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

The Evaluation is expected to start early April 2013 and have an estimated total input of 35 working days. The final work plan will be agreed jointly by the Evaluation Team and UNDP upon submission of a draft work plan and methodology for discussion.

Table 4. Timetable for NewCAPP MTE Preparation

Activity	Timing	Completion Date ³
Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To include orientation to the assignment, initial document review, and preparation/discussion of the Evaluation Plan 	2 days	April 3, 2013
Evaluation Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed document review, interviews with key project personnel and partners, stakeholder consultations, visits to selected sites 	15 days	April 18, 2013
Draft Evaluation Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis and preparation of draft evaluation report highlighting initial findings Debriefing Preparation of Draft Evaluation Report including comments provided during the debriefing meeting 	10 days	April 29, 2013
Final Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of Final Evaluation Report, including addressing comments from stakeholders on the first draft 	4 days	May 14, 2013

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator/s is expected to deliver the following:

Table 5. MTE Deliverables

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report ⁴	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

The Project Team in consultation with UNDP CO will be responsible for logistical arrangements for the field visits including setting up meetings and organizing in country travel. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

³ Estimates only. These will be validated during Inception.

⁴ When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The evaluation will commence when formalities are completed ideally by late March 2013. The Evaluation Team will present preliminary findings to the Project Board planned for late June 2013. A draft Mid Term Evaluation Report for comments will be submitted to UNDP within 5 days following the de-briefing. UNDP will coordinate comments from partners and share consolidated written comments with the consultants within 14 days after receiving the draft MTE report. A final MTE report with comments from partners incorporated will be submitted to UNDP no later than July, 2013; for consideration in the preparation of the Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Review by UNDP-GEF.

THE QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE NATIONAL CONSULTANT

The National Consultant will have the following profile/competencies:

- An effective evaluation manager with demonstrated experience in conducting international development evaluations; prior experience in GEF Project evaluations would be an advantage;
- Demonstrated strong knowledge of Monitoring and Evaluation methods for development projects; knowledge of UNDP's results-based management orientation and practices;
- Familiarity with biodiversity conservation issues in the Philippines,
- Knowledge and experience in diversification of protected area governance regimes, including recognition of ICCAs, and strengthening the role of sub national governments in biodiversity conservation;
- Demonstrated experience with implementation and/or evaluation of capacity-building efforts in developing countries, in the area of biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management.
- Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills.

The National Consultant should have at least 10 years' experience in the implementation of protected area management, PA system wide planning and monitoring, capacity building for PA management, and PA financing sustainability. He/She should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The National Consultant will report to the UNDP Country Director through the Programme Manager – Energy and Environment Programme. The environment team at UNDP CO will provide support to the development of the evaluation work plan in consultation with key project partners. The project team (PMU) will serve as the reference group for the evaluation and ensure the monitoring of satisfactory completion of evaluation deliverables.

UNDP will provide office space and access to office services such as, internet and printing. Evaluator/s should provide their own computer and communications equipment.

In consultation with the National Consultant and as requested, the PMU personnel will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and

facilitate contact where needed. The team will also assist in organizing any briefing de-briefing meetings including coordination of stakeholders' input in the evaluation draft report.

The National Consultant may engage other consultants and/or researchers to assist in the evaluation. The TORs and qualifications will be discussed with and approved by UNDP in consultation with the PMU. However, the professional fee/compensation of the additional consultants should be part of the financial proposal of the National Consultant, and may be discussed during the contract negotiation.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultant/s will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Consultant/s will be contracted by UNDP and remunerated according to the reviewed and accepted financial proposal. The contract will be output-based and payment issued only upon delivery of satisfactory outputs/milestones.

Table 6. Payment Schedule

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://www.undp.org.ph.jobs>) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions.

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX 2

MID-TERM EVALUATION ITINERARY

Activity		Schedule
1	Preparatory Activities	
1.1	Project Briefing	23 July 2013
1.2	Initial review of documents	
1.3	Preparation and submission of Inception Report	7-23 July 2013
1.4	Approval of Inception Report	25 July 2013
2	Data Gathering	
2.1	Key Informant Interviews	
2.1.1	Atty. Alton Durban	10 July 2013
2.1.2	Mr. Dave de Vera	10 July 2013
2.1.3	Mr. Giovanni Reyes	10 July 2013
2.1.4	Ms. Amelia Supetran (UNDP)	22 July 2013
2.1.5	PAWB Dir. Mundita S. Lim	23 July 2013
2.1.6	Sec. JR Nereus Acosta	29 July 2013
2.1.7	FMB Asst. Dir. Mayumi Natividad and For. Genesis Francisco	1 Aug 2013
2.1.8	Isabelo R. Montejo, RED, DENR 7	5 Aug 2013
2.1.9	Rudy Aragon, NewCAPP NRM Specialist	6 Aug 2013
2.1.10	CBCFI (May Ybanez, Estella Rodriguez, Del Justin)	6 Aug 2013
2.1.11	Gov. Roger Mercado, Southern Leyte	6 Aug 2013
2.1.12	Board Member Daisy Gamale, Southern Leyte	6 Aug 2013
2.1.13	PENRO Bhoy Tumol	6 Aug 2013
2.1.14	Ms. Floradema Eleazar	20 Aug 2013
2.1.15	RTD Reynald Yawan, DENR-CAR	27 Aug 2013
2.1.16	Gwendolyn Bambalan, RTD, DENR, Reg 4 A	3 Sept 2013
2.1.17	Miks Padilla and Portia Villarante, AnthroWatch	9 Sept 2013
2.1.18	USec. Manuel Gerochi	18 Sept 2013
2.1.19	NCIP Executive Director Marlea Muñoz	20 Sept 2013
2.2	FGD in Manila	
2.2.1	Project team	20 Aug 2013
2.3	Field Visits (will include KIIs and FGDs with implementing partners and local stakeholders)	
2.3.1	Mt. Nacolod	4-7 Aug 2013
2.3.2	Nug as Lantoy	5 - 6 Aug 2013
2.3.3	Kalinga Watershed	4-7 Aug 2013
2.3.4	Mt. Kalatungan and Hilong-Hilong	9-13 Sept 2013
2.3.5	Mts. Iglit Baco National Park	23-25 Sept 2013
2.4	Participation in project activities	
2.4.1	First Steering Committee Meeting of the Philippine ICCA Consortium	10 July 2013
2.4.2	NCIP Orientation with BPP (Sequoia Hotel)	7 August 2013

ANNEX 3-A

LIST OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWEES	
Acosta, Juan Romeo Nereus	Presidential Adviser for Environmental Protection and former Congressman, Bukidnon
Aragon, Rudy	NewCAPP NRM Specialist
Bambalan, Gwendolyn	Regional Technical Director, DENR, Region 4-B
D' Cruz, Joseph	Regional Adviser, UNDP
De Vera, Dave	ICCA Specialist, NewCAPP
Durban, Alton	Legal Specialist, NewCAPP
Eleazar, Floradema	Chief Technical Adviser, NewCAPP
Francisco, Genesis	Forester, Forest Management Bureau, DENR
Gamale, Daisy	Provincial Board Member, Southern Leyte
Gerochi, Manuel	Undersecretary, DENR
Justin, Del	Cebu Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc.
Lim, Theresa Mundita	Director, Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau, DENR
Mercado, Roger	Governor, Southern Leyte
Montejo, Isabelo R.	Regional Executive Director, DENR Region 7
Muñez, Marlea	Executive Director, National Commission on Indigenous Peoples
Natividad, Mayumi	Assistant Director, Forest Management Bureau, DENR

LIST OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWEES

Padilla, Miks	AnthroWatch
Ragub, Manolito	Regional Director, DENR-Region 8
Reyes, Giovanni	Coalition of Indigenous Peoples Network in the Philippines (KASAPI)
Rodriguez, Estella	Cebu Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc.
Supetran, Amelia	Team Leader, Energy and Environment Unit, UNDP CO
Tumol, Bhouy	Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Officer, Southern Leyte
Villarante, Portia	AnthroWatch
Ybañez, May	Cebu Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc.

ANNEX 4

List of Documents Reviewed

- Project Document and CEO Endorsement – Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial protected Areas in the Philippines
- Annual Reports (2010 Annual cum Inception Report, 2011, 2012, 2013)
- Quarterly Reports
- APRs/PIRs (2011, 2012, 2013)
- Minutes of Project Board meetings
- Work and Financial Plans (2010, 2011, 2012, 2013)
- Draft Procedures for ICCA Documentation
- Draft Modules for Establishment of Local Conservation Areas
- Proceedings of National ICCA Conference, March 2012
- Reports of Subnational ICCA Conferences, November 2011
- Communities in Nature: State of PA Management in the Philippines
- NewCAPP Technical Bulletins
- Reports on FLUP Workshops, July and September, 2012
- Report on Capacity Assessment of PAW Sector
- Report on PA Financing Study by National Consultant
- Reports on Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Study
- Report on Legal Review of NIPAS and related laws
- Updated PA Financing Scorecard, 2012
- METT Scorecards, 2012
- Knowledge, Awareness and Practice Report (PowerPoint slides)

Annex 5-A

Summary of Site Visit

Site Date	Mt. Nacolod (Tacloban and Southern Leyte) 4-7 August 2013	
Date/Time	Activity	
August 4		
3:40 – 5:00 PM	Travel from Manila to Tacloban City	
August 5		
9:00 – 11:00 AM	Roundtable discussion with DENR VIII/DENR VIII Conference Room, Tacloban City	
11:00 – 12:00	Interview with RED Manolito Ragub , RED Office, DENR VIII, Tacloban City	
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch at DENR Regional Office	
1:00 – 4:00	Travel time from Tacloban City to Maasin City	
	Overnight in a hotel in Maasin City	
August 6		
9:00 – 10:30	Interview with Southern Leyte Provincial ENRO and SP Gamale/Maasin City	
10:30 – 12:00	Round table discussion with DENR PENRO Southern Leyte, CENRO San Juan, CENRO Maasin, NewCAPP Focal Persons for PENRO Southern Leyte and CENRO San Juan @ PENRO, Southern Leyte	
12:00 – 1:00 PM	Lunch @ Maasin City	
1:00 – 2:00 PM	Travel to Sogod, Southern Leyte	
2:00 – 3:30	Focus Group Discussion with Libagon, Hinunangan, Sogod, Silago and St. Bernard @ Sogod, Southern Leyte	
3:30 – 6:00	Travel from Sogod to Tacloban City	
	Overnight at Deriada Hotel, Tacloban City	
August 7	Travel from Tacloban City to Manila	

ANNEX 5-B

Summary of Site Visit

Site Date	Mts. Nug-as and Lantoy (Cebu) 5-6 August 2013	
Day/Time	Activity	
August 5, 2013 (Monday)		
7:00 – 8:15 AM	Travel from Manila to Cebu	
8:15 – 10:30 AM	Travel from Cebu airport direct to venue for FGD, i.e., Dalaguete, Cebu	
10: 30 – 12:00 Noon	Focus Group Discussion with selected BioCon Team members of Argao, Dalaguete and Alcoy LGUs/Dalaguete, Cebu	
12:00 – 1:00 PM	Lunch with with BioCon team members/Dalaguete Municipal Hall	
1:00 – 2:00	Roundtable discussion with Mayors of Dalaguete, Alcoy and Argao/Dalaguete Municipal Hall	
2:00 – 3:30 PM	Travel from Dalaguete, Cebu to Cebu City	
3:30 – 4:00	Interview with DENR 7 RED Isabelo R. Montejo	
4:00 – 5:30	Roundtable discussion with DENR 7 at Office of the RTD PAWCZMS; ▪ RTD for FMS; ▪ RTD for PAWCZMS; ▪ DENR NewCAPP Project Coordinator; and RPAO	
August 6, 2013 (Tuesday)		
9:00 – 10:30 AM	Interview with For. Rudy Aragon, NewCAPP NRM Specialist	
10:30 – 12:00 Noon	Roundtable discussion with Cebu Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc. (CBCFI)	
12:00 – 1:00 PM	Lunch	
1:00 – 3:00 PM	Roundtable discussion with CBCFI, continuation	
3:00 – 4:00PM	Travel time from CBCFI to airport	
6:00 PM	Travel time from Cebu City to Manila	

ANNEX 5-C

Summary of Site Visit

Site Date	Kalinga Watershed <i>(But activity done in Baguio City)</i> 27-30 August 2013
Date/Time	Activity/Key Informants
September 4	
13:00 – 17:00	Travel time from Manila to Baguio City Travel time from Tabuk to Baguio City Travel time from Abra to Baguio City
September 5	
8:00 – 9:30	Briefing and overview of the MTE
9:30 – 12:00	Roundtable discussion with DENR-CAR, DENR Conference Room, Baguio City <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RED ▪ RTD for FMS ▪ RTD for PAWCZMS ▪ Project Team – Claire Pawid, Maegan _____
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch
13:00 – 15:00	FGD with Banao
15:00 – 17:00	FGD with Balatoc
September 6	
9:00 – 11:00	FGD with Tipon
11:00 – 12:00	FGD with CCAGG
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch Break
13:00 – 15:00	FGD with CCAGG (conti.)
15:00 – 17:00	Wrap up
September 7	
8:00	Departure

ANNEX 5-E

Summary of Site Visit

Site Date	Mt. Iglit Baco Natural Park (Mindoro) 3-6 September 2013
Date/Time	Activity/Key Informants
Sept 3	
9:00 – 12:00	Roundtable discussion with DENR-4B, DENR Conference Room, Roxas Bldv. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RED ▪ RTD for FMS ▪ RTD for PAWCZMS ▪ Project Team
Sept 4	
6:00 – 7:00	Travel time from Manila to San Jose
8:00 – 12:00	Travel time of TaoBuhid and SHB to San Jose
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch Break
13:00 – 16:00	Briefing and overview on the MTE with Community, DENR and Anthrowatch
Sept 5	
9:00 – 11:00	FGD with TaoBuhid
11:00 – 12:00	FGD with SH Buhid
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch Break
13:00 – 15:00	FGD with Anthrowatch
15:00 – 17:00	Wrap up
Sept 6	
8:00	Departure

ANNEX 6

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?				
Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?	<p>How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD?</p> <p>Does the project support other international conventions, such as the UNFCCC and the UNDRIP?</p>	<p>UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design</p> <p>Level of implementation of UNCBD in the Philippines, Program of Work on Protected Areas and contribution of the project</p> <p>Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally UNCBD and other international convention web sites</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners</p>
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area?	How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities	Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area	<p>Project documents</p> <p>GEF focal areas strategies and documents</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>GEF website</p> <p>Interviews with UNDP and project team</p>
Is the project relevant to the Philippine Development Plan and environment and sustainable development objectives?	<p>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Philippines?</p> <p>How does the project support the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)?</p> <p>Is the project country-driven?</p> <p>What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?</p>	<p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</p> <p>Degree to which the project supports implementation of the NBSAP</p> <p>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies</p> <p>NBSAP</p> <p>Key project partners</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with UNDP and project partners</p>

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	<p>What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?</p> <p>Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?</p>	<p>strategies</p> <p>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <p>Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process</p> <p>Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria</p>		
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	<p>How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</p>	<p>Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</p>	<p>Project partners and stakeholders</p> <p>Needs assessment studies</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</p>
Is the project internally coherent in its design?	<p>Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources, etc.)?</p>	<p>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</p> <p>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</p>	<p>Program and project documents</p> <p>Key project stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Key interviews</p>

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	<p>Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</p> <p>Are the resources of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</p>			
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	<p>Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</p> <p>How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</p> <p>Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?</p>	Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally	<p>Documents from other donor supported activities</p> <p>Other donor representatives</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
Are project activities relevant and appropriate to meet objectives and current development context?	How appropriate are the planned and implemented activities? (in the context of any changes that have occurred in the PAW/ENR sector in the Philippines, recent priorities and opportunities for policy change and program shifts)?		<p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p> <p>Project reports, and new policies in the ENR sector</p>	<p>Data analysis</p> <p>Document review and KII</p>
Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	<p>Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</p> <p>1. PA system of the Philippines has been expanded under new and</p>	See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Project team and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Data reported in</p>	<p>Documents analysis</p> <p>Interviews with project team and relevant stakeholders</p>

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	<p>diverse management regimes (ancestral domain, local government and community managed areas) to cover an additional 400,000 hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and with enhanced potential for further expansion</p> <p>2. Improved conservation effectiveness through enhanced systemic, institutional and individual capacities</p> <p>3. Enhanced financial sustainability of the terrestrial PA system</p>		project annual and quarterly reports	
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<p>How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</p> <p>What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</p> <p>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</p> <p>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</p> <p>Quality of risk mitigations</p> <p>Strategies developed and followed</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<p>What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</p> <p>What changes could have been/should be made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?</p>		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	<p>Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</p> <p>Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?</p> <p>Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</p> <p>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</p> <p>Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)</p> <p>Did the leveraging of funds (co financing) happen as planned?</p> <p>Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</p> <p>Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</p> <p>How was results-based</p>	<p>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</p> <p>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</p> <p>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</p> <p>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</p> <p>Cost in view of results achieved compared to cost of similar projects from other organizations</p> <p>Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</p> <p>Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</p> <p>Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</p> <p>Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Project team</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Key interviews</p>

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	management used during project implementation?			
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<p>To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported?</p> <p>Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?</p> <p>What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</p> <p>Which methods were successful or not and why?</p>	<p>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</p> <p>Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p> <p>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	<p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</p> <p>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</p>	<p>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<p>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</p> <p>How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures</p>	<p>Value for money of partnership arrangements and delivery mechanisms</p> <p>Efficiency of alternative approaches and adaptation strategies</p>	Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	and procedures, partnership arrangements, etc...)? What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?	undertaken by the project		
How efficient and effective are the management and coordination arrangements, including oversight mechanisms for the project?	Does the Project Board provide a useful management and steering function for the project activities?		Minutes of Project Board meetings	Document review Interview with key staff and officials
	Does the PMU provide a useful and effective management function? Should other alternative arrangements be explored?		Project reports	
	How effective is the UNDP CO in supporting project implementation, technical assistance, and oversight?		Assessment reports	
	How effective is PAWB overall in performing its responsibilities as Implementing Agency?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				
What are the major factors which influence sustainability of the project?	Are policies sufficient and in place to support the roll out of ICCA recognition and establishment of LGU managed conservation areas in other KBAs?	Clear policies specifying procedures and mechanisms, including protection of and support to recognition of ICCAs and LGU managed conservation areas	Data collected throughout evaluation	Document review Community FGD and interviews KII with partners and representatives of key institutions/DENR Rapid field assessments in selected pilot sites
	Does the DENR provide adequate priority to BD conservation as a programme and the enhancement of capacities of its agency and staff?	Program and budget levels allocated by DENR to PAW, its programs and continued capacity development	Community feedback	
	Is there sufficient support	Commitments,	Insights/perceptions from institutions and partners Site reports	

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	<p>by key agencies (DBM, BTr, DoF, NEDA) to PA financing sustainability? Are there appropriate measures and policies to support these?</p> <p>Do the stakeholders have sufficient capacities, ownership and commitment to continue the innovations and enhanced systems developed under the project?</p> <p>Is there sufficient financing available or are there suitable fund sources to continue what have been initiated under the project?</p> <p>Will communities and local government units continue to implement the conservation plans developed/to be developed in the pilot sites?</p> <p>Were essential elements identified for a successful and sustainable roll out of new conservation areas in the Philippines, and have lessons been sufficiently documented?</p> <p>Do implementation arrangements support ownership of the project outcomes by government and stakeholders?</p> <p>Do project coordination mechanisms support sustainability of the project?</p> <p>How can the project better make ICCAs/LGU</p>	<p>pronouncements, joint issuances between DENR/PAWB and partner agencies</p> <p>Capacity assessment results</p> <p>Estimates of financing required to continue innovations introduced by the project, and financing capacity assessment</p> <p>Requirements for implementation of conservation plans compared with current capacities and constraints</p> <p>Quality and levels of discussions on the requirements for roll out, quality of documentation made</p> <p>Evidences of uptake by stakeholders</p> <p>Effectiveness of coordination mechanisms, evidences of ownership</p> <p>Presence of incentives and support to continue conservation objectives</p> <p>Strength of commitment to conservation, as evidenced by clear choices made by communities/LGUs against alternative land uses</p>		

EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX				
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	conservation areas more valuable to the participating communities and LGUs and support them in sustaining conservation areas as a better alternative than other land uses?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduction in threats to biodiversity in KBAs, and/or improved ecological status?				
Has the project made/or is likely to contribute to measurable difference to the conservation of terrestrial KBAs in the Philippines?	<p>How will expansion of new conservation areas, which involve recognition of ICCAs and LGU managed LCAs, reduce environmental stress, improve ecological coverage, and protect important BD resources?</p> <p>What evidences have there been, to establish reduction of environmental stress, prevention of incompatible land uses in and around conservation areas, and improvement of ecological status?</p>	<p>Status of habitats and important BD resources</p> <p>Extent of habitat fragmentation, unsustainable land use practices, and/or incompatible land uses within and around KBA pilot sites</p>	<p>Baseline BD assessment results</p> <p>BD monitoring reports in pilot sites</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Rapid field assessment</p> <p>Community FGDs</p>

ANNEX 7

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Interview with USec. Manuel Gerochi, DENR

Questions:

- The NewCAPP is introducing two natural resource/biodiversity management modalities. How significant are these modalities to the fulfillment of DENR's mandate? Can these be mainstreamed in DENR's modus operandi?
- What are the problem areas in mainstreaming these modalities? What solutions can be offered?
- How can we sustain these initiatives beyond the project?

Summary of Responses:

- The introduction of other management modalities further confuses the biodiversity conservation management approaches of the DENR, particularly the BMB. What should be done is for the BMB to rationalize its management modalities, put them in a systematic framework so that we would know what to do given the situation.
- However, NewCAPP as a project is good because it gives us a wider perspective of the options available for management by providing us with models. That's what projects do. However, its results will have to be viewed from a systemic/institutional (in relation to the mandate and work of DENR) standpoint that can be expressed in terms of policy to mainstream it.
- The ever-changing political landscape at the local level impacts the sustainability of these initiatives. One opportunity that must be taken advantage of is the National Land Use Bill which is now pending in the Legislative. A legislative act has the power of compulsion that might give these initiatives a chance at permanence.

Interview with Ms. Amelia Supetran, Team Leader, Energy & Environment Unit, UNDP

Questions:

- What is the significance of NewCAPP to UNDP?
- What are the expectations of UNDP from NewCAPP? Do you see the project meeting these expectations?
- What still needs to be done to firm up the achievements of NewCAPP and make these modalities sustainable?

Summary of Responses:

- UNDP is always interested in policy and governance, which is what NewCAPP is trying to achieve through the establishment of ICCAs and LCAs. UNDP thus expects NewCAPP to make a convincing case for these two modalities such that its efforts can impact on policy.
- With the way it is going, NewCAPP is living up to its promise. This is especially true with regards ICCAs as the latter has in fact caught the attention of the UNDP Regional Office such that a PIF has been solicited (and submitted) in hope of making a full-blown project on it.
- However, it has to firm these modalities up in policy so that it can easily be replicated in other areas. It is important to communicate this to policymakers in both the Executive and the Legislative.
- With the uncertainties in the field, it is important that a critical mass be created that will ensure continuous support to these management modalities.
- There is a need to look farther beyond this project. ICCA and LCA are only two of the many management modalities that need to be explored.
- Whatever is necessary and not included in this project can be explored in future projects, that is why we need recommendations from the project on this.

Interview with Sec. Juan Romeo Nereus Acosta

Questions:

- You have been very supportive of ICCA, especially the one in Bukidnon. Why? What do you see as its important feature/s?
- One of the problems of many development projects is sustainability. Do you think the ICCA is a sustainable idea? What do you suggest to ensure or help ensure its sustainability? What about the LCAs?

Summary of Responses:

- The ICCA is conceptually good because it provides an avenue for indigenous peoples to assert their rights over their natural resources as well as their ancestral domains using their own ways of governance.
- While ICCA and LCA are good ideas, and NewCAPP is a very relevant project, sustainability is indeed another matter. What they need to do is to firm up the policy bases for them and to provide a system by which they can be continuously protected. This is especially true with regard to LCAs because much of its sustainability depends on who run in the LGUs. With regard to ICCA, so long as

- the IP community believes in it, there is better assurance that they will fight for it.
- Perhaps a good idea for continued support to ICCAs and LCAs is to make them part of the Legacy of the present dispensation. NewCAPP should lobby to convince the President to issue a directive making ICCAs and LCAs part of his priorities.

Interview with Asst. Director Mayumi Natividad and For. Genesis Francisco, Forest Management Bureau, DENR

Questions:

- How do ICCA and LCA fit into the strategies of FMB?
- What are the problem areas in the implementation of NewCAPP in relation to the work of FMB? What can be done to resolve them?

Summary of Responses:

- Conceptually, ICCA and LCA are okay, except that NewCAPP and PAWB have to clarify how they fit into the whole scheme of forest management.
- Why can't the PAWB just focus first on doing well in implementing the NIPAS Act? They keep expanding beyond the NIPAS sites without even securing these protected areas first.
- NewCAPP wants FMB to integrate biodiversity in Forest Land Use Plans. This is good. But they need to capacitate FMB personnel first before they expect this.

Interview with Executive Director Marlea Munez, National Commission on Indigenous Peoples

Questions:

- Please describe your working relationship with NewCAPP. What can be done to improve it?
- How does the NCIP view ICCAs?

Summary of Responses:

- NCIP is hardly working with NewCAPP. There is no coordination happening. In fact, NewCAPP has entered ancestral domains without obtaining the necessary

Certification Precondition from NCIP, which is required under IPRA and NCIP rules. This is actually the case with DENR projects.

- If projects really want to work with NCIP, then the NCIP and the IPs have to be involved in all stages of the project, starting from conceptualization. NCIP should also be part of the decision-making body of the project.
- The questions are always what's in it for the IPs, and how are the rights of IPs promoted and protected by these projects. Without going through the NCIP processes and without involving the NCIP in the project process, there will always be doubt on these concerns.
- As far as NCIP is concerned, the management unit is the ancestral domain, not ICCAs.

Interview with Joseph D' Cruz, *Regional Adviser, UNDP*

1. **What is the specific strategic interest of UNDP in the NewCAPP? Why is this strategy/project chosen? What does UNDP see as the advantage of the NewCAPP over other strategies?**

During project design, several options were considered in expanding biodiversity conservation outside of NIPAS sites. Establishment of NIPAS sites was slow, time consuming and did not encourage buy in from key stakeholders such as LGUs and IP groups. Biodiversity conservation in private lands was even considered but did not take off.

It was not foreseen during project design that the demand for the establishment of ICCAs would be big.

UNDP was looking for ways to expand biodiversity conservation beyond DENR and NIPAS because of the present and urgent need to conserve biodiversity before it becomes totally lost to humanity. Capacity and resources are limited within DENR to effectively protect and manage the important biodiversity resources of the country.

2. **The project is embarking on two new policy ideas – LCAs and ICCAs. Don't you think the project is too ambitious considering that it will only run for five years with a budget of only \$3.5? It also appears that the project suffered a lot of FOREX losses, thus pulling its financial resources down. What does UNDP really expect from the project with regard to the institutionalization and sustainability of LCAs and ICCAs, and its capability-building initiatives?**

9 months of project activities were lost due to forex losses. The project has to prioritize where the remaining funds can best be used. At the same time, synergies with other projects such as the BPP can be maximized to continue the activities of NewCAPP, eg LCA. BPP started later than NewCAPP and there are flexibilities within the project that can be utilized by NewCAPP.

Because of the big demand for ICCA establishment, UNDP is considering a new project on ICCAs which will be developed in partnership with IP groups and NCIP. Meetings and consultations to develop the PIF for this is on going.

3. **What will be your indicators that the initiatives of the project can be sustained? What are the plans of the UNDP in moving this initiative forward?**

There is great enthusiasm for ICCA establishment as mentioned above. LGUs in the project sites, as well as in BPP areas, are very supportive of the program and are even providing their own funds to expand the activities to non project supported areas, eg Province of Aurora

4. **The project document, especially the log frame, aside, what do you think are the big risks/threats to the success of the project? How do you think should the project surmount these risks/threats?**

The risks lie with the change of LGUs during election period, that officials that are supportive of the initiatives are not reelected or finish their terms of office. There are also risks in terms of maintaining good relationship amongst DENR, LGUs and NGOs and other civil society groups. Partnerships amongst DENR, LGUs and civil society groups are important for the model to be sustainable. With in DENR there are also turfing concerns among the various sectors that need to be addressed by the DENR management, eg protected area and forest protection.

5. **Is there hope to make this project a model for other jurisdictions? From what reaches you, what are the possible aspects of the project that can make it a model for others? Is there anything new that you see in the outputs of the project so far? Yes see explanations above.**

Yes. See explanation above.

6. **And what opportunities do you see that will enhance the success potential of the project? How can these opportunities be taken advantage of?**

BPP and the openness of the new administration of NCIP to work with DENR on ICCAs.

Round Table Discussion with Mt. Nacolod Regional Management Team

DENR Regional Office VIII, August 5, 2013

Highlights of Mt. Nacolod Updates by Forester George Guillermo:

- Out of the 7 municipalities involved in the project (5 in Southern Leyte and 2 in Northern leyte), 3 municipalities of Southern Leyte (Silago, St. Bernard and Sogod) have already established their FLUP through the technical assistance of

GIZ. Two of the municipalities (Hinunangan and Libagon) were assisted by NewCAPP in the formulation of FLUP thereby completing the 5 target municipalities in Southern Leyte while in Northern Leyte, Abuyog has started formulating their FLUP. The remaining town of Mahaplag is yet to work on their Forrest Land Use Plan.

- Forester Guillermo shared that they are not sure when the cut-off of the project would be; if it is on 2013 or 2014. He further said that they want to be clarified on this matter.
- A provincial resolution declaring Mt. Nacolod as protection forest or locally protected area has been filed by Sangguniang Panlalawigan member Hon. Daisy Gamale. The resolution disapproves mining applications in the area but it has sustainable use aspects for the residents in Mt. Nacolod.
- The success of the project is attributed to the consolidated and complementary efforts of different conservation groups and NGOs in the area such as GIZ and Visayas State University (VSU). They were able to create a TWG and a Mt. Nacolod Team comprised of regional, provincial and CENRO teams. The UP Wildlife Outdoor conducted a research to get a sighting of the Philippine Eagle wherein they were successful. Sightings of the Philippine Eagle were established between Silago and Sogod and somewhere in Burauen.
- According to For. Guillermo, they are working on capacitating the municipalities with critical habitat to come up with their own protection structure. They intend to link these structures together to form an alliance or a bigger structure with a management body and ultimately create a resolution to legitimize the protection of Mt. Nacolod.

What is the preference of the team between a nationally declared critical habitat or LGU declared forest?

- Forester Badeo shared that they prefer an LGU managed forest because it is consistent with the logistical framework. He added that DENR has so many things to do and they cannot possibly manage all timberlands in the region which is why allowing LGUs to co-manage the area would be favorable to both parties.
- The team also wants to explore other legalities aside from NIPAS because the provisions of NIPAS are complicated.
- In support of LCA, the RMT strengthens the areas through capacity building and by ensuring that the municipalities' FLUP is integrated with local policies.

The team's progress is relatively slow considering that they are just on the 3rd step of FLUP formulation and the project is getting close to its end. What are the reasons for the delay in project implementation?

- For. Guillermo said that the project implementation and activities came to a temporary lull due to the recent elections. For. Guillermo said that will fast track the process. However, given the short amount of time left, they may fall short of the expected outcomes of the project.

- For. Badeo emphasized that they consumed a lot of time on data gathering, providing technical assistance, mapping and they conducted participatory consultations for the process to be thorough and also to help the concerned municipalities better. He shared that they intend to finish the entire process by the end of the year. They waited for other municipalities to finish their FLUP which further contributed to the delay but it is only through the completion of FLUP that they can start up scaling the project implementation. However, For. Badeo said that he is positive that they can achieve their targets with the support of the provincial government and the sincerity of the LGUs.

What are your opinions regarding an LGU Conserved Area?

- For. Badeo shared that he views the project as a temporary abridging strategy towards a sustainable solution. He said that while NIPAS is not yet within their reach, while the policies are being processed and the transfer of management from DENR to LGUs is underway, they can have NewCAPP.
- For. Guillermo shared that the project is very timely since the LGUs are already aware and calamity prepared, the only thing missing is a national or even a local mandate that will govern the protection and conservation of the area.
- Mr. Burgos shared that Board Member Daisy Gamale of Southern Leyte is currently reviewing the steps for the area to qualify as a NIPAS site and she is waiting for the CMF so they can work on the IRR of the provincial resolution that she authored.

Is the provincial government aware of the project, and if so, why do they refer to NIPAS instead of working on an LCA?

- For. Badeo said that the province is more interested on NIPAS because it has budgetary allocation.
- For. Guillermo shared that DENR has so many things to do and it is quite embarrassing for them that they cannot keep up with the stakeholders so according to him, it would be better if they transfer the management of locally protected areas to the LGUs. For. Guillermo said that they should not put too much emphasis on finances, what they need to do is make people understand that they can actually reap financial benefits if they know how to utilize their resources and make use of science.
- Ms Purificacion Dalo-os of RPAO shared that she is more concerned on how to educate the people in terms of Mt. Nacolod protection regardless if it is under NIPAS or NewCAPP. She said that the plans formulated today would be futile tomorrow if the people do not understand the concept of conservation. Ms. Dalo-os shared her apprehension on relinquishing the management of Mt. Nacolod to the LGU. She is not confident that the LGU can sustain its management especially with the periodic change of administration. Thus, she prefers NIPAS over LCA.

- Mr. Burgos shared that although the LGUs have IRA, they cannot rely on it for Mt. Nacolod's sustainability. However, with a local legislation, they can easily support the protection needs of the area..

Are there any changes or developments in Mt. Nacolod that can be attributed to the project?

- Mr. Gacoscosim shared that the people in the area are more aggressive now when it comes to protecting the forest. However, Mr. Gacoscosim added that the problems regarding timber poachers remain especially that most of these poachers are not from the area itself.
- For Forester Badeo, a positive change in the LGUs through their crafting of municipal resolutions is most notable. He then presented a map, showing the forest coverage of Mt. Nacolod expanding. For. Badeo said that the information can be verified through Google and he attributes this positive development to the project.

How can the team sustain positive outcomes of the project?

- For. Badeo said that they can sustain the effort through co-management, reward system or by making the people realize that they will get something out of protecting the environment and through distribution of IEC materials in the area.
- Ms Dalo-os shared that since the project doesn't have a budget for IEC, they mainstream the project by including it in RPAO's information drives.
- For. Guillermo shared that they should identify the remaining resources in the forest and develop it for regeneration as it could translate into billions of revenue.

How is the team's relationship with the PMU?

- The team concurred that they are generally satisfied with PMU's support to the project.
- However, according to For. Guillermo, they often get requests in the area for equipment such as computers especially that there has been a precedent of gifts and equipment coming from GIZ. For. Guillermo said that they just present and explain the financial constraints of the project and they are thankful that the LGUs understand their limitations.

How is the team's relationship with UNDP?

- The group said that they do not have a direct relationship with them.
- They only communicate with PMU so they cannot say so much about UNDP.

What are your insights on the project?

- For. Guillermo shared that the funding is usually delayed even if they submit their liquidations and reports on time. He added that there may be times when

their liquidations are delayed but this is because they wait for the liquidations of the 9 sites to be completed.

What can you say about the project?

- For. Badeo expressed his hope for the project to be extended for at least a year or for it to get into Phase 2 because they are just starting to establish the framework. They encountered unavoidable circumstances like the elections which lead to their delay but For. Badeo said that it doesn't mean that they are slacking off. If the project would be withdrawn right in the middle of its implementation, all their efforts would go to waste. He added that they have done so much just to come up with a workable framework and they have worked hard to find a project direction, they have also achieved considerably and their hard work and efforts would be meaningless if the project would stop just like that. He also said that the team should be allowed to finish the entire process especially that the crafting of provincial resolution reflects the LGU's sincerity to protect Mt. Nacolod.
- With the allocated budget found on the resolution, the team is positive that something good will come out of the project.

Interview with Governor Roger Mercado

Office of the Governor, Maasin, Southern Leyte, August 6, 2013

What are your insights regarding NIPAS and LCA?

Governor Mercado said that he is amenable with NIPAS as a technical framework but it has to be coordinated with the local ordinances for better management of the area.

Since NIPAS sites are under the jurisdiction of DENR, is this a concern for the local government?

Governor Mercado said that he doesn't see this as a threat to the local government since the area is managed by DENR.

However, he shared that there are illegal activities in their forests and sadly, the DENR provides permits for this. When apprehended by the LGUs, poachers would present permits issued by the DENR and the local government can do nothing about it.

Governor Mercado said that they can only do so much in terms of protecting their environment. When MGB provides permit, they can't do anything about it but pray for the environment.

NIPAS is spearheaded by DENR and any revenue generated in the area will go directly to DENR but with LCA, they can easily download the funds generated to the LGUs.

The governor said that what they really need is an IRR, otherwise, they can't do anything about what's happening in the area.

Gov. Mercado said that he hopes for DENR to be sincere because whenever LGUs try to implement their protection powers over protected areas, DENR would say they have the jurisdiction over it but when problems arise, the DENR would say that areas are already devolved therefore the LGUs should resolve the issues.

Governor Mercado said the DENR is equivocal with its policies.

Would it be better if Mt. Nacolod was managed by LGUs?

Governor Mercado said that it depends if DENR would let Mt. Nacolod go. He said that they can create an IRR for Mt. Nacolod's protection but it would be disappointing to find out that DENR still has the oversight powers over the area.

Governor Mercado shared that their province, through a Republic Act, is under total log ban and they have filed a bill for the province to be declared as a mining-free zone. They are also hoping to get NIPAS and for the government to be sincere of its efforts because they had a negative experience with DENR before. He further said that the government, through DENR, is for big businesses that even if they try to protect their forests, they can do nothing because these big corporations would flaunt their permits issued by DENR. He also said that when there is conflict on the interpretation of the law, the law should be in favor of the LGU. The governor added that they cannot go against the national government.

Is the project feasible and can it be sustained?

The project can possibly work if they work closer with LGUs and for as long as the LGUs and the province are aware of their roles and responsibilities. The Governor said that the province is often disregarded by the project in its LGU activities but he assured that the project has the province's full support.

FGD with Mt. Nacolod Stakeholder LGUs

Sogod Municipal Hall, Sogod, Southern Leyte, August 6, 2013

Did the RMT explain the concept of the LCA? Did the RMT explain the project itself?

Hon. Vejarme asked Atty. Quicho what the project is all about and what's in store for the stakeholders. He also said that it would be better if they can take a look at the project's timeline to determine where they are in as far as the implementation is concerned and if they are delayed, find the gaps so they can implement the project better.

The MPDC of Libagon said that they had a project orientation before and they also had previous activities for the crafting of their first and second modules.

(NOTE: Everyone in the group had a full understanding and appreciation of the project except for Hon. Vejarme, the new SB member of Sogod.)

Are there any updates on the Technical Working Groups of the other municipalities?

As to the municipalities' Technical Working Group, the Facilitator suggested for the areas to come up with a local policy or a local steering committee since almost all of the municipalities, except Sogod, has a functional TWG.

Are municipalities inclined to follow NIPAS or another mechanism for a locally protected area?

Hon. Vejarme asked what NIPAS is. Atty. Quicho then explained what NIPAS is and the idea behind it.

The MPDC of Hindang prefers a co-managed protected area but if Mt. Nacolod is declared a NIPAS site, the policies should trickle down to the barangay level so that residents will cooperate in its protection; It would be better if the area would be managed locally because they are the ones who are aware of what's happening in Mt. Nacolod; At present, the communities are wary about protecting the area because they know it is managed by DENR and because there is only a few DENR personnel in the area, they will not be able to manage the entire area.

Mr. Agtejar of Sogod said that it would be better if LGUs manage the area because there would be ownership, thus, they would protect the area more.

How would the stakeholders manage the periodic change of administration?

Ms Engcoy of Hindang said that if there is a MOA in place, they can sustain their plans especially if barangay units accept the agreement.

How will the LGUS carry on with the project given that it will end early, by 2013?

The MPDC of Hindang said that they are used to do counterparts; in fact the LGUs make it a point to contribute during activities such as their travel expenses. If money gets depleted, the project would continue depending on how it is being implemented today. If DENR transfers its technical expertise to the stakeholders effectively, then they can manage the project by themselves.

Can the stakeholders finish the project considering the time and financial constraints and the reality that they lag behind on the implementation's timeline?

Ms. Engcoy said that they are currently working on their FLUPs and after its completion they have proposed plans on how they will co-manage the area. Ms Engcoy said that they are willing to take on the management of Mt. Nacolod so long as the national

government would provide budget for it since it would be like doing the national government's tasks. Ms Engcoy said that another way to sustain the project is to increase their IRA. Ms Engcoy shared that they might finish the process before the year ends because they intend to submit their FLUP draft by first week of August. The municipality of Hindang also intends to file and approve their local ordinance on October 2013.

Hon. Vejarme said that if they are looking at sustainability, they should also consider where they are going to get the budget to support the project's continuity. He also said that the RMT should present a timeline so LGUs could determine what the needs are and who are the persons involved so for them to allocate budget for its sustainability. He added that they need to define the problem in order to determine the solutions.

Mr. Almirol of Sogod MENRO said that they could not finish their FLUP because they cannot come up with thematic maps.

The MPDC of Sogod said that they would probably finish the process by the end of 2013. Ms Engcoy suggested for their LGU to come up with an activity to update others especially the local officials and appointees who came in late.

The MPDC of Libagon said that they need to fast track their FLUP because their next steps and activities depend on it.

Do the LGUs have timeline or project implementation schedule?

The stakeholders said that they do not have schedule or even a deadline on FLUP formulation. The MENRO staff of Sogod shared that they were not given technical assistance on thematic maps. MPDC of Hindang said NewCAPP only provides the type of technical assistance needed by the LGU.

Does NewCAPP work separately in each municipality?

Yes. The stakeholders suggested that the concerned LGUs should be gathered together for sharing of information and capacity development.

When can the LGUs finish their FLUP? How much time do they need so they can start with their module?

The MPDC of Sogod said that creating an FLUP is not their only concern, their TWG has only two members and only the MPDC works for the project. Hon. Vejarme said that they should define the duties and responsibilities of concerned individuals and who the point persons are considering that they have other tasks to tend to. He also suggested for them to admit their weaknesses and needs such as the salary aspects so they can perform better.

The MPDC of Hindang shared that in their municipality, she and a JO employee are the only ones who do the project tasks but they coordinate with other departments that

hold their needed data or information. They also designate a person who will focus on a certain task such as the completion of CLUP. The MPDC of Sogod shared that they were able to create a CLUP in 2000 because they hired personnel to focus on its formulation.

What are the stakeholders' relationships with NewCAPP?

All stakeholders said that they have good working relationship with RMT and they are provided with their needed technical assistance.

Are there any areas for improvement in the relationship with NewCAPP?

The MENRO staff of Sogod said they badly need technical assistance especially on how thematic maps are done.

Ms Engcoy of Hindang said that whenever they need technical assistance from NewCAPP, they ask their LCE to communicate with NewCAPP such as during their thematic map formulation, they went to the DENR regional office in Tacloban for them to be mentored and they just exchange data and outputs with RMT via email.

The MPDC of Libagon shared that they conducted a project orientation among newly elected officials in their area and when they had difficulty creating thematic maps, they also went to the regional office of DENR for mentoring.

Are there any notable changes in Mt. Nacolod which can be attributed to the project?

Are there any changes in the management of Mt. Nacolod?

The MPDC of Sogod said that there are tree planting activities in the area but they are initiated by GIZ.

As to the management aspects, Ms Engcoy said that now they can already appreciate maps and their local officials already understand the concept of the project after the orientation. They have already included FLUP in their 2013 budget and in the barangay level, the communities are already aware of the benefits of protecting a forest. Ms Engcoy added that people in the community are now empowered. She shared that they did not honor the black sand mining permit even if it was already approved by the national office because they know how to exercise local autonomy and they have plans for the area. Ms Engcoy said that the government should provide budget for Mt. Nacolod management or they should increase their IRA. They can also create a plan and submit it to DENR so they provide the funds while the local governments do the groundwork.

The MENRO of Sogod doesn't see any changes because their LGU do not allocate funds for sending personnel to Tacloban for mentoring and they do not provide counterparts during activities.

For Libagon, their MPDC said their LGU was activated when the project came and their old related project on Mt. Nacolod tree planting was revived. Mr. Endico shared that

they have idle lands in Libagon and they are almost full now since they started planting trees in the area. The MPDC of Libagon said that it all boils down to political will.

Are the stakeholders aware of the differences between a NIPAS site and an LCA?

The MENRO of Sogod said that there is no unity and consultation among LGUs and they do not have a focal person within Southern Leyte.

Do the stakeholders have other needs to help them implement the project?

The MPDCs of Hindang and Libagon said that they need a laptop with a bigger memory that works better with maps such as the i7, 8 gigabyte memory laptop which amounts to Php70,000. The MENRO of Sogod shared that GIZ issued a laptop for them.

FGD with Regional Technical Directors and Protected Areas, Wildlife and Coastal Zone Management Services, DENR – Region 7

What is your take on the LGU-LCA? Do you think it is a practical and practicable resource management approach?

It is good to partner with LGUs and CBCFI because DENR doesn't have enough resources to protect the country's forest and biodiversity. As of now, there is one forest guard to 5,000 ha of forest and in some cases this is not even achieved. Many DENRO staff are already in their 50s and suffering from age related physical condition that limits their capacity to do field level work. Hopefully with rationalization, DENR will be able to hire younger personnel. In the LGU-LCA modality the LGUs contribute funds and personnel for biodiversity conservation. In Dalaguete for example, the LGU hired 30 forest wardens that they provide with honorarium. The achievements of the project so far could not have been accomplished if left to DENR alone. CBCFI was persistent in following up with LGUs in doing their activities.

Just looking at the concept of LGU-LCA (without considering the project), what are in the present national and DENR policy framework that makes the adoption of LCA possible?

The Wildlife Act provides for wildlife habitat protection to be undertaken in partnership with LGUs. The DENR can issue an administrative order defining the process and arrangement for LCA similar to what has been done with CBFMA. The legal consultant of NewCAPP has already drafted this.

What are the practical and policy hurdles to its realization?

There are turfing concerns within the various offices in DENR that sometimes affect fund allocation. For example, for 2 years in a row, the PAWS nationwide has not been allocated funds for PA protection. All funds for protection activities have been lodged with the forestry sector. They claim that Region 7 is an exception in terms of the good relationship between PAWCZM and forestry sector. LCA would also be difficult to implement if elected officials are anti environment or have links with timber

poachers/cutters. One congressman from the area is a coal mining operator in Argao. The current vice mayor of Argao is the brother of the congressman who is a coal mining operator. One of the threats to the LCA is timber cutting to supply the mine poles for the coal mine tunnel. The 3 year term of local officials is a threat to the continuity and sustainability of LCAs. When the current mayor of Dalaguete finished his 3 terms, his replacement did not continue with providing allowances for the forest wardens. Now the mayor is consulting with lawyers if it is possible that municipal ordinances on conservation can only be changed by subsequent elected officials through a referendum.

Does the project take advantage of these opportunities? How? Does it address these challenges? How?

The project encourages the participation of academe and communities in the LCA planning and establishment. Community participation strengthens ownership of the project and deters hanky panky of government officials, whether LGUs or DENR staff.

What should be done to improve the project?

Include and harmonize the CRUFs (community resource use frameworks) of CBFMAs in the LCA management planning. There should also be an inventory how many of the CBFMA holders have working CRUFs. There are 11 CBFMAs covering 4,186.57ha within the proposed LCA. The FLUPs of LGUs cover only the untenured portion of the forestland. Coordinate with the DOE on the coal mining operations in Argao and Dalaguete. The mining claim and operation started in 1982 and is not covered by the EIA process – does not have an ECC and environmental impact is only monitored by DOE. There is also no environmental guarantee fund to cover the cost of damage caused by the extraction of coal. Before coal is extracted, water is pumped out of the water table. Otherwise the mine tunnel will be flooded. The DENR has to determine what part of the mining claim is located in the proposed LCA so that appropriate action can be undertaken. DENR can also issue a DAO on LCA establishment and management.

Mt. Nacolod and Mt. Nug as have been identified as demonstration sites for a co-management arrangement that is anchored on FLUPs. However, based on the LCA Establishment guide, you are still on the first process (LGU Management Planning), particularly doing situational analysis. Are you going fast or slow or just right? What challenges do you face in following the process? On the contrary, what factors facilitate the process?

PMU revised the timeline for finishing the LCA management planning to the end of 2013 instead of 2014 so that implementation can be started by 2014. Establishing harmonious relationship with LGUs and winning their trust take time. If not with the assistance of CBCFI, they would not have been able to achieve what they have accomplished so far. Alcoy and Dalaguete have their FLUPs formulated in 2004 and reviewed and updated in 2013. The EcoGov project assisted them in formulating their FLUP. Argao on the other hand is still in the process of formulating their FLUP. Argao was not part of EcoGov. The Cebu Technological University is assisting LGU Argao in formulating their FLUP. Even

before the project started, there already efforts at forest protection and biodiversity conservation in the 3 LGUs. Since 2003, Dalaguete has set up a program called the Dalaguete Biodiversity Management Program and allocates a budget for it. Argao has declared part of Palinpinon Range as bird and wildlife sanctuary.

Is the length of the project sufficient to grab the opportunities and address the challenges?

The time frame is short given that LGUs have their own set priorities that sometimes are hard to change to fit into the project timelines.

How would you describe your relationship with your target LGUs?

Very good and harmonious.

What particular developments/changes in the area do you attribute to the project? Are they good or bad?

DENR tripartite MOA with the 3 LGUs, formation of the biocon teams in each of the LGUs, biodiversity assessment by FFI, discovery of a new owl species and herps that was thought previously as extinct,

Do you think these positive developments can be sustained beyond the project? Why?

DENR and the LGUs are committed to continuing with the conservation activities that have been started.

Interview with Dr. Isabelo R. Montejo, RED DENR 7

RED's Office, 05 August 2013, 6:00 – 06:36pm

Is the Nug-as-Mt. Lantoy conservation area part of the priority of DENR-7? Is the commitment of DENR beyond the project?

RED Montejo said that both FMS and PAWCZMS are working together to support the areas. He said that even before NewCAPP, there are already interventions. With or without NewCAPP, he stressed that the existing interventions should be continued by DENR. It is part of the forest corridor that they have in the South.

Included in the recommendations of the biodiversity assessment conducted by FFI is that Mt. Lanaya in Alegria should be included in the key biodiversity area. Is this possible?

It is possible. It does not only include Mt. Lanaya but also other range of mountains such as the Patong and Basak in Badian. He added that there is one area there that is considered as one of the remaining forests in the South. Though it is a second growth, it is a habitat of some bird species such as the Black Shama and the rest of birds that are endemic in the Province.

In Alcoy, they said that they have a nursery of endemic trees which include the Cebu cinnamon. Is this something that they are working out with DENR?

The initiative is actually part of the activities that is under the National Greening Program (NGP). Even prior to NGP, he said that there was a project of Cebu Biodiversity Foundation (CBF) that encourages for the planting of indigenous species, particularly the ones found in the vicinity in Nug-as in Alcoy and other neighboring forests. The NGP areas in Nug-as and Mt. Lantoy is more than 500 hectares that cover the three people's organizations, namely; BALAD, SAMPISI, and TYMP in Alcoy. He added that the NGP areas are the target areas for KBA.

After the completion of the management plans of the three LGUs, what will be the management arrangement?

There is an existing common management agreement between Dalaguete and Alcoy because their FLUPs are already in place. DENR, he said, plans to strengthen the collaboration among the three local government units (LGUs). He added that both the LGUs and DENR will manage the area. They have now a plan for the declaration for the issuance of NIPAS area.

The important thing is to come up with a management framework for the three municipalities. There is a need to come up with a joint resolution for the three LGUs to support it. He said that if there is a need for the Governor to issue an executive order for the protection of the three areas, it can be done.

The LGU can operate as an individual municipality. DENR should come up with a framework that will complement their respective efforts. He said that there should be complementary interventions among the three municipalities in such a way that they will be establishing a common program in their boundaries.

Does DENR have a regular budget for the Nug-as-Mt. Lantoy complementary funds?

The areas are recipient of the old reforestation project in Southern Cebu. With the old reforestation project in Southern Cebu Reforestation and Development Project, it was enacted by a law established in 1964 by Congressman Kintanar. Budget has been provided. The law provides the administration and how funding are provided for, the structure, and conducting of evaluation. We use the land classification map as boundary. It covers the timberland of Argao, Dalaguete, Alcoy, Badian, and part of Sibonga.

So far, how is the relationship of DENR with the LGUs?

Dalaguete and Alcoy were piloted by the EcoGov project. Argao has been supportive in projects, particularly on community-based projects. With NewCAPP, he said that they were able to fast track the preparation of FLUP. Whenever the FLUP will be legitimized, it will be jointly implemented by DENR and the LGUs. He said that this will be the time to have a joint implementation of the plan.

Do you have plans to come up with an administrative order to support the locally managed conservation areas? In the Wildlife Act, is the habitat conservation with the LGUs?

Once there is a co-management, there is no need to create an administrative order. For the habitat conservation, it depends where the habitat is located. When we talk about jurisdiction, it is locally under the local government.

What is the challenge of the project?

One of the challenges faced by the project is its sustainability. He said that it is not supposed to be dependent with the national government and dependent on international projects to have funds. He added that what is important is they can institutionalize payment for ecosystem services. He said that there is a potential in eco-tourism in the areas.

The Mayors discussed that there is a coal mine in Argao and Dalaguete. Which agency gives out the permit to the operators?

The function of MGB is only in mining safety. In the law, he said, DOE issues permits. The mining operation firms have been existing prior to EIS system. Projects that have been established prior to 1982 are exempted from ECC except if there are expansions or new developments that require environmental compliance.

What are things that need to be done to improve the implementation of NewCAPP?

Sustainability of the project is the most important thing. There is a need to maintain the Bantay Lasang in Dalaguete, protection of the areas, and the Forest Wardens in Alcoy.

Even before NewCAPP, there are already interventions. With or without NewCAPP, the existing interventions should be continued. There is also a need to maintain the existing initiatives of the LGUS such as the Bantay Lasang in Dalaguete and Forest Wardens in Alcoy.

FGD with Nug-as Lantoy Mayors

Dalaguete Mayor's Office, 05 August 2013, 1:15 – 2:45pm

Ms. Gonzales said that the technical working group from the three local government units (LGUs) is supportive of the conservation efforts. She said that even before the project started, there are various initiatives in terms of biodiversity conservation. In Dalaguete, they already have the Dalaguete Biodiversity Conservation Management Program (DBCMP) since 2008. Alcoy has the biggest natural forest in the Province. The challenge of Argao is they are still processing their FLUP. Thus, the two LGUs have to wait for Argao's FLUP to finish. One of the concerns raised is most of the personnel are Job Orders. They said that if there is a change in the administration, there is a threat that they too will be terminated.

Another concern raised is information dissemination, especially to the stakeholders in the barangay level. This is important for them to see the importance and benefits of conserving their resources.

What should be done to address the concern of termination of the personnel?

- a. Mr. Cesante said that the concern is on the security of tenure in relation to securing the future of the protected areas. First, he said that they should define the issue of security of tenure. It will affect the knowledge and skills of the staff in managing the protected areas. Originally, he said that the functions of the environment were not devolved. On a functionary basis, there is a close relationship with DENR. However, he said that we should also look at the system and the institutions. It should be a subject of another research.

Ms. Gonzales said that LGUs don't see DENR as supportive of what they are doing. Mayor Cesante said that it boils down to funding. The national government may provide the agencies with mechanisms to sell the "idea" to the LGUs with regard to protected area management. There is no clear thing on what have been devolved by DENR. He cited that in Section 18, only 50 hectares or less are communal forest and outside of that are all given.

He added that there are many studies about Alcoy like the Alcoy Biodiversity Conservation Management Project. When it was lost, there was still strong community-based through KYLB, the oldest people's organization.

He said that they have one key biodiversity area with three modalities. In Dalaguete, they have the DBCMP and the Bantay Lasang. The Forest Wardens are paid with Php125 a day. The previous Bantay Lasang has no allowance. He pointed out that a study should be done on these kinds of modalities and what is sustainable after three years. After one election, a continuing research should be done to assess its impact. Through that, he said they can learn how to fix the problem on the security of tenure vis-à-vis with the cost of managing the project. He stressed that most of the LGUs have some sort of realization that contractual employees are more efficient than the regular plantilla.

For the record, he said that the municipality is over personnel services limit already. If they have limit, it is hard. To be able to address this, he asked for good, trainable, and passionate personnel even in a job order status. On the training and skills matters, he said that LGUs should highlight and make some plans to be able to empower the lowest level. They still have

to put a sort of framework for them to move. They also need people to patrol. He said that as they empower people, the job order system can be called as empowering people.

b. Mayor Cesante added that in people empowerment, it is good to start from the individual to familial impact empowerment among themselves. He thinks that when it comes for the community, it has to wait until after the society has been modernized. He added that they should empower institutions first, especially in this kind of program development and management. To make projects sustainable, they need to be financially sustainable, he said.

c. The greatest threat is the timber-cutting for coal mining. The municipalities of Argao and Dalaguete have coal mining. The mining claim is until the municipality of Boljoon. He thinks that the biggest threat against secondary forest is actually the encroachment for vegetable farming, timber, and settlements. The LGU only get Php300, 000 every year from the mining firms when in fact they said million in road repair alone. He said that there should be fair share.

d. Mr. Pua said that before the miners get the coal, they have to extract water from it. The water is drain down to the rivers. He suggested that there should be a regulation on the extraction process.

Is there a monitoring team for coal extraction?

a. Mr. Pua answered that the Department of Energy (DOE) gives the coal mining the permit. It has first grade or high quality with 12, 500 BTU which supplies to local and national power corporation.

There is a need to empower the people first for them to know the importance of biodiversity conservation. With regard to the concern on security of tenure, Mayor Cesante stressed that he needs to find personnel who are passionate and trainable for the project even in job order status. One of the biggest threats raise is the coal mining firms present in Argao and Dalaguete. Though they have concerns regarding its operations, only the DOE issues permits for their operations.

Interview with Rudy Aragon, NewCAPP NRM Specialist

Questions:

- What area the significant achievements of the project so far?

- What challenges are there in LCA establishment?
- What are the strengths of the project?
- What are your recommendations?

Summary of Responses:

- NewCAPP revised the FLUP to include biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction management and carbon capture. Gender considerations are factored in and women's role is defined. Originally, FLUP focused only on closure of open access untenured forest areas. FLUP is implemented by DENR and LGU through a joint agreement. A steering committee chaired by the LGU is formed.
- In areas where there are CBFMAs, holders participate in community consultations and are asked if they want to be included in the LCA. LCA will include only the biodiversity area and not the whole forest land. There are also agricultural areas in forest land.
- LCA formation is the only option for LGUs. It is allowed in the Joint Memorandum Circular DENR-DILG 2003-01, DENR-LGU co-management of forestland in the framework of the FLUP.
- Another option is the declaration of the area as a critical habitat area but the rigorous scientific study required is daunting to undertake. A declaration of the area a critical habitat requires the approval of the DENR Secretary.
- Challenges in LCA establishment
 - Because LAC establishment is trail blazing, there is no reference material used for guidance.
 - Getting the DENR and LGU to work together needs an external agent to bring them together. It is difficult for them to do it on their own.
 - Continuity of project implementation is hampered by changes in mayors every election period and reassignment of DENR personnel.
 - Encouraging LGUs to allocate budgets for biodiversity conservation.
- After the NewCapp project, the PAWS section of the regional offices can continue monitoring the LCAs established by the project. However there is turfing between the PAWS and FMS within the DENR. The FMS people thinks that if an area is declared as a biodiversity conservation area, there will be less land allocated for production forest. There is also more funds coming in for biodiversity conservation. The FMS people are also wary that management of FLUP by LGUs will mean less areas for them to manage and they will be reduced to just technical assistance providers.
- The 5yr timeline for the project is quite short given that elections delays project implementation. It also takes time for LGUs to understand the project and implement it.
- Project strengths include: Implementing partners are working well together and the regions selected are interested and open to pilot testing the concept.
- Recommendations:

- National guidance in terms of measuring progress, not only the financial management and utilization.
- Difficult to replicate good practices in one area to other areas if no one is coordinating/supervising at the national level and different partners are doing different things according to their own realities and conditions.

Interview with CBCFI: May Ybanez, founding president, and Estella Rodriguez, Executive Director

Questions:

- What are the environmental problems in the area?
- How would you describe the relationship between the DENR and CBCFI? What challenges have you encountered in working with the DENR in general and the PMU in particular?
- What challenges have you faced in working with LGUs?

Summary of Responses:

- Bats are hunted for food in 2003 and birds are hunted as pets before.
- In the 1990s, kaingin is rampant in Dalaguete and mining in Argao. There are many small scale coal miners in Southern Cebu.
- Vegetable farming in the area is heavy in the use of pesticides and fertilizers.
- We will designate areas for firewood production after the identification of corridor areas. Firewood production can be a source of livelihood for the people.
- CBCFI has a MOA with DENR regional office signed every 2 years, premised on their working together. CBCFI has good relations with the DENR regional office but has strained relationship with PAWB and the PMU. Funds for February 2013 was released only in August of 2013 and has affected delivery of project outputs. PMU wanted to hire Justin directly to do work that are similar to his role as project coordinator and offered higher rates. Some activities were also delayed due to miscommunication with the PMU, eg direct hiring of FFI which came on board only on Nov 2012, delayed levelling off on conservation corridors affected the production of IEC materials, etc
- CBCF staff before has conflicts with the Alcoy LGU resulting in the LGU requesting for the pull out of the staff

FGD with DENR Cordillera Administrative Region Representatives

Highland Villa, Baguio City, 4 September 2013, 9:30AM - 12:19PM

Attendance:

RTD Reynald Yawan

Project Coordinator, Claire Pawid

Maegan Kitong

Describe the situation of the project.

Ms. Pawid, of DENR-CAR said that when they started the project they talked with Banao and Balatoc tribe and presented the ICCA concept. They felt that there's a conflict which was so intense between the two tribes and they suggested meeting together but they were hesitant. During the second consultation, one tribe told them that they were tired of their situation and wanted to settle the conflict which they don't want to pass on to the next generation. This was the entry point of DENR to mediate to have the "*Budong*". The Banao were concerned about the cost for a "*Budong*" for their tribe to support and were asked about if the project could help. But the Balatoc felt uneasy if the project will finance it since it's not according to what their costume and tradition is. In the end, both tribes agreed to have the "*Budong*" and to proceed with their ICCA but leaving the conflict area as a gray area.

Although there was cluster between the tribes but they talked with each other now unlike the animosity they had before.

How do you see the resolution in relation to the whole peace pact to the objectives of this project?

Ms. Pawid stated that there was this forest that they have to protect; where the Banao people have this pit traps as for animal hunting and the Balatoc tribe use it as their pathway to work. The Banao protected the forest because it's the source of meat and water (source of life). And so they're making efforts to be peaceful with one another.

Is it part of the project's intension to pursue for their CADT?

Ms. Pawid agreed and it will even solve the issue for the finalization of the tribes' map for CADTI leaving the conflict area, which was outside NIPAS and they would share it as a hunting area for both.

What are the things that you will really attribute? Is it the whole thing attributes to the goal of the project?

"I believe so, we (DENR-CAR) were not aware of the intense conflict situation", Ms. Pawid said.

Explain the administrative structure of DENR, DENR-CAR and NCIP on the management of resources.

Ms. Pawid said that they (DENR) respect the indigenous way even before NCIP until problems were met that they came up to a policy. In addition to that, DENR respects the IPRA law and they have requested the NCIP to invite them in the preparation of

ADSTPPP for review but it didn't happen. However, they don't have this biodiversity conservation along to that.

Through, ICCA, within the CADTI area, do you think ICCA should be oversight by NCIP over DENR?

Ms. Pawid suggested that both NCIP and DENR will oversee. In their 1st consultation, NCIP supports ICCA concept but when they were about to secure a certification pre-condition the NCIP Director was changed and negative responses were heard.

How is it now if the NCIP doesn't support?

Ms. Pawid said that what is important to them are the tribes and that they will understand the ICCA regardless what the NCIP will say.

How is the sustainability?

With Banao, the elders are the PAWB and amazingly understood the concept of ICCA. The elders want to invite other tribes and IPAF because they're looking forward to Eco-tourism to open their area to protect and their PA, as Ms. Pawid responded.

If you look to their plan, how long will this sustain?

Ms. Pawid detailed, what is good to them, they don't rely much with the organization. They were not looking for funding from other organizations or external funding. They have this independency. The project was so serious to help the IPs by supporting to finance for the "*Budong*" since both tribes are tired with their situations and their children are affected even if they didn't agree at first because of tradition. CCAGG talked to both tribes explaining the need of help from the NEWCAPP.

What for is that "Budong"?

Ms. Pawid said that the boundary conflict and the "*Budong*" are in a severe situation. There is a conflict that arose aside from the boundary conflict. Mr. Yawan explained this "*Budong*" or the peace pact is about real issues among tribes, DENR can't solve since boundaries are not defined and undocumented. It is controllable, some could facilitate but it is the tribe that could probably solve it.

Did they pursue their application?

Ms. Pawid said that it's not yet okay. Their mapping will follow after the finalization of their map in ICCA leaving the PA. Mr. Yawan added that issues are inter-province, inter-municipality considerations and each of them claims the area which resulted to boundary issues.

Why is it that NCIP were not so involved in the issue? Does the project intend not to include them?

Mr. Yawan disagreed, right from the start they have been informed that FPIC – that this is an ancestral area, their role is to issue the documentation, CADTI. The involvement of NCIP and IPOs that this project would help inputs for ADSTPP through this project. With

ancestral domain, there is no conflict since they recognize it and they are proud of it since they respect what is the domain/ancestral domain in CAR.

If there is a threat, what is the sustainability on that area?

Ms. Pawid said that some were interested because of the mining exploration that's why they applied for ICCA . Mr. Yawan added that their direction from their technical view, these conservation areas would be an input to ADSTPP. Furthermore, there is management with full participation considering the assessment of their resources, biodiversity, and assets. Ms. Pawid said that this is also a threat since its taking slow. However, during the planning and workshops some things were considered.

How about the integration with the NCIP? How critical up to this point for ICCA, or do you think that the project from the threats to attain sustainability?

Ms. Pawid thought that it will be solved since DENR is making and finding ways, like coordination, consultation, and MOA with NCIPs. Mr. Yawan further said with the ADSTPP, plans for conservation should be pursued.

What do you think is the priority?

Ms. Pawid enumerated inventory and conservation plan should be done, so IPs will be able to input these plans to ICCA and MOAs and can strengthen the working relationship amongst. And NEWCAPP is doing these. Mr. Yawan said that these would be adapted by the community and IPs as well.

What is your working relationship with PMU?

Ms. Pawid said that PMU is very facilitative, it's easy to communicate with PMU, and they release finances on time.

What are your thoughts about the project?

Mr. Yawan expressed how they deal with other agencies and organizations. Also, with regards to financial implications, if the agency will go through this effort, DENR and NGOs need to immerse to the community. In this manner the image of each organization will be changed for a better perspective as to a friend to the community and not as a threat to them. They want to reach the community itself as the implementing unit plan and this in line with the tradition and policies.

Ms. Pawid added that before the projects ends they hope that these tribes will be registered to ICCA. This registration will boost their morale for their area to appear in the international map.

FGD with Banao Tribe Representatives

Highland Villa, Baguio City, 4 September 2013, 1:28PM-2:52PM

How did you get to know about the project (NewCAPP)?

Capt. Balao-as of Banao said that they knew about the project during the ICCA in Manila, wherein one of the speakers is from the NewCAPP and introduced to us the project. This project is about the protected area in which it is similar to ICCA.

What was the situation in that area before ICCA came?

Mr. Pagano stated that there was a protection in the forest by the community even before the project came, but there were improvements when the ICCA came. There was a complete information education campaign about the importance of protecting the forest. The ICCA informed the tribe that they want to help in the protection of the area using the peace process with the other tribe together to fix the boundary however, there were tribal differences at that time.

What about these tribal differences?

Mr. Pagano explained, before there was a “*Bodong*” for the establishment of the boundaries. But the Balatoc tribe wanted to claim the Banao area probably because of mining. What they wanted is to protect it because it’s their watershed and to protect it from mining which they don’t want to lose the area. And so, in order to maintain it they talked with the Balatoc about it. Mr. Tambawan added that historically, before the conflict, these two tribes were friends. But because there was a violation on boundary issues, they have to establish the “*Bodong*” and settle the “*Bodong*”. This is a gray area but for them it was not, because we agreed about this before and this is within our area.

What should be done?

Mr. Tambawan answered that they should talk about and agrees with the “*sipat*” (to agree about the original boundary). They saw this as something to be settled but it will take time. Although there was no violence that happened but still there’s conflict but only manifested through words.

Why is this so important?

Mr. Tambawan said that it is their watershed. Atty. added that the gray area is also a hunting ground. Mr. Tambawan expressed that their concern is to protect the area.

How did the project change the situation?

Mr. Tambawan narrated that there were attempts in the reestablishing of “*Bodong*” with the Balatoc tribe. However, none succeed but through the initiative and financial support of the ICCA they were able to meet again last year that resulted to have better relationship although, it was quite unfair for Banao and not to Balatoc. Atty. clarified the statement Mr. Tambawan stated as the area became gray only to Banao but not to Balatoc. Mr. Tambawan reasoned that both tribes agreed upon as a gray area but the effect was not good to them since it’s within their area.

What happened to the first “Bodong”? Why did you say it was severed and needs to be reestablished?

Mr. Tambawan detailed that there were reasons but it is because of the gray area. There was a boundary violation and the “*pagta*” (provisions of the “*Bodong*”).

Although at first, the Balatoc tried to talk with them but the Banao’s intent from Balatoc is different. Mr. Balao-as added that many religious groups, NCIP, LGU’s, Kalinga-Bodong Council and other organizations wanted to help in the reestablishment and so they thought the solution is to have ICCA. Mr. Tambawan also added that they appreciated ICCA, as a sincere organization to establish our organization. They felt comfortable with ICCA. Mr. Paganao said that because of what ICCA had offered.

Why is it that you did not want to sit with the other at first?

Mr. Tambawan explained that it might be a yes or a no because they tried to initiate to sit with each other but maybe because of character differences. Banao is soft hearted but the other tribe seems to be aggressive which they found it difficult to sit together.

Do you think the project has done enough since it will be finished on 2014?

Mr. Paganao agreed and they need more help and that they will be able to maintain the natural resources of biodiversity with the funding.

What are the things that need to be improved?

There is a need to expand influence to the people as Mr. Paganao said.

What do you expect the NCIP has to do with the IPs?

Mr. Paganao said that one problem was that some IPs’ were not serious in the protection of the area but some agencies help in protecting the area. That they need intervention of more groups in the protection of the area. Atty. asked them about their CADT. Mr. Paganao added that they were trying to pursue their CADT application but still have boundary conflicts.

What are the things that you don’t like about the project? Is there any cultural insensitivity about the project?

Mr. Paganao stated that there was none and that the project even tried to work with culture of the people. The supported and let them talk together with the Balatoc.

What did you talked about when you sat down with the Balatoc?

Mr. Rolland narrated to stay on their tribe’s stand, maintain the original boundary, to oppose and establish. They had the courage to sit with the Balatoc because of the presence of people, different tribes, NCIP, CCAGG, and NEWCAPP.

Good experiences from the project

Mr. Gumabay said that they were able to conduct of resource inventory. The trees became lush and they were able to monitor the trees. They were taught on transecting.

Aside from the data that you have, what help do you need?

Mr. Gumabay, Mr. Paganao and Mr. Tambawan enumerated their need of more or less than 10 forest rangers, equipment (radio, firefighting equipment etc.) training, and the considerations of salary of the fulltime workers. Even though the project will be finished they have a mini-hydropower plant that could be able to support the need in protecting the area.

What do you expect? Do you have resource evaluations?

Mr. Gumabay said that they only conducted inventory. Atty. suggested that resource evaluations are pretty good to help with the finances.

What are other things that the project should be done?

Mr. Tambawan asked if they have any claim, since they were informed about the value of carbon. Atty. explained about carbon trading. What is needed is capacitation, evaluation, techniques in fund raising because that is what is needed. Atty. explained about the NIPAs and the process to have its own law that applies to a certain area. That the project is autonomous and it is based on the uniqueness of the area.

FGD with Balatoc Tribe Representatives

Highland Villa, Baguio City, 5 September 2013, 8:55AM – 10:48AM

How did you get to know about the project (NewCAPP)?

Ms. Wendy said that for some of them it was explained but merely more of the ICCA. Mr. Elvie and Mr. Victor said that they are using the “Lapat” system (customary laws) to protect the area. It came about that Ms. Pawid of DENR informed them about the project. Atty. Rivera helped them how to conserve the area.

What did the project do to you?

Mr. Elvin said the project introduced farming, hydrothermal and they have to settle also about their boundary conflict with Banao. Because Banao did not consult them about the plotting, their CADTI was not yet approved in which since Spanish Era they have been using the area to hunt. Ms. Wendy added about the boundary conflicts, the NEWCAPP talked to each conflicting tribes and it was successful and an agreement was done between Banao and Balatoc.

Was the issue resolved?

Mr. Victor explained that a peace pact “*inom*” was conducted wherein the problems will still be discussed. They have talked about boundary disputes and had an arrangement to sign a document so the peace pact is still intact.

Has the project has done enough or still to do more?

Ms. Wilma said that the project needs to continue. Mr. Elvie added as to the conflict issues, there is possibility of resolving it for the next generations will not suffer. Ms. Wilma and Mr. Victor added that there is a need of communication and to schedule another dialogue in which animals to butcher for the occasion is needed.

Ms. Wilma and Mr. Elvie also said that the project is also good because this project helps the IPs, they are glad because there is a local decentralization unlike before that the IPs has to work hard and *angkas* (*bayanihan*/volunteerism). But now that there is decentralization, funding is made available. They were able to talk to the community to explain regarding the project but still needs more information dissemination. Those who did not attend didn't understand what the project is because of passive attitude.

How did the process proceed? (Since Balatoc and Banao were not brought together)

Mr. Edwin enumerated the mediators which was conducted in their provincial Capitol, were members from the LGU and NCIP but they have observed that some of the mediators from the other tribe. Which they saw it as having an influence to other mediators so it didn't succeed.

Whose idea to make the gray area to be a protected area?

Mr. Edwin said that both agreed in order for the both tribes to avail for CADT.

How will you get CADT if the issue was not yet resolved?

Ms. Wendy informed that CAGG helped them in resolving the issue.

What is the project doing with regard to the conversation issues?

Ms. Wendy said that they were trying to resolve the conflict first. Mr. Edwin added that they were planning to work on for their support on preservation and conservation because they saw that the other (tribes) was encroaching their trees. There's a need of preservation. They even asked the LGU to provide salary for Forests rangers in the preservation of the watershed especially in Tabuk since they are one of the beneficiaries of the watershed.

What can you say on the way you were chosen, is there any problem?

Mr. Edwin stated that they were grateful to the project because it helped them a lot; it was reoriented to the tribe because of the illegal logging that was happening.

How does NewCAPP help BKT?

Mr. Victor stated that it helped the officers of BKTl to be recognized and to remove negative personal thinking of some especially those who has personal interest in mining. Ms. Wendy added that it helped them in providing trainings like facilitating and enhancing. The project supports the conservation of natural resources, Ms. Rowena added.

Is the project culture sensitive?

Ms. Rowena agreed. The project is supportive that there was continuous information dissemination, since not all were educated, the IPs were able to understand with transparency. The project even supported the idea for both tribes to meet. Mr. Victor stated that before they don't have the peace pact due to disagreement of boundaries but it was asserted and both tribes want to restore the "Bodong".

How is your relationship with NCIP?

Mr. Edwin said sometimes it's good sometimes it's bad. Ms. Vilma reasoned that it's good if they support them but sometimes not because they don't support them even if they have supporting documents. They don't explain much about the IPRA law.

Do you think this project will end up protecting the area? Which is a better approach to remain it as a gray area or to with defined boundaries?

Mr. Victor explained that they prefer to have a defined boundary since they were the longest CADT applicant but until now their CADT was not yet approved.

What does the project has to do for the community that could carry on beyond the process?

Mr. Victor said that they can continue even without the project. Mr. Victor said they need assistance in the preparation of the map and as a guide for them to do their part.

FGD with Cordillera Citizens' Action for Good Governance Representatives

Highland Villa, Baguio City, 5 September 2013, 11:48AM – 12:43NN

What is the role of CCAGG as the local responsible partner?

Ms. Susan enumerated as technical person, strengthens the IPO's, orients and disseminates about the project by conducting community orientation and consultation about ICCA ,and facilitates the project towards conservation.

What has NEWCAPP attributed to the area?

Ms. Susan stated that while they were doing the project, boundary issues arose so they helped to have dialogue between tribes even though it was not included in their activities.

How does this help?

Ms. Susan enumerated that it provided jobs; it covers the community and helped to reach out remote areas which caters problems with the ancestral issues. Mr. Orlando added also provided workshops.

How will you evaluate this?

Mr. Orlando said that the peace issue activities were tendered and there was realization between tribes especially on biodiversity conservation that security issue is a part. A tribal resource management was also done through this project. Ms. Susan stated that there was awareness and tribes appreciated what they were doing. What IP's have done will be recognized through this project. This could also help the government to minimize overlapping claims and data.

Ms. Susan suggested that it would be easier to implement if we will use the ICCA term because for them ICCA is the same with their lapat rather than Protected Area. They have a negative conception on the term PA which is prohibited and the government will just control it. With ICCA, support will be strengthened, easier expansion of protected area. Atty. added acceptability.

Having this project how was the relationship with DENR?

Ms. Susan said it was improved, there is collaboration and there's a strategic partner event he community. It became good among NCIP, CCAGG, DENR and with other organizations as well.

How about the relationship with the NCIP?

Ms. Susan wondered with NCIP (regional office) that they didn't know about the ICAA or the project that it's even on its mid-year. But NCIP (provincial) were one of CCAGG's partners.

What else can the project do?

Mr. Orlando suggests to level up what the project is to the regional office since they did the process. Ms. Susan said that what the NCIP wants them to do then they are willing to do it.

What is the lack of the project?

Ms. Susan said that they are having problems with the budget and the preparations of yearly budget since the approved budget was reduced from the proposed budget. For this year, the budget was only until 3rd quarter. They can request from PMU but it takes time and it affects the implementation. Mr. Orlando said that these problems were discussed through letters.

FGD with Tipon Tribe Representatives

Highland Villa, Baguio City, 4 September 2013, 3:27PM - 4:26PM

How did you get to know about the project?

Mr. Dongatan stated that it started from the FPE project. Ms. Damullan added that NEWCAPP was introduced to them during the invitation in Manila. TIPON has this proposal, which was approved about biodiversity on their ancestral domain and the group knew only about SGP. So, they were able to get fund from SGP. Ms. Claire, DENR introduced them about the project when they invited her to the workshop. They learned that the project was important and so they got interested about to be recognized in the system. Although, they don't get fund from the project but they were help through technical assistance.

How does the fund help?

Mr. Mariano narrated that although "*Lapat*" system was already developed in the conservation of the Protected Area, the project was a great help, especially with the resource inventory and enforcements.

How far have you been through?

Ms. Damullan said that they were in the compilation and data analysis, although they already had the "*Lapat*" system, they see this as important for recognition.

Do you have a CADT?

Ms. Damullan said they were not able to have CADT since they have boundary conflicts with Abra, Quirino, Ilocos Sur, Bagu Tribe, Mt. province which were not yet resolved as Marino and Anthony stated even though they have made a lot of actions but the negotiations just stopped. They came to the point of talking with the conflicting tribes but they don't agree with it. Ms. Damullan added that a lot of dialogues were conducted but the Bolinney didn't show up.

What does this project help you?

Ms. Damullan said it helped them because of ancestral domain but others conduct mining in the area.

What help can this project give to resolve this?

Mr. Mariano said what they need is direct legal assistance. The support from SGP does not give any assistance to stop the mining. They have declared it as a PA but still mining arises to the area. NewCAPP and PAFID helped them only with proposals.

Does ICCA affect what you are protecting?

Ms. Damullan stated that their focus is in a certain area while "*Lapat*" focuses in the ancestral domain which they found it easier if the scope will be specific. There is no problem with "*Lapat*" but there concern is the declaration of PA on the map. One from their community suggested that the areas that will be identified will be called special "*Lapat*" area.

FGD with Community Environment and Natural Resources Office, DENR, Malaybalay

On the problems with NIPAS where DENR overpowers the stakeholders, i.e. IPs and LGUs, is this felt in Kalatungan? Is the ICCA approach helping in addressing the issue?

Forester Camaso said a resistance from the IP was felt before. However, later on when the purpose [of project] was already known, the IPs understood the protected area. The LGUs were included at the very start. IPs resistance was one of the apprehensions of the LGU. With this, LGUs lost involvement and ownership is with IPs.

As DENR workers, what are your views on ICCA?

Forester Camaso expressed that there is no conflict with respect to conservation. ICCA gives IPs rights to provide protection to protected areas.

What is your understanding on IPAF? The earnings, policies? To whom will IPAF go?

Forester Ramos said that the collection of IPAF is 70-30. Seventy percent funds PA and is retained by province while 30 percent goes to national treasury. Forester Camaso said there is neither clear direction nor resolution from the PAMB. Forester Ramos agreed and added that there is no mechanism in place.

If ICCA earns, what should be the guidelines?

Forester Camaso said that PAMB should create the guidelines. Deputy PASU Sotelo mentioned that PAMB EXECOM looks on tribal affairs. PASU only implements PAMB, we [PASU] are only the secretariat.

What is(are) the benefit(s) of ICCA in terms of conservation?

Deputy PASU Sotelo expressed that ICCA is good in terms of conservation. In Kalatungan, 80 percent is claimed, only a small part I sunder us [DENR]. IPRA and NIPAS law were harmonized. As of today, no more conflict between IPs and DENR. *Bantay Lasang* volunteers are our partners in detection and forest protection. There is a big contribution in terms of protection and conservation. DENR is unmanned, having only 3 employees.

Does ICCA fill the limitations of DENR?

Deputy PASU Sotelo agreed and expressed they accept ICCAs contribution in the protection. DENR needs partners.

What if IPs wanted ICCA to be taken out of NIPAS?

Forester Camaso expressed that NIPAS and ICCA should not be separated. The two are bounded by government regulations. If separated, there will be autonomy.

Forester Ramos said multi-sectoral. IPs address conservation according to their practices.

Why is there a problem on planting falcata for commercial purposes within the protected area?

Forester Camaso said the IPs could apply for the AO.

What do you think of CADT in NIPAS?

Deputy PASU Sotelo mentioned that when IPRA and NIPAS were harmonized, DENR still has hold over destruction of land. In instances where IP has contribution to the destruction, it is being addressed through conduct of meetings. Though not totally stopped, it has been minimized.

Forester Camaso expressed that in his opinion, CADT gives absolute ownership to IPs. Should they [IP] sell their land, DENR is not involved.

In other regions, DENR ground staff was not empowered in this project. What can you say about this? What do you think is the role of DENR?

Forester Camaso conveyed that they did not know the role of DENR in ICCA. DENR should be involved in ICCA planning and in other components. Forester Ramos agreed and expressed that they are not familiar with the components of the project. She mentioned they do not know where to enter.

What is the technical participation of DENR?

Forester Camaso mentioned research inventory and surveys. Forester Ramos added 3D mapping and providing data.

What do you think of the Project Management Unit (PMU)?

Deputy PASU Sotelo said that they at DENR are not informed. With proper coordination, they can implement and disseminate.

Do you have other concerns?

Forester Ramos expressed that they will appreciate if DENR is provided with at least proceedings of activities being conducted to bridge the gap of coordination lapses. Deputy PASU Sotelo suggested having additional manpower as Kalatungan is a very big area. Having only two personnel in the field, additional technically capable personnel can focus on the project.

FGD with Datus in Mts. Kalatungan and Hilong-Hilong

How do you feel about NewCAPP? Are they doing the right thing to IPs?

Datu Guina said the tribe was not recognized by LGUs and DENR. NewCAPP recognized IPs efforts to conserve and protect their environment. Government is not alone in protecting forests.

The project pushes co-management with DENR and LGUs. Is this idea welcome to you?

Datu Guina conveyed his observation that these agencies should harmonize operations with tribal practices.

Are you willing to give up sole management of ICCA? This means your plans should be aligned with their plans?

Datu Besto expressed that with co-management, he does not have a comment because they [] respect the tribes practices and management style on their resources.

Is your participation and contribution enough with respect to joining NewCAPP?

Datu Besto said that NewCAPP respects tribal practices. Financially, they need NewCAPP as they address our [tribe] lack of funds.

What are the actual benefits of joining NewCAPP?

Datu Guina said in the site, one could really see that the areas that are supposed to be protected are indeed protected. The resources are really untouched because of their [NewCAPP] guidance. We [tribe] have rituals which others are not able to witness/attend due to lack of funds. It is better if they have funding for this.

Datu Besto stated that NewCAPP made them aware of the importance of protecting their environment not just for IPs but others as well.

Are you implementing PES?

Datu Besto answered that having PES is their objective.

Why do you feel the need for a national registry?

Datu Guina said for them, they want to be registered. In the Philippines, there are a number of forests. They want their tribes in Mindanao especially in Bukidnon to be recognized especially their efforts on protection.

Who manages the registry? Who is(are) your partner(s) in conservation/protection?

Datu Guina answered the NGO not the government. DENR thinks their tribe is not capable of protecting the natural resources and that they lack funds.

Datu Besto said both DENR and NGO are partners in strengthening their organization. DENR is the primary partner yet they did not strengthen the organization. In terms of protection, we [IPs and DENR] are both doing our parts.

How about NewCAPP? Did they strengthen you as well? Did they change your view on DENR?

Datu Guina agreed and said NewCAPP made them change their view on DENR. The government's operation is focused on the national level. Our [tribe] efforts were not recognized globally without the help of NewCAPP.

Without NewCAPP, will your relationship with DENR change?

Datu Guina answered saying it will change for the better with NewCAPP. Even without NewCAPP, he thinks the relationship will be sustained as long as PASU Alima would not be replaced.

Ms. Emelia said they want to be registered because other tribes (e.g. Palawan can learn from their efforts in Bukidnon. They will be known in protecting their *yutang kabilin* [ancestral domains inheritance]. The young ones are included in tree planting activities. They are starting to take part in our efforts. They install in them [youth] the importance of protecting our environment.

NewCAPP is about to finish yet there are still a number of things to be done. What is your reaction to this?

Datu Guina said in his opinion, they can finish. NewCAPP efforts enabled all the tribes to engage in dialogue and sharing which in turn provided us [tribes] the venue to learn from one another, e.g. strategies.

For the next 2 years, what are the areas for improvement?

Datu Guina said during rituals, LGU and DENR support the tribe. They need budget for rituals, i.e. pig, chicken, fares.

Datu Besto mentioned more years should be added so other projects can be implemented in Milalitra and other tribes.

What about your experience with PES?

Datu Besto said they are currently negotiating with the buyer side including CDO-based industries. They are hoping the whole Philippines will benefit.

How much will be earned? Why will Xavier University manage it?

Datu Besto replied they do not have figures yet and the University has the personnel as response to the respective questions. When dealing with tribes, there will be no payment from buyers unlike if the transaction goes thru Xavier.

Is this setup fine with you?

Datu Besto responded yes because Xavier's management is transparent.

Where will you use your PES?

Datu Besto said they would use it to improve their lands. Denuded PA will be reforested and agroforest livelihood will be implemented.

How many people are needed? Are you able to finance it?

Datu Besto answered they do not have any information yet.

What will be your reaction if PASU will be replaced?

Datu Guina conveyed that before they did not have a good relationship with previous PASU as he sought only the other leaders of the tribe. With the current PASU, the tribe and the others had harmony. PASU is better in explaining what needs to be done, hears their inputs and respects their tribal laws.

What if DENR recognizes his efforts and he gets promoted?

Datu Guina and Ms. Emelia expressed that will be good but it would be better if PASU will continue to work with them.

What are the other partner NGOs?

Ms. Emelia mentioned Kasilak Foundation – a partner of DOLE. Datu Guina supported this and mentioned Kasilak's project include coffee and abaca.

Datu Guina mentioned UNDP on reforestation. Ms. Emelia mentioned Arnet for livelihood, i.e. planting potatoes, onion, carrots.

What is the basis for installing PES? How do you determine the amount to be paid?

Datu Besto said he has no idea. Datu Guina for them it will start PES, Kalitungan is where it will all start.

Do you see yourselves having buyers? How long would it take for the negotiations to be finished?

Datu Guina responded yes, i.e. Napocor, Stanfilco and Dole. Negotiations will start this September and a meeting will be held for this.

Do you have other insights?

Datu Besto said he hopes that in 2015, NewCAPP will be extended in helping our tribes not only in the protection of our ancestral domains but introducing livelihood projects. The economic situation of the tribes will surely be alleviated. Datu Guina said that agroforestry projects will be good for them.

How were you involved in the project NewCAPP?

Datu Tumopas said mapping, documentation of tribal culture and resource inventory. After NewCAPP then linked to PAFID and funded the project.

When NewCAPP came about, was there an existing 3D map? What was the process when NewCAPP started?

Datu Tumopas said documentation and resource inventory

What was the impact of the project? Did the project bring positive impact?

Datu Tumopas said they conducted the resource inventory and documentation which were funded by NewCAPP. Datu Tumopas responded that through the project, the ICCA was in place because of NewCAPP funding.

What is the best output of this project?

Ms. Daculay said the community ties was strengthened especially with the elders who were the priority at the start. The relationship was strengthened because of the project's guidance and the culture was made known because of the documentation.

Datu Tumopas said the younger generation was unaware of the culture. By doing documentation, the youth are now aware of the culture esp. the sacred protection of the forests.

Mr. Hupayan mentioned before the documentation happened, they relied on the elders when it comes to culture. Now their cultural practices are written in paper and not just conveyed verbally.

Ms. Lupyahan said having native title.

Mr. Daculay said ICCA was already protected before not just recognized.

What is the importance of global registry of ICCA?

Datu Tumopas said the most important reason why they want the Tribe Manobo to be recognized by UNDP/UN is to convey that even with limited resources, the tribe is protecting the forests and recognizes the need for additional knowledge on protecting their resources.

What more can be done to protect ICCA? Would you want your area under ICCA – NIPAS?

Datu Tumopas said with NIPAS, the tribe has rights over resources and ancestral domain. When they planted *falcata* the DENR did not allow them to cut it. They are hoping that NIPAS and DENR would not take away their rights over these plants.

So no NIPAS just ICCA?

Datu Tumopas and Mr. Hupayan agreed saying YES.

DENR says just reconcile plans to be NIPAS-ICCAs? Is it feasible? Will this be good? Or better off separated?

Datu Tumopas said the tribe could not go without the guidance of NGOs and DENR. Without NIPAS, there will be no guidance and they will have difficulty in the implementation. Even without the funding, the tribe carried out rituals and made efforts to protect the sacred land even without external help. Their efforts will be reinforced if the current programs are present.

What about NIPAS? ICCA without NIPAS? All with NIPAS?

Datu Tumopas strongly answered No. OK without NIPAS. But he also said NIPAS provisions were not presented to the tribe. In the protected areas, NIPAS lead but the ICCA has no power and rights.

The tribe needs to ensure sustainable financing. Do you agree? If yes, how much is needed?

Datu Tumopas agreed and said yes they need sustainable financing. Mr. Daculay said the *baganis* [the forest guards] and the elders enforce the rules in ICCA so sustainable financing is needed to sustain their services. Mr. Hupayan said the forest guards need to concentrate on their tasks. Nevertheless Mr. Daculay said the amount needed is still not computed yet.

With sustainable financing what is acceptable? In Milalitra, they have PES. Can you do PES? Do you have the market?

Mr. Daculay mentioned that last May a research was conducted on water. It was not pushed through for reasons unknown to them. If PES will be introduced to them and covers the environment, maybe they can do it.

2014 is fast approaching. What are the things needed to be done (e.g. inventory, establish PES)? Will the project be finished by 2014?

Mr. Daculay said in their previous activities, it took them four (4) months to complete and required two (2) months extension.

Was the process, including the length, of PES in Milalitra explained to you?

Mr. Hupayan, Mr. Daculay and 11 mentioned they do not have updates of the project nor the project explained to them.

What more should be done?

Ms. Daculay, Ms. Lupyahan and Datu Tumopas all mentioned about livelihood for everyday living. They stressed the difficult living situations in ICCA. Ms. Lupyahan mentioned education for the youth.

What livelihood do you want to get from the project?

Mr. Hupayan mentioned for the youth -weaving of tribal dresses. Mr. Daculay said if they can plant abaca and coffee, it would provide monthly income to the community. According to an agriculturist, abaca and coffee are intercropped and its annual harvest is ensured.

If sustainable financing is in place and livelihood is also established, can you sustain the project?

Datu Tumopas and Mr. Hupayan agreed and said Yes. Mr. Hupayan stressed that with sustainable financing they can sustain the project.

Are there negative impacts brought about by the project?

Mr. Hupayan said none.

Was the project culturally sensitive?

Mr. Daculay said because of the project they were able to perform rituals, which were showcased to the other members of the tribe. Mr. Hupayan mentioned the members of the tribe did the research on their own culture so no time was wasted. Ms. Daculay mentioned with NewCAPP and the activities conducted, the 'forgotten' practices of the tribe were now known. She can now tell the grandchildren to refer to the documents when asked about their customs and traditions. She is thankful. Ms. Lupyahan shared that her kids, aged 11 and 12, did not know how to dance the *lumad* dance. Now they are determined to learn the dance.

For the project with DENR, is DENR communicating with you or only to PAFID?

Mr. Daculay narrated that at first, PASU Flores was a not friend of the tribe. After 2 years, PASU Alima came and DENR started becoming helpful. NGP installed and *Bantay Lasang* was enforced properly. He even mentioned they even apprehend own members of the tribe. With PASU Alima, DENR and the tribe had an understanding.

Did this project help the image of DENR?

Datu Tumopas said for him, DENR did not 'destroy' us.

In the community conservation plan, is cutting of trees included?

Mr. Daculay mentioned cut only what is used and we are not allowed to sell. Datu Tumopas agreed with Mr. Daculay and said it is written that they are allowed to cut only what is needed. Mr. Daculay mentioned ICCA is not included in CCP.

Where is NCIP? What do they do?

Ms. Daculay said the agency for them [tribe] is NCIP. However, in the area, they were not aware of the functions of NCIP. They want the LGUs to visit us in our barangays so they can introduce themselves to the tribe.

Datu Mando said they want help in their lands, e.g. surveys, and titles. However, they always say there is no budget. *'We thought they are the ones who will help us. Why don't they find ways for us'.*

Datu Mando said they need help in solving problems with CADTI.

What is(are) lesson(s) learned from NewCAPP? Lessons you want other tribes or NewCAPP to learn?

Mr. Daculay said one of the lessons learned was the importance of culture and tradition. It is very important as it changed their outlook. It made them aware and appreciate the culture of their ancestors esp. in protecting their lands.

Datu Tumopas said the activities they did like resource inventory, photographic documentation of sacred land has strengthened and empowered their tribe.

Mr. Hupayan said they contributed in their own ways in the prevention of global warming.

Ms. Lupyahan said they used to have no idea of the importance of culture and tradition. With UNDP, they now understand its importance.

Mr. Helomoc representing the youth mentioned that he learned to respect their culture. As a member of the youth, they follow their ancestors as stewards of their lands. They learned from the ancestors how to take care of the environment.

Ms. Mando stated that before she thought the Manobo dance was just performed in intermission numbers. Now she realize their dance is showcased as *kabilin* (legacy) of their ancestors. This gives the tribe the identity and its importance in the community.

Mr. Nonoy said he did not believe in stories (e.g. cutting of trees). Now he knows what message the ancestors wanted to impart.

Interview with RTD Gwendolyn Mutya Bambalang of DENR Region 4B

Sept. 3, 2013

Questions:

- What challenges are present in a NIPAS area where you have IPs?
- What experiences do you have in Mt. Iglit Baco that can be shared in other sites?
- What is the working relationship between the region, Anthrowatch and the PMU?

Summary of Responses:

- Mt. Iglit Baco is part of the initial component of the PA project. Congresswoman Sato helped in working for its legislation
- There is a CADT in the NIPAS site. The challenge is how to make the IPs understand the general management plan and incorporate it in the ADSDPP.
- DENR regional office have not talked with Anthrowatch yet. PASU Rodel is the one working closely with Anthrowatch. The former Project Coordinator who became the PENRO has not mentioned about coordination with Anthrowatch.
- Early in 2012, Folay was thinking of pulling out of Mindoro. RTD requested for more time to talk to the IPs. The IPs said that they don't feel the presence of Anthrowatch in their area. Region 4B has a closer relationship with Haribon with the BPP project. Haribon submits reports to Region 4B.
- There's a GOP budget but we don't know where to spend it. We want to bring NGOs and Tribal leaders to a meeting to determine where to work together and how to move forward.
- RTD Mutya had initial bias against the IPs because she felt that they are not appreciative of government programs. The IPs are suspicious that there might be double charging in some projects. Through time she has come to understand the IPs better.
- In terms of ICCA establishment, learnings from Mt Iglit Baco can be applied in other PAs with IPs. The ICCA establishment of ICCA can minimize the kaingin practice by Mangyans.
- Mt. Iglit Baco has an approximate area of 75,000 ha which has no management zoning done yet.
- There is a lot of potential in the project if there is closer coordination between the region, PMU and Anthrowatch. The region has not been oriented on what NewCapp wants to do in Mt. Iglit Baco.
- There's no IPAF established yet for Mt Iglit Baco

FGD Mt. Iglit Baco Stakeholders

Aroma Center, San Jose, Occidental Mindoro, September 2013, 8:00 – 6:00

Who are the indigenous people living in the Protected Area? Their culture? Activities?

PASu Rodel M. Boyles answered that there are three (3) tribes living and has claim to the land. These are Buhid, Tau-buid and Bangon tribes. They are scattered in both Occidental and Oriental Mindoro.

In culture, according to AFTI (Agdalawanon Framudi Tao Buid Inc.) Chair Juanito Perez, Tau-buid is changing their culture of early and arranged marriage. They also focus more on education and other livelihood opportunities by the government as of now.

Do they have their CADT?

Buhid tribes had their CADC which they hold together with the Bangon tribe, according to PASu Boyles. The Tau-buid is still working on processing their CADC.

Why the CADT of the Buhid processed first than the Tau-buids?

PASu Boyles answered that because of some internal issues with their political formation and partly with NCIP, the surveying and delineation of their CADC process in Tau-buid nearly stopped.

Ms. Lodripas of Anthrowatch stated that maybe the NCIP has other priorities and focus the attention mainly to the Buhid through the help of Mangyan Mission, an NGO, to mobilize the tribe's CADC process. It appears that the Buhid is also more accessible. FPE has helped the tribe in the past.

At present, in what process these tribes currently engage in for their CADT?

PASu Boyles stated that at present, the Tau-buid tribe is in the process of ADSDPP, which is one of the steps of CADC process. He also said that Buhid is in the process of registering their CADT with assistance from Anthrowatch. It takes long for the CADT to be registered because of the unresolved issue of CLOAs within the CADT area.

Vice Chair Aysik Onday of SADIK HABANAN BUHID answered that they are waiting for registration and issuance of the CADT for them to be officially and legally acknowledge by the government.

How many ICCA areas were established in Oriental Mindoro?

Mr. Onday answered that there are three (3) ICCA sites established and monitored regularly. These were in the municipality of Bansud, Bongabong and Roxas. These areas were considered as sacred area in their ancestral land which might be a tribal grave, forest and springs. These areas are prohibited to *kaingin* activities.

What are the helps and advantages of these ICCA to your community and CADC?

According to Mr. Onday, ICCA areas are a great help as source of their food and other forest products. Also according to their forest ranger, the ICCA area is rich in different biodiversity except to Tamaraw.

According Mr. Onday and his colleagues, also Bangon stated, its great advantage is that the government acknowledge the rights of indigenous people in managing and conserving their own land. Also, the power to prevent the illegal activities in their ancestral domain.

In managing your ICCA, what are the activities that the tribe is doing? Problems encountered?

Mr. Onday answered that they had Forest rangers that conduct regular monitoring to the ICCA areas within their land. They support these rangers thru financial, technical and by formulation of committees as body in creating more organize management for their ICCA.

According to Dama, one of their forest ranger, existing illegal activities and natural calamities were the challenge and problems they encounter.

Did the community coordinate this to local government unit to consider in Forest and Land Use Plan of the municipality and acknowledge your rights?

Mr. Onday answered that they not yet coordinate in the local government unit or even in the barangay because they believe that it was in their own ancestral land. As of now, we had already identified our representatives for each municipality to stand for our rights.

How is your relation to DENR, NewCAPP, Anthrowatch and other related programs?

We have a good relationship in DENR and even to Anthrowatch by their help. One of the help of the DENR in establishing ICCA was documenting of it. We are suggesting to DENR, Anthrowatch and NCIP to continuously support us thru financial, technical and to other things, said Mr. Onday. This is because the IP's needs help from NGO's and government programs to minimize or prevent them in destroying the forest for food and other purposes. Mr. Yawin-ay Giayan suggested conducting a joint training together with the NGO's and DENR.

According to AFTI Chair Perez, NewCAPP are helping them thru financial and technical assistance to process the ICCA. He ask for help to established ICCA by surveying the total delineation of the ancestral domain, planning and community consultation for approval of the establishment of ICCA in their ancestral domain lands.

On Anthrowatch part, according to Ms. Lodripas, is still helping and supporting the projects for Tau-buids. Only NCIP has the control to the schedule, she also added. In delineation matter, it has been plan to survey and measure the CADC until 2014.

To the relation to DENR, Ms. Lodripas, she cleared that she was submitting report of accomplishments of the Anthrowatch to the Regional Office and also NewCAPP asking reports from their office.

What are being deficient in the ADSDPP of your organization (Tau-buid, Buhid and Bangon)?

According to Mr. Onday, only the approval from the NCIP holds them to their registration and awarding of the CADT that they working on.

Ms. Lodripas answered that on the part of Tau-buid, ADSDPP initiation must come from the tribe to be acknowledged by the NCIP.

Synthesis of the whole FGD/RTD

The discussion focuses to the status of the ICCA and activities of the offices, particularly the NewCAPP and PASu, in the development and process for the CADT. Three (3) tribes were claiming their ancestral lands inside the protected area. These were Buhid, Tau-buid and Bangon. They were scattered in the land of Oriental and Occidental Mindoro. PASu Rodel M. Boyles, concurrent Tamaraw Conservation Program Coordinator (TCP), gives some information to the status of the CADC/CADT of every tribe. He also discussed why Buhid and Bangon of Oriental Mindoro processed first their CADT compare to Tau-buid of Occidental Mindoro. The political status of the Tau-buid tribe and slow-moving in the part of NCIP in processing the CADC as priority delayed their CADC. This statement was also supported by representative of Anthrowatch, a NGO that mission to support indigenous people and to practice their human and land rights, who facilitate the 3D modeling map and ADSDPP of the Tau-buid.

Buhid and Bangon tribes stated the advantage and problems that they currently encounter in their respective CADC and ICC areas. They also detailed the participation of NewCAPP and DENR in supporting their ICCA and activities in preserving forest and strengthening their claims and authority in their respective lands. They also acknowledge the effort of organizations, such as Anthrowatch and other NGO's, for supporting their aspiration to register their CADT. Also, they requested support for the financial, technical and livelihood to their *Bantay-Gubat* (Forest Rangers) and community for continuing effort of conserving and protecting their ICCA and sustainable usage of products within. They also requested to conduct training, collaboration with DENR and NGO's, subjecting the rules and alternative source of income for every community.

Interview with Anthrowatch – Portia Villarante, Miks Padilla

Sept. 25, 2013

Questions:

- Why do IPs want to establish ICCAs?
- What are the challenges in mainstreaming ICCAs?
- How is your working relationship with DENR?
- What are your recommendations to improve project implementation?

Summary of Responses:

- ADSDPP is associated with NCIP. Some IPs do not like to work with NCIP. ICCA seems to be easier to process than ADSDPP. IPs feel that they have a handle on ICCA – there is no disagreement on where and why it is being established. Because of the ICCA establishment, the IPs are now more open to partner with DENR. They viewed the NIPAS before as disenfranchising them from their AD.
- The Buhid tribe see ICCA as something that can strengthen their ADSDPP.
- The project served as a venue for consolidating the POs in Mindoro Oriental and Occidental.
- Challenges in mainstreaming ICCAs:
 - LGUs are not yet integrating IP concerns in their development plans
 - With PAMB, there is a challenge in DENR and LGU acceptance of IPs in the PAMB. IP voice can be drowned out because of their number.
 - The remoteness of IP areas makes them less accessible to government support and services
 - Unresolved tenurial conflicts between different government agencies, eg CADT of Buhid was approved by NCIP but cannot be awarded because of the unresolved CLOA question. There was a suggestion to make the IPs as beneficiaries of the CLOA. This was rejected by DAR.
- Our relationship with DENR is varies from one agency to another. We have a good relationship with PAWB and NewCapp and DENR CARAGA regional office. It is rather personality centered. It depends on the people occupying the positions.
- Recommendations to improve project implementation:
 - More sharing among ICCA practitioners
 - Cross site exchanges are inspiring. IP to IP exchanges are more potent
 - Don't idealize the IP ways and culture. Mistakes will be made and principles are not always followed.
 - ICCA consortium is a good start and can be further supported.