

ATTACHMENT 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

The original Terms of Reference (TOR) was effectively superseded by the most recent guidance from UNDP-GEF which was discussed during the inception meeting of August 2015, and agreed upon by all parties. The following is a word version of the PowerPoint presentation made by the UNDP Philippines as the new guidance from GEF.

1.0 Focus of MTR

- Assessment of progress towards results
- Monitoring of implementation and adaptive management to improve outcomes
- Early identification of risks to sustainability
- Emphasis on supportive recommendations

2.0 Elements of the Project Design that the MTR should review:

- The extent to which lessons from other relevant projects were incorporated into the project design;
- The extent to which the project addresses country priorities and is country-driven;
- The sustainability and viability of the project;
- Decision making processes;
- The extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.

3.0 Major Areas for Assessment

3.1. Progress Towards Result

- Critical analysis of the log frame
- GEF Tracking Tool
 - Compare the mid-term TT with that of baseline TT;
 - Analyze trends and comments on progress made or lack thereof;
 - Make recommendations for the completion of the GEF TT at project closure
- Progress Towards Outcome Analysis
 - Provide ratings on project's progress towards its objective and each outcome;
 - The assessment should be based on the data provided in the PIRs, supplemented by data provided in the GEF TTs, the findings in the MTR mission and interviews with project stakeholders

3.2. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

1. Management Arrangements

- Quality of UNDP to support the Project
- Quality of IP's execution of the project
- Compare the management arrangements described in the ProDoc and the current arrangements.

UNDP

- Whether there is appropriate focus on results
- The adequacy of UNDP's support to the IP;
- Quality and timeliness of UNDP's technical support to the IP;
- Candor and realism in annual reporting;
- The quality of risk management;
- Responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any);

Implementing Partner

- Whether there is appropriate focus on results and timeliness;
- Adequacy of management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement;
- Quality of risk management;
- Candor and realism in reporting;
- Government ownership
- Adequate mitigation and management of risks identified

2. Work-planning

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify causes and examine if they have been solved;
- Identify if work planning processes are results-based; if not, suggest ways to reorient;
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/logframe as management tool

3. Finance and Co-finance

- Assess whether strong financial controls are established;
- Variances between planned and actual expenditures;
- Whether project demonstrate due diligence in the management of funds, including annual audits;
- Any changes made to fund allocation as a result of budget revision and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions

4. Project level M&E systems

- Quality of M&E plan's implementation;
- Appropriateness of the M&E systems
- The extent to which the project team is using inclusive, innovative, and participatory monitoring systems;
- The extent to which follow-up and/or adaptive management, where taken in response to the PIRs;
- The extent to which the development objectives are built into the monitoring systems

5. Stakeholder Engagement

- Partnership with direct and indirect stakeholders
- Support of the local and national government to the objectives of the project;
- Quality of stakeholder involvement to the project

6. Reporting

- Quality of project reporting
- 7. Communication
 - Quality of internal and external communication

Rating for Project Implementation

3.3. Sustainability

- Likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends;
- Areas for assessment: financial, socio-economic, institutional framework and governance, and environmental;
- Should validate the risks identified by the project

Rating for Sustainability

ATTACHMENT 2: MTR MATRICES AND RATING SCALES USED

RATING SCALE: PROGRESS TOWARDS OUTCOMES

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

RATING SCALE: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Highly Unsatisfactory	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to

(HU)	efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
------	---

RATING SCALE: SUSTAINABILITY

Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

MTR RATINGS AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY TABLE FOR (PROJECT TITLE)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

ATTACHMENT 3 Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

The MTR team followed the key questions outlined in the GEF guidance document entitled “Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP Supported, GEF financed Projects. Specific reference to Chapter 3. This was further amplified with the following evaluative questions. Further improvisations were made in the field to adjust to the actual context of project stakeholders:

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the objectives, outcomes and outputs address the documented situation analysis of local biodiversity management in the country? Does the policy agenda address the known barriers in biodiversity management as defined not only by the PRODOC but also other existing policy analysis? Is there internal consistency between outcomes and outputs and on their respective indicators? 	<p>Correspondence between project components and policy and institutional gaps as defined by key PRODOC and other sectoral assessments</p> <p>Presence of misplaced indicators</p>	<p>-National Devt Plans /Sectoral Plans</p> <p>-Assessment report of local governance</p> <p>-UN - NCSA 2007</p> <p>-Policy analysis of Phil NRM situation</p>	<p>Literature Review</p> <p>KII with Local officials and</p>
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the perceived main drivers for the agencies (national and local) to introduce and sustain biodiversity (BD) concerns in its policies, programs and plans? What information and lessons learned has been used to help define problems and formulate strategic policy responses? What benefits and costs are anticipated on the part of the agency adopting the innovation? 	<p>Opportunities being identified by stakeholders in undertaking policy dialogue</p> <p>Stakeholder insights on their participation to project supported activities</p>	<p>Agency positions papers</p> <p>Agency Plans</p> <p>Sector papers</p> <p>Highlights of seminar workshops including</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KII</p> <p>FGD</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are key stakeholders participating in the process for 			

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
formulating policies and programs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do the key professional career staffs as well as political leadership regard these changes? How are the National BD Information systems being developed in terms of content, process and stakeholder participation? What support systems from the agencies concerned are being provided to enable adoption by the LGU? 	Counterpart financing provided by agencies and LGUs to project learning events Situation analysis reports and reports on best practices	participant feedback	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do stakeholders learn about the good practices and technologies? What support systems are being provided to investors and practitioners and what is the perceived effectiveness? What initial work has been actually done in terms of communication campaigns, monitoring implementation and knowledge management? 	Substantive content of policy instruments Substantive content of Training programs for LGUS	Draft policies Manual of operations	
What is the overall progress of each planned output and what is the evidence based prospects that the outcome indicators will be met?	Communication plans and communication products		
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the planned actions consistent with the mandates of the agencies to take the lead in the implementation of the project? What is the level of vertical coordination/inter-organizational collaboration- influences from the source of the project (national government), from within the LGUs, and from the wider environment: e.g., extent of leadership within the local authority, local political support, etc.? What is the level of horizontal collaboration-network 	Trend of Project Board insights and decisions to steer the project and adapt to implementation realities	Minutes of Board Meetings PIRs MOA between the DENR and Agencies	Lit review KII FGD

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<p>management?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What mechanisms have been put in place to facilitate collaboration? Have these been effective in ensuring the successful implementation of the project? 	<p>Ability of project stakeholders to articulate the objectives , mechanisms and success indicators</p>	<p>concerned</p> <p>Technical reports of field partners</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the level of commitment and leadership skills of implementing officials/staff? • What is the level of capacity of the implementing partners in terms of: organization and management; capabilities and facilities, and financial and absorptive capacity? 	<p>Nature and scope of interaction between DENR project and other stakeholder agencies</p>	<p>Draft policy instruments</p> <p>Manuals of procedures developed</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the implementers at the project sites have full comprehension/understanding of the project? • What are misconceptions, if any, about the project? • Is the project well received at the national and demonstration sites levels? • What is the intensity of acceptance? • Are all implementers implementing the program in the same way? • Do implementers need additional training/capacity building on the project? 	<p>Monitoring and evaluation system actually being used</p>	<p>Training modules undertaken</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there financing mechanisms established to fund and maintain the project both at the national and at the demonstration sites levels? • What has been the progress of financial flow so far? • What incentives have been identified and offered for the implementation of the project and beyond? • What has been agreed so far in terms of setting up the LGU based monitoring system and what resources are being planned to support these? 	<p>Actual physical progress versus planned implementation schedules</p> <p>Disbursement rates</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project being implemented as it was designed? • Is it being implemented on schedule? • Are there any negative outcomes surfacing? 			

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the social and cultural characteristics at the national and local levels that have affected, either positively or negatively, the implementation of the project and sustainability of the good practices generated? • What are the policies both at the national and local levels that facilitate and/or hinder the implementation of the project? • How supportive are the national and local political leadership to the project? • What persistent institutional constraints and reforms will have a key effect on sustainability/ • Based on progress so far , what practical project innovations are expected to work and help stakeholders overcome traditional barriers to biodiversity management • What is the status of the phase out planning process? 	<p>Consistency of pronouncement of local leaders to actual public investments earmarked by LGU</p> <p>Perceived cost and benefits by stakeholders (government and community levels)</p>	<p>MOA between the DENR and Agencies concerned</p> <p>Multiyear Trend in public investments by partner agencies during project period</p> <p>Agency plans and progress reports</p>	<p>Lit Review</p> <p>FGD with LCE LGU officials and community leaders</p>

The above questions are extracted from the supplemental Questionnaire proposed by the MTR Team for policy and institutional analysis and adapted to the GEF format above. This is part of the evaluation plan.

ATTACHMENT 4: MATRIX ON FINDINGS AND RATINGS FOR PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS

Note: Colors on the 7th Column represent assessment of progress of indicators: ACHIEVED (Green); ON TARGET TO BE ACHIEVED (Yellow); NOT ON TARGET TO BE ACHIEVED (Red)

Project Goal: Ensure that fragmentation is arrested by making certain that activities in the production landscape conserve species assemblages and maintain ecosystem functions.

Objective:

To demonstrate how Local Government Units (LGUs), with enhanced capacities, and working together with local and national partners, can plan and manage economic activities and growth in ways that meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives in critical biogeographic regions.

Rating: Satisfactory (S)

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
Populations of at least three critically endangered species in three demonstration sites.	Expected to decrease by at least 10% by end-project.	The baseline biodiversity assessment is part of the project activities for 2012 of the Responsible partners in Mt. Siburan, Central Panay and Northern Negros Natural Park and Mt. Hamiguitan. The results of the biodiversity assessment will provide baseline data to determine the status of the populations of the three critically endangered species. The project has engaged the Fauna and Flora Inc. as		No decline in populations of tamaraw in Siburan forests; Visayan hornbill in Central Panay and NNNP; and Philippine eagle in Mt. Hamiguitan.	Baseline information in the 3 sites which will be known by early 2015 yet. Recent LGU decisions for BD friendly land use (assisted by the project) will facilitate adoption of BD friendly practices in the next 2 years. Their impact may be felt on land use improvements (see other indicators	Due to the need to develop and fine tune an effective methodology, and budgetary constraints, the Project has required more time than anticipated to establish Baseline information. Since most on the ground adoption of recommended interventions is starting also at this time, this may actually still be a good time for base lining. Consequently, the ideal time to do an impact survey would be at least 3 years after, which will be slightly after the project has ended.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
		a Responsible Partner to develop the methodology for undertaking a standard biodiversity survey and monitoring that can be used in the mid and end of project assessment of status of biodiversity resources in the project demonstration sites.			below). But the impact on population count; forest fragmentation and habitat improvements at the level targeted by the project may not yet be seen at the end of the project. R	There are initial promising findings observed in one site (hornbill in Negros) but requires double checking. Less intensive baseline information from 4 other sites were also collected by local stakeholders. In effect information in 7 sites instead of 4 can be used in local land use planning and monitoring processes.
Extent of habitat fragmentation in unprotected PAs/KBAs in eight demonstration sites.	Expected to increase by at least 10% by end-project.	The mapping of PAs/KBAs in eight demonstration sites is part of the baseline activities of the project. The project has procured from NAMRIA satellite image maps (SIMs) to help facilitate the baseline mapping and assessment of the current extent of habitat fragmentation of unprotected PAs/KBAs in the project sites. At the end of the project, these SIMs would be compared with the new information of the habitat conditions to determine fragmentation status of the PAs/KBAs.		No net increase in fragmentation in 287,000 hectares of unprotected PAs/KBAs in eight demonstration sites.	Baseline information is being firmed up in 5 of 7 sites and will be known in 2015. As in the case of population counts, since most of community/farmer level adoption of BD friendly practices will occur in 2015, the positive effect on arresting fragmentation in 287,000 hectares cannot yet be expected at project end. However other lower level initial impact indicators may be observed (habitat improvement, land use interventions	The justification relevant to population counts also applies to the case of fragmentation. Similar to the fragmentation analysis, the budget in the ProDoc did not include funds for the procurement of satellite imageries and on-ground vegetation cover validation. The project has to work around the ProDoc budget to allocate funds for this purpose. Also due to budgetary constraints, the project covered only 5 sites (NECKBA, NNNP, QPL, Lake Mainit, and Mt Hamiguitan). Results of the fragmentation analysis are expected to be available by the 1st quarter of 2015. Land cover and fragmentation analysis of the 3 other sites will be done by the trained staff of BPP and BMB.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
					adoption). R	
Extent of remaining natural habitat within PAs in five biogeographic regions.	Expected to decrease by at least 10% in PAs in project sites by end-project.	The procured SIMs from NAMRIA by the Project will facilitate the baseline mapping and assessment of the natural habitats in eight demonstration sites. New information on the status of these habitats from biodiversity assessments in the project sites at mid and end of Project will be compared to the baseline maps obtained from the NAMRIA SIMs and other data/information from the results of the baseline biodiversity assessments.		No net loss of remaining natural habitat covering at least 310,000 hectares in PAs within project sites.	The preliminary baseline have been established by the Project, using the satellite images obtained from NAMRIA and extrapolated data from the ongoing land use planning processes subject to further validation. The impact of recent LGU land use decisions may be felt in terms of positive changes in production systems (see other indicators below) by year end But the impact on habitat improvements may not yet be at the levels targeted at the end of the project. Y	The PMU reports that the remaining natural habitats covering at least 310,000 hectares in PAs (QPL, MSPLS, NNNP, Mt. Hamiguitan) within the project sites have been delineated in the land cover maps and are subject to field validation. The vegetation/habitat maps of the sites served as inputs in the preparation of biodiversity-responsive CLUPs of the LGUs in the project sites. The subject maps prepared during the CLUP process used the land cover/vegetation maps of NAMRIA based on the satellite images of 2010 supported by existing data from DENR and vetted by the LGUs and other stakeholders during the series of consultation workshops in the preparation of the CLUPs. These habitat maps and data will also be validated further using the results of the Land Cover and Fragmentation Study of CI-P and the BD Survey Assessment in the project sites that will serve as inputs in the preparation of Transboundary Plans. The Project conducted a review of the DILG mandated and LGU

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
						based M&E systems including the DENR BMB Biodiversity M&E system and is preparing recommendations for an LGU based monitoring system. This system will among others, capture the information that will correspond to the targeted indicators to be monitored.
Number of hectares in production landscapes/waterscapes under sustainable management.	No increase during the period.	The Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) between the Department of Agriculture (DA) and DENR-PAWB for approval and signature of concerned officials. The tasks agreed upon with DA for 2012 that shall contribute to the attainment of sustainable management in the production landscape is the a) enhancement of DA's capacity at the national and regional levels to provide technical support to LGUs; and b) enhancement of DAs certification scheme to include the biodiversity friendly agricultural production practices. The Responsible partners were also tasks to conduct identification/documentation		At least additional 10,000 hectares under sustainable management but not yet certified.	The baseline has been established by the Project, using extrapolated data from the ongoing land use planning processes. The PMU reports that a total of 4,525.4 hectares were under sustainable management but not yet certified. This is in Calatrava, Northern Negros Natural Park: 2,362.4has and in Buguey, North Eastern Cagayan Key Biodiversity Area: 2,163 has Recent LGU land use and program planning and budgetary decisions	These areas are identified in the CLUPs as Sustainable Use Zones and Agriculture zones where BD friendly agriculture practices has been specified as among the allowable uses. The development programs and projects on BD friendly agri practices are specified in the CDP.” The above PMU information refers to plans and targets but not necessarily areas under active sustainable production (with the possible exception of exiting pockets of good practices in the respective sites). Positive effect on habitat improvement (indicator 3) and extent of sustainable production systems would likely have the biggest and most readily measureable impact by year end, assuming outcome targets are achieved on time.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
		of the biodiversity friendly agriculture practices on sites. Their documentation will serve as an input to the framework and policy that DA will develop.			point to the good prospects of adoption of BD friendly agricultural practices. Y	
				At least additional 800 hectares and 8 production systems under certified production practices that meet sustainability and biodiversity standards.	A good number of good practices in BD friendly agriculture have been identified in the 2013 consultations and field visits done by the DA. Some are candidates for certification. The Project is currently doing an actual count of good practices (including those existing before the project. Y	The time left (2 years) will not likely to be sufficient to establish the certification system and at the same time promote active adoption in at least 800 hectares but the system can be actually established and more modest piloting can be done on much smaller scale area.

Outcome 1: National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU-level biodiversity conservation efforts

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
Agencies with policies and associated capacity to conduct biodiversity impact assessment of sectoral policies and plans.	None	The Project has engaged and mobilized Senior Policy and Institutional Development Specialist to assist in the formulation of framework, policy, and methodology to mainstream biodiversity impact assessment in the policy-making, planning, and programming processes first of the DENR and later of the DA, DILG and other partner government agencies including the LGUs. Mobilization/ Inception meeting with Senior Policy and Institutional Specialist conducted to define	2012 Draft national framework and policy for assessing the impacts of national policies and programs on biodiversity conservation formulated; Draft tools and manuals biodiversity policy impact assessment and monitoring prepared; Design for training of users on the use of the biodiversity impact assessment tools drafted 2013-2014 BD impact assessment mainstreamed in the programs of DENR/partner agencies including DA and DILG.	DA and DENR are routinely conducting biodiversity impact assessments of sectoral policies and plans by year 4.	The Department Administrative Order (DAO) Prescribing the Biodiversity-focused Strategic Environmental Assessment for Assessing the Impacts of Policies, Plans, and Programs has been recently adopted in principle by the DENR senior technical staff and other relevant stakeholders. The Manual of Procedures (MOP), toolkits, and training modules that incorporate BD in SEA has been prepared. The MOP for local government units is still under preparation. The training program has not yet been developed.	There is generally strong agreement on the need for BD oriented EIA for projects which has been made possible through a recent separate promulgation under the EMB (Environmental Management Bureau). This is good entry point for fostering appreciation for the value of SEA of policies and programs. The SEA manual that has been prepared appears to emphasize more on the procedural principles instead of as structured step by step process for the conduct of the SEA. This will need to be addressed to allow for routine application. The expected approval

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
		and specify methodology and work plan for the preparation of framework and methodology for undertaking biodiversity impact assessment. The Project has participated in the workshops and meetings initiated by New CAPP to incorporate biodiversity assessment in the conduct of EIAs under the EMB.			The operating principles of SEA (not BD SEA) as reflected in the tool called SEA was tried out with the National Tourism Development Plan. Neither the DA nor DENR has started to conduct EA of sectoral plans so that it would already be a routine practice by year 4. R	of the formal legal instrument in 2015 will help initiate the piloting of the tool in a smaller number of target programs of DENR DA and LGUs by project end. Piloting is possible but not routine application in the next 2 years.
Programmes and policies to support biodiversity friendly agricultural production in critical landscapes.	No agrobiodiversity programs in AFMA plan.	The Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) between the Department of Agriculture (DA) and DENR for approval and signature of concerned officials provides for, among other tasks of DA the development of a national policy for biodiversity friendly agricultural practices within and	2012 Existing agricultural policies and identification of relevant policies that promote and implement of biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices reviewed; Implementation of existing policies particularly within and around the	Updated AFMA Plan incorporates agrobiodiversity programs.	The AFMA plan has not been updated to incorporate agrobiodiversity. There is currently no official window for updating the AFMA until 2017. However, DA has requested and the Project has agreed in principle, to develop instead, a more focused policy instrument in the form of Joint DA-DENR Memorandum	The DA has requested to drop the updating of the AFMA to incorporate agrobiodiversity and prepare a DA –DENR Joint Memorandum Circular or JAO instead. The Project has agreed. The draft AO articulates the principles and general criteria for BD friendly agriculture. When finally promulgated,

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
		<p>around the PA/KBAs. This shall be the basis for the incorporation of the agrobiodiversity programs in the AFMA, NAP-SLM and all other relevant plans and programs of the DA.</p> <p>To facilitate project implementation, DA has issued Special Order 220 Series of 2012 that organized the BPP-DA Technical Working Group. The activities and outputs have been assigned to specific concerned bureaus/offices of the DA.</p>	<p>PA/KBs covered by the project assessed;</p> <p>List of identified priority needs of LGUs in terms of technical support and assistance to implement biodiversity friendly farming technologies prepared;</p>		<p>Circular for Promoting BD friendly agriculture in and around Protected Areas. The draft Joint DENR-DA Admin Order of JAO, is more than halfway. The BPP Technical working group has agreed to begin promoting the BD practices advocated in the draft AO with assistance from the DA Regional offices. Y</p>	<p>this will be a significant signal for enjoining DA regional offices and LGUs to invest in BD friendly Agric. The draft has yet to fully address the provision on incentives for transition to BD friendly agriculture. Promulgation has also been delayed due to the novel and unprecedented nature of work (agricultural programs in protected areas), thereby affecting in turn, the implementation of downstream activities under outcome 2 and 3. The types of BD friendly practices advocated by the draft has been communicated to BPP field partners, through the BPP Technical Working Group , as basis for planning project interventions starting in 2015</p>

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
	National Action Plan for Sustainable Land management (NAP-SLM) do not include agrobiodiversity projects in buffer zones of PAs and KBAs.			The Revised National Action Plan or NAP for Sustainable Land Management (NAP –SLM) includes agrobiodiversity projects in buffer zones of PAs or KBAs.	NAP- SLM updating that incorporates ABD initiatives is at least halfway through and will likely be completed before project in end. Y	The current draft includes the conservation of agrobiodiversity resources but does not yet specify the exact areas where it should be located. The BWSM plans to do so in the final preparations.
	Standards and certification schemes limited to organic agricultural production.	The DA tasks also include the enhancement of their certification scheme to include the biodiversity friendly agricultural production practices.	Draft standards and certification schemes that consider the requirements for biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices prepared.	Standards and certification system for biodiversity friendly production systems in place.	The basic principles and features for Criteria and standards have been identified but the actual criteria and standards are still undergoing initial discussion. This is based on a review of site situations; existing best practices identified in the sites; and initial consultations as well as existing certification systems in the country. R	A good number of good practices in BD friendly agriculture have been identified in the 2013/2014 consultations and field visits done by the DA. Some are candidates for certification. The experience of the evolution of the certification system under the Organic Agri law indicates that this will take time and lot of organizational work at the grassroots level and will be a key challenge given the remaining time frame. Also the Organic Agriculture will recognize the

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
						<p>Participatory Guarantee System or PGS (a viable alternative contemplated by the BPP project design) only until 2016. To prepare for that, the Bureau of Agricultural Fisheries Standards of BAFS has initiated preliminary discussion of a new system that builds on modalities such as the Good Agricultural Practices GAP agreed upon in ASEAN. Pacing is a challenge.</p>
	<p>Activities to promote conservation and utilization of indigenous crops.</p>	<p>The DA through the BAR likewise shall set-up protocols for in-situ/on farm crop conservation in partnerships with LGUs, academic/research institutions and farmers.</p>	<p>Draft national framework policy for the conservation and utilization of indigenous crop species prepared.</p> <p>Promoted in situ conservation and utilization of indigenous crops.</p>	<p>Policy and program developed in DA to promote conservation and utilization of indigenous crops.</p>	<p>Field level information has been generated from 4 pilot sites through participatory research and planning with local stakeholders. This will serve as one of the basis for preparation of policy and program formulation. Y</p>	<p>Inventories with promising information have been completed for four target sites and communicated to LGU and other local stakeholders. Participatory action planning for in situ conservation has been initiated in collaboration with local stakeholders as basis for developing action programs at local</p>

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
						<p>levels. The DA through the Bureau of Agricultural Research or DA BAR with the Bureau of Plant Industry is poised to prepare by 2015, the Strategic Action Plan for promoting indigenous crops as well as develop enabling mechanisms for such programs. These include protocols for supporting registration of traditional varieties (BPI) as well as expanded R & D work on indigenous crops conservation and sustainable use.</p>
<p>Systems and procedures for implementation of new regulations of trade in wild plant and animal resources.</p>	<p>Department Order issued.</p>	<p>The Project has engaged already the Environmental Legal Specialist to assist in the review of policies, administrative orders, and regulations of DENR and other government agencies that</p>	<p>Enhanced existing information and data management systems at PAWB and developed a complete data set on distribution of existing wild plant and animal resources which trade is either strictly regulated or</p>	<p>System established for surveillance, monitoring, and mapping the sources of illegally traded wild plants and animals.</p>	<p>Elements of the system are taking shape. The draft DA-DENR-DILG Joint Administrative Order (JAO) on the "Guidelines for the Harmonized Implementation of the Regulations on Domestic Trade of Wildlife under the</p>	<p>The basic building blocks of a system for surveillance, monitoring and mapping of sources of illegal trade are being established through two policy instruments (JAO between DENR and DILG and DILE Memo Circular to LGUs) as well as two</p>

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
		<p>concern wildlife trade. The intention is to harmonize these policies and regulations and formulate proposals to strengthen the enforcement of the Wildlife Act and its implementing rules and regulations and enhance collaboration with concerned national government agencies, the LGUs and stakeholders for improved surveillance and mapping of wildlife illegal trade.</p> <p>PAWB also will set-up a computerized database and mapping system on the species distribution of birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians.</p>	<p>prohibited. (Produced distribution maps and updated the distribution records of birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians) Existing national and local policies on domestic trade of wildlife resources assessed. Policy harmonizing national and local policies on domestic trade of wildlife resources drafted. Harmonized Policy on domestic trade and wildlife resources in placed (implemented and disseminated).</p>		<p>Jurisdiction of the DENR” has been reviewed by the BMB’s Technical Review Committee and endorsed to the DENR’s Policy Review Committee. Concerned agencies are currently working out a MOA to strengthen interagency information sharing, monitoring and education support systems, using the ELE Data Base system. A DILG Memorandum Circular consolidating and updating previous DILG issuances is under review by the DILG. A Wildlife Information, Education, Monitoring, and Reporting Support System; for wildlife law enforcement. Y</p>	<p>information systems (MOA on inter agency information, monitoring and education sharing); and the wildlife.</p>

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
Policies to encourage investments in biodiversity friendly business.	None	The definition and context for BD-friendly businesses has been incorporated into the recently issued DTI-DILG Guidelines for the Local Incentives and Investments Code. This shall be among the basis to promote BD-friendly businesses in the project sites.	Biodiversity-friendly business incorporated into the DTI-DILG Guidelines for Local Investments and Incentives Code. Framework for integrating on biodiversity and ecotourism and ancillary/support tourism businesses the Local Tourism guidebook of the DOT formulated.	Policy in place at DTI. Priority biodiversity business identified in DTI policy documents.	The Framework for Biodiversity-Friendly Business/Enterprise has been prepared which will guide future project identification. To institutionalize the framework, a Joint Administrative Order (JAO) of DENR, DOT, and DTI adopting the Framework for Biodiversity-friendly Business/Enterprises was drafted. The draft JAO has already been reviewed by the BMB Technical Review Committee and is now with the DTI and DOT for a parallel review. The concept of biodiversity has been incorporated in the 2013 Investment Priorities Program (IPP) to encourage registered enterprises to implement best practices on	The framework integrates a business perspective into the conservation of biodiversity within the protected areas and key biodiversity areas. This framework incorporates the definition and criteria for BD-friendly businesses/enterprises and will guide in the identification of projects. Additional attention however is needed for strengthening the draft. Existing and proposed incentives and more of market based strategies will need to be addressed in the final drafts of policy instruments or in subsequent department bulletins.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
					biodiversity. The same is incorporated in the 2014 IPP. Y	
National biodiversity information system.	PAWB biodiversity information system has limited data and information that can be shared with LGUs, conservation NGOs and other development agencies.	The accomplished to date related to the creation of the National biodiversity information system are as follows: Detailed terms of reference and scope of works prepared. Engagement of Knowledge Management Specialist, Systems Analyst and Programmer, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, IEC Specialist on-going. MOA with NAMRIA signed. Engagement of staff to support development of CITES E-permitting system on-going.	Existing information systems of the DENR and national partner agencies & LGUs assessed; Draft design the KMS and its subsystems prepared; Draft implementation plan for the KMS developed; Potential linkages/information sharing opportunities with partner organizations evaluated. Current KMS networking and information systems of DENR, partner agencies and LGUs covering the 8 project sites reviewed; BPP Monitoring and Evaluation System	A Knowledge Management System established at PAWB with computerized data storage and retrieval system that can be accessed on-line by LGUs, conservation NGOs and other development agencies.	Based on review of existing DENR information systems, a knowledge management system for locally based biodiversity information initially in the project sites has been partially established at the DENR based BMB. On site NGO partners that are working with LGUs have been trained to work with LGUs for its active participation in the system and sustainability Provision of training for participating LGUs is planned for 2015. Y	The IT architecture has been designed and being established, building on international protocols for data base systems. The system is hosted by the BPP website and will be integrated to the BMB website. Populating the systems is ongoing by at least by DENR and CSO partners of DENR and LGUs. Current plans for enhancing and sustaining LGU inputs requires further clarification, given current LGU capacities. Contributions from technical partners (e.g. technical NGOs) are being discussed, taking note of the lessons learned from experience of the Clearing House Mechanisms.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
			and Manual of Procedures prepared; Training design for the application to the BPP M&E System developed; Design of Project Process Documentation prepared Draft design of CITES electronic permitting system to reinforce LGUs wildlife enforcement thru linkage with DENR prepared.			

Outcome 2: LGUs encompassing at least 1.6 Million hectares in five biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures

Rating: Satisfactory

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
LGUs with tools and capacities for mainstreaming biodiversity in local development policy making, planning, budgeting and M and E systems.	Nil	Prepared concept framework for mainstreaming BD in the CLUP and CDP process. Preliminary schedule for conduct of trainers' training and training of LGUs in BPP sites agreed on with HLURB. Engaged Environmental Planning Specialist. Mobilization/Inception meeting with Env. Planning Specialist. MoA between PAWB and DILG signed. MoA between PAWB and HLURB for signature by concerned officials. Forged MoA with the FFI Intl. for the development of methodology for biodiversity survey	National framework and policy for mainstreaming biodiversity in the local planning and plan implementation processes designed. Orientation-seminar on local land use and development planning for partner organizations and selected LGUs conducted. Issued DILG/HLURB memo circular. Developed biodiversity monitoring and impact assessment including the review and repackaging of tools developed and applied.	A comprehensive suite of tools and associated capacity-building support for mainstreaming biodiversity available to LGUs in the target regions by year 3.	An initial set of helpful decision support "tools" has been made available for LGUs in target regions. These include the analytical framework determining the BD friendliness of land use options; analyzing agricultural land use options; characterizing BD friendly business. A range of hands on structured and semi structured learning events have been likewise	The tools that have been developed and made available so far have been put to meaningful use to the LGUS covered. The piloting of the BD-friendly Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP) Tool has been used by most number of LGUs (22) out of planned 8 LGUs. The most favorable response from LGUs for the BPP has been on the CLUP assistance. The tool is based on a framework agreed upon by key stakeholder agencies especially the DENR and the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board HLURB) Participating LGUs are

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
		and assessment.			provided both the to field staff of technical agencies as well as to LGUs themselves Tools for monitoring fragmentation have been piloted in 5 sites with a CSO partner (FFI). G	have also taken advantage of tools and approaches for characterizing BD friendly agriculture and BD friendly business specially the value chain analysis and product design. These are derived from framework plans for mainstreaming biodiversity agreed upon between the DENR, DTI and DOT CSO partners of LGUs are being trained on the tools for local participation in the Knowledge management information system.
LGUs with toolkits and implementation capacity for application of SEAs, as well as landscape level natural resource management, across multiple	Nil	Tasks for this output will be done in 2013.	Simplification of tools to assess BD impact on policies/plans for use by 15 LGUs.	Tools developed and 20% of LGUs in project sites trained in SEAs and landscape level natural resources management. DILG Memorandum Order prescribing planning guidelines and SEA	The tool kits for LGU level action are under initial preparation but training on SEA for all of the targeted 20% of LGUs are unlikely during the project	The draft BD-inclusive SEA tools are focused on the national government agencies and can be strengthened with a discussion on specific steps leading to assessment. The tool that is intended for local government units

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
and individual LGUs.				approaches.	period The draft DILG Memorandum has yet to be prepared. R	is still being prepared. As such, no BPP activities in the project sites can be directly attributed to the interventions under the thematic area on BD-inclusive SEA.
			15 LGUs trained on planning tools mapping, & res. mgt. for integration to CLUP and PES.	User friendly manuals for trans-boundary resource management planning developed and 20% of LGUs trained in their use.	Trans boundary planning manual has been developed and being applied in 3 sites. The process provided hands on training to 16 LGUs or approx 30% of LGUs. These include NECKBA (Cagayan, 6 LGUs), Lake Mainit (Agusan and Surigao del Norte, 8 LGUs) and Central Panay Mountains (Iloilo, 2 LGUs), LGUs. G	Both the manual and the process of implementation adheres to ecosystems and land use planning principles and can be related to the LGU level CLUP process. LGUs are beginning to compare the information gained in the trans-boundary planning process to the decisions they are making in the CLUP process in order to fine tune the latter. This is still an ongoing technical process but in so far as the indicator is concerned the latter has been achieved.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
LGU development expenditures for identifiably BD-friendly programmes and investments.	<p>Only LGUs in NNNP and Malampaya have annual budget allocations for biodiversity friendly projects amounting to US \$ 55,562.</p> <p>Other LGUs in the project sites do not have regular budget allotment to support biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Budget support to biodiversity related initiatives is negligible and sporadic.</p>	Tasks for this output will be done in 2013 to 2014.		200% increase in overall LGU development expenditures for biodiversity friendly programmes and investments.	No baseline has been done yet for the expenditures of LGUs covered other than Malampaya. Additional budgetary increases are expected as Comprehensive Development Plans, and Programs are completed. The project has tracked the initial LGU investments in the preparation of programs and staff training for the various thematic innovations recommended by the project.	BPP is working with the different LGUs in the project sites in preparing their respective BD-responsive CLUPs and CDPs and LDIPs. These plan documents particularly the LDIP incorporate biodiversity-friendly programs, with multiyear financial specifications that will become the basis for the preparation of the LGUs' annual budget allocations. The following Local Government Units (LGUs) provided their counterpart to support the mainstreaming of biodiversity in the local land use planning process (approx total = USD 39K): Municipality of Buguey, Cagayan: US\$ 4.4; Municipality of Tubod, Surigao Del Norte: US\$ 4.5; Municipality of Taytay, Palawan: US\$27.2;

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
		Tasks for this output will be done in 2013 to 2014.		At least 3 LGUs in each biogeographic region have budget allocations for biodiversity conservation by end-project.	Various budgetary earmarks are being made by 11 LGUs who are preparing their BD friendly CDPs. Y	Municipality of Calatrava, Negros Occidental: US\$ 4.5 Eleven LGUs in the 3 biogeographic regions are actively preparing their comprehensive development plans and have allocated various multi -year budgets. However baseline information is still being collected in order to provide a basis for comparative analysis.
LGUs in critical biogeographic regions with policy framework and technical capacity to support biodiversity friendly agricultural practices.	Nil	Tasks for this output will be done in 2013 to 2014.	Local ordinances passed supporting BD friendly agri. technologies/ practices (until 2015).	20% of LGUs with local ordinances and programs adopting biodiversity friendly agricultural practices.	Twenty two LGUs or 50 % of the total number undergoing CLUPs preparation, identified land use directions and limits for agriculture. In eleven (11) or 50% of the above category of LGUs, Comprehensive Development	The agriculture sector of the CDPs provides initial substantive directions to agriculture that are biodiversity friendly, pending availability of the technical guidance from forthcoming DA policy (outcome 1). Based on the overall guidance from the CLUP and CDP, participating LGUs are in varying stages of groundwork to prepare local

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
					Plans (CDPs) are being prepared that translate CLUP land use decisions into sectoral (including agricultural) investment programs. Y	extension and outreach programs to provide for local incentives and delivery mechanisms for farmer -adoption of biodiversity friendly agricultural practices.
		Tasks for this output will be done in 2013 to 2014.	Enhanced DA capacity DA trained MAOs of at least 20 LGUs in 8 sites. Supported PAOs and MAOs of at least 20 LGUs in 8 project sites in the packaging and dissemination of biodiversity-friendly farming practices.	20% of LGUs with staff trained in promoting BD friendly agricultural practices.	LGU staff, in at least 5 sites participated in rapid assessments of the local agricultural situation and the degree of BD friendliness. The assessment included an inventory of the nature and scope of BD friendly agriculture. Also LGU staff in at least 11 or 25% of total LGUs attended	The regional agricultural rapid assessments and consultations as well as the CLUP planning cum training processes provided the venue for in depth multisectoral discussion of local issues and opportunities from the BD lens. They also provided hands on use of rapid tools for assessment that are useful for long term changes in perspective of local agricultural planners and partners. The DA has

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
					training on the preparation of comprehensive development plans that include preparation of 3 year action programs for agriculture. Y	developed a training framework for BD friendly technologies under the leadership of the Agricultural Training Institute. The modules and workplans have yet to be threshed out in 2015 for use primarily by agricultural technicians. The training framework considers that target farmers are remote marginalized communities including IPs and is guided by an evolving agenda within the DA referred to as the IP and gender agriculture agenda.
		Tasks for this output will be done in 2013 to 2014.		20% increase in LGU budgets for biodiversity friendly agricultural programs.	In at least 11 LGUs or 25 % of total number, the CDP is being prepared that provides substantive directions and budgetary guidance for	The CDP process provides mandatory and strategic guidance on priority strategies that must be addressed by the annual budgeting process.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
					agriculture. Y	
LGUs in critical biogeographic regions with local regulations and capacity to implement policies on wildlife trade.	Nil	Tasks for this output will be done in 2013-2014.	10 LGUs with draft local Ordinances that support regulation of endemic wildlife resources.	10 LGUs with local Ordinances to support regulation of local endemics.	Five LGUs covered so far. The BPP assisted the LGU of Calatrava in Negros Occidental in the preparation of its BD-enhanced Local Environment Code. Likewise, a Unified Fishery Ordinance involving the four (4) LGUs located along Lake Mainit is in the final stage of adoption. Y	The ordinances under development will be helpful models for other neighboring terrestrial LGUs (as in the NNP site in Negros where Calatrava belongs) and coastal LGUs in other areas who want to better conserve their endemic and indigenous wildlife.
		Tasks for this output will be done in 2013-2014	10 LGUs with duly deputized/designated and trained WEOs to enforce policies and procedures governing wildlife trade	10 LGUs with staff trained on policies and procedures governing wildlife trade	At least 17 6 LGUS or 60% of targets are with staff trained on policies and procedures	17 LGUs with staff trained on policies and procedures governing wildlife trade. Malampaya Sound Protected Landscapes (1); Central Panay

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
			Trained local bantay gubat/dagat groups, local DENR officers/staff and enforcement partners from other agencies on wildlife law enforcement.		governing wildlife trade. This training, which aims to strengthen their capabilities for wildlife law enforcement include the initial topics on surveillance and monitoring. G	Mountains (2 in Aklan; 6 in Antique; 2 in Capiz; 3 in Iloilo). Mt. Hamiguitan (3 LGUs).
		Tasks for this output will be done in 2013-2014.	10 LGUs with established and functional coordinating mechanism.	Local coordinating bodies established with DENR, wildlife enforcement agents and volunteers to strengthen regulation of wildlife trade.	Local coordinating mechanisms for wildlife enforcement are not being worked out yet. R	Facilitating the establishment of the coordinating bodies is not in the works plan of BPP.
LGUs with regulatory structures and incentive systems to encourage the development of biodiversity-friendly businesses,	Nil	Tasks for this output will be done in 2014.	Assisted 10 LGUs in the development & implementation of regulations/incentives systems to attract business enterprises & invest BD friendly services/products in the 8 BPP sites. Supported LGUs in	10 LGUs in project sites with regulatory structures, incentive codes of conduct and programs and budgets promoting BD-friendly business.	Forty-four (44) LGUs have been assisted by the BPP through the conduct of consultation workshop cum initial capability building training	There are four (4) LGUs (i.e., Sablayan, Lal-lo, Sta. Teresita, Buguey) out of the six (6) pilot LGUs with approved LIICs wherein the concept of biodiversity has been incorporated. In the pipeline are the LIICs

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
including investor codes of conduct.			creating programs to promote BD friendly business Capacity-building and training for LGUs within project sites on LIIC relevant BD-friendly businesses conducted Strategy for the development of market-led biodiversity-friendly businesses prepared.		on the Local Investment and Incentives Code (LIIC) which include elements of Investors Code of Conduct and monitoring of tools on investment promotion. Y	of Calatrava, Taytay, San Vicente, Gonzaga, and Sebaste.
Mechanisms and capacities for intra LGU knowledge sharing on mainstreaming biodiversity.	Mechanisms exist for intra LGU sharing on environment programs and performance but not on biodiversity.	Tasks for this output will be done in 2013 to 2015.	Installed BD data & KMS linked to the PAWB system in 20 LGUs of the 8 sites.	Mechanism and network established to regularly share lessons on mainstreaming biodiversity.	Mechanisms through the Local Project Steering Committees (LPSCs) are being established for local project steering and intra LGU sharing of technical resources and experience. The project initiated discussions with the	There are no clear plans yet on how to systematically make this happen, and how in the near future, the sharing process can lead to capacity development for advocating improved policies. Dialogue has started for the creation of a BD Network among local R&D institutions.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target *	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification for Rating
					League of Municipalities (LMP) but this has not been sustained. LGUs participating in trans-boundary planning get to share common issues, lessons learned from past projects and common aspirations.	
		Tasks for this output will be done in 2013 to 2015.		New national policy proposals formulated/approved based on lessons from LGUs/project sites.	No plan formulated yet for drawing national policy proposals. R	
		Tasks for this output will be done in 2013 to 2015.	Eco-labeling program to reward LGUs w/ initiatives on mainstreaming biodiversity initiated.	Improved capacity by LGUs to advocate improved policies.	No clear plan yet to improve capacity for advocating improved policies. R	

Outcome 3: Systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering at least 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro, Mindanao).¹

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
LGU development plans at project sites complying with SEA approach, as well as landscape level natural resources management.	LGUs do not apply SEAs in local development planning	Finalized TOR, scope of work and detailed annual implementation plan of the DENR Regional Offices, and NGO partners for each of the BPP sites. Forged MoA with NGO partners.	Assisted 7 LGUs in 8 sites in the use of BD impact assessment and SEA toolkits and modules.	At least 20% of LGUs in the project sites apply SEA in their development planning.	No LGU has applied SEA yet in their development planning since the tool to do so is not yet available. The simplified BD-SEA framework for the LGUs is being developed together with its Manual of Procedures, once these tools and the policy for adoption is in place, the LGUs will be trained in the application of simplified BD-SEA. In the meantime, the BD friendly CLUP process and Comprehensive Development planning (CDP) processes provided	Given the current pace, it is unlikely that 20 % of LGUs will be able to apply SEA in their development planning by project end. However at least 1-3 pilots may be possible in LGUs with advanced planning processes.

¹Partners: FFI, Haribon Foundation, CI Philippines, Philippine Eagle Foundation, Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, and Lake Mainit Development Alliance.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
					participating LGUs an opportunity to begin to strategically assess in a more rudimentary way, their proposed development strategies from the BD lens. R	
	PA management plans and FLUPs not integrated in CLUPs.	Review of management plan of PAs within the project sites part of the preliminary activities. Preparation of FLUPs for KBAs in the project sites will commence after completion the baseline biodiversity assessment and ecological profiling work in the sites. Biodiversity zoning integration will be part of the framework and methodology for mainstreaming biodiversity in the CLUP.	Preparation/updating of management plans, FLUPs, buffer zone management plans.	At least 20% of LGUs in the project sites integrate biodiversity conservation zoning (PA or KBA zoning) in their CLUP.	22 LGUs or 50% of the total number of LGUs are in varying stages of integrating BD conservation zoning (PA or KBA) in their CLUPs. These include the following: a) Preparation of BD enhanced CLUPs and Zoning Ordinance (ZOs) of the six (6) municipalities in Quirino Protected Landscapes (QPL). These are for mandatory review by the Provincial Land Use Committee (PLUC), while the enhancement of the CDPs are ongoing	Participating LGUs have demonstrated high appreciation of the BD enhanced processes for CLUP. The field personnel of the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board also appreciate the enhanced process and have suggested measures to further enhance replication in other areas. The Project has essentially exceeded the physical target and most of the

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
					b) Final stages of preparation of the BD-enhanced CLUPs and Zoning Ordinance of the eight (8) municipalities covered under BPP in Lake Mainit Key Biodiversity Area (LMKBA) c) Final stages of preparation of the BD-enhanced CLUP of Taytay, Palawan and Calatrava, Negros Occidental d) Ongoing training and coaching for the LGUs of: Buguey and Baggao, Cagayan Culasi and Sebaste, Antique in Central Panay Mountain (CPM); and Mati City, San Isidro and Governor Generoso, Davao Oriental. G	substantive decisions by LGUs have been made. The remaining actions deal with consolidation of documentation.
Inter LGU cooperation in planning and regulation of	Municipal and City LGUs plan separately	Finalized TOR, scope of work and detailed annual implementation plan	Trans-boundary plans in 5 sites developed.	At least two transboundary conservation areas established.	Inter local trans-boundary plans are being prepared for at least 3 areas (Lake	The trans-boundary planning processes for the 3 sites are active

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
natural resource use.	and do not coordinate and harmonize their plans.	of the DENR Regional Offices, and NGO partners for each of the BPP sites. Forged MoA with NGO partners. Transboundary plans for the project sites to be prepared in 2013 and 2014 after completion of the baseline/ecological profiling work.			Mainit, NECKBA and Mt Hamiguitan) while the Protected Area Management Plan for the South Western Negros KBA is being enhanced as additional conservation area. These planning exercises are using the guidelines and manual for trans boundary planning developed by the BPP. Y	processes catalyzed by the Project with the active participation by LGUs and key agencies.
				LGUs in the project sites (at least 3 jointly managed landscapes) harmonize their development plans for natural resource use in biodiversity landscapes that cut across their administrative boundaries.	Component LGUs of inter LGU initiatives are looking at the evolving inter LGU landscape plan to subsequently guide the updating of respective component CLUPs. In Lake Mainit, technical consensus has been achieved towards the establishment of a unified fishery ordinance (UFO).Y	LGUs who are participating in the trans-boundary planning are concurrently receiving assistance from the Project on CLUP. Thus they are able to draw insights from the trans-boundary process. LGUs interviewed look forward to strengthen their

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
						draft CLUPs with information derived from the trans-boundary planning process.
				LGUs in the project sites sharing PA or KBA areas jointly adopt resource planning tools such as FLUP, ICRMP, ecological zoning.	The trans-boundary planning processes in the 3 sites where the Project is assisting are utilizing basic principles approaches and methodologies also utilized by existing basic planning tools such as FLUP ICRMP and ecological zoning. Y	In several sites some LGUs have actually undertaken FLUP and ICRMP processes even before BPP. On the other hand other LGUs are intending to do FLUP or revisit their existing FLUPs after they have undertaken CLUP in order to provide further guidance to match proposed forest land use with appropriate resource managers.
	Provincial Land Use Committees oversee and approves			At least 3 Provincial CLUPs in the project sites adopt the planning tools for	Provincial Governments involved in all 22 sites actively participate in the	The field staff of the HLURB are interested to replicate the planning

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
	municipal and city land use plans.			biodiversity conservation.	trainings on BD friendly CLUP. At least 3 provinces namely: Surigao Del Norte, Negros Occidental and Cagayan have expressed interest to update their Provincial physical framework plan (PPFP) using BD friendly planning protocols as well as to replicate the process done in the pilot LGUs to other municipalities not covered by the BPP. Y	processes to other LGUs, together with PLGUs during and after the project (if resources allow) and have suggestions on how to facilitate this. PLGU efforts may be supported by some MLGUs. MLGUs have the potential to be effective sharers of the processes that may be other LGUs. Understand the BD friendly CLUP protocols and processes.
	LGUs within PAs or KBAs do not jointly adopt any economic PES instruments.		PES mechanisms implemented in QPL & NNNP & Northern Negros w/ LGUs to sustain watershed management forest protection and improved agricultural production.	PES instrument developed and tested in at least one biodiversity landscape.	PES - The PES concept is being initiated in one barangay in QPL where protection of headwaters by an upland farmer association is being supported (water fees) by lowland domestic water	The barangay council serves as intermediary with support from the PLGU and MLGU who want to replicate the process in the near future.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
					supply users benefiting from assured water supply. The site is in Barangay Sto. Nino, MLGU of Madela in Quirino Province. Y	
New conservation areas established.	None	To be accomplished in 2013 and 2014.		Three new conservation areas established covering 15 LGUs.	Four new conservation areas being established involving at least 7 LGUs. These are the following: a) Proposed Local Conservation Area (LCA) of Tubod, Surigao del Norte assessed and mapped; b) The pilot-testing of a Conservation Agreement (CA) in Mt. Hamigutian aims to provide conservation benefits among locals to manage and benefit their natural resources as part of an LGU declared Philippine Eagle sanctuary; c) The proposed	These 4 new areas are promising works in progress which are locally initiated and participatory with the local DENR providing the leadership and facilitation with BPP support.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
					LCA of San Isidro and Governor Generoso as part of the core and buffer zones of Mt. Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary (MHRWS, RA 9303). These efforts (led by the local DENR team with BPP assistance) accelerated the declaration of Mt. Hamiguitan as the UNESCO World Heritage Site; d) The Southwestern Negros KBA has been identified also as a new conservation area with preliminary activities for the preparation of biodiversity-focused trans-boundary plan undertaken. Y	
Farmers adopting biodiversity friendly practices.	No increase over project period.	The Department of Agriculture (DA) is the partner agency tasks to develop a national policy for biodiversity friendly	Provided technical support to farmer organizations within and around Pas/KBAs in the conservation,	At least 5,000 farmers adopting biodiversity friendly agricultural practices.	Demonstration farms established in at least two LGUs (Tubod Surigao del Sur and Silay in NNNP). Incremental	While it is not expected that full adoption rates happen in midterm, agricultural

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
		<p>agricultural practices within and around the PA/KBAs, enhance their capacity at the national and regional levels to provide technical support to LGUs, enhance their certification scheme to include the biodiversity friendly agricultural production practices and set up protocols for in-situ/on farm crop conservation by the DA-BAR in partnerships with LGUs, academic/research institutions and farmers. DA is currently on the stage of reviewing/assessing their policies and programs, listing the priority needs for technical support, reviewing existing certification</p>	<p>utilization, and marketing of indigenous crops.</p> <p>Set up demonstration plots in QPL and CPM.</p>		<p>agricultural extension work that is BD friendly is just about to start. No available data yet on number of farmers adopting BD-friendly demonstration farms. R</p>	<p>extension efforts should have fully started at this time. However at least 11 LGUs or approx 50% of total are in various stages of developing their Comprehensive Development Plans which provide guidance on BD friendly agricultural strategies and multiyear budgeting for BD-friendly agriculture beginning in 2015. Once the agricultural programs, delivery mechanisms and budgets are firmed up for 2015, proactive extension work can potentially go full blast in the same year.</p>

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
		standards, and drafting protocols for the conservation and utilization of indigenous crop species.				
		On the other hand, the Responsible Partners are tasks to conduct assessment and documentation of the existing and potential biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices and livelihood activities in the project sites. This have been discussed and agreed upon with them. The information that they gathered on site will be forwarded to DA as an input to the frameworks that they are preparing.	Provision of support for the implementation of standards and certification system through identification of potential farmers and farmer groups for certification. (2014-2016) Applied certification schemes in 8 sites set up as demo plots Conducted trainings for farmers in the pilot sites and implemented and disseminated a participatory guarantee system (PGS) (2013-2016).	Additional 2,000 farmers and producers meeting certification standards.	As standards and certification systems are still works in progress (Outcome 1), no program of work yet has been prepared for targeting 2,000 farmers and producers meeting certification standards. R	The establishment of certification system is necessary so that interested producers are able to decide and organize themselves to meet the standards before the project end. The remaining two years may not be sufficient to do both the systems establishment as well as actual adoption by a large number (2000 farmers). However the groundwork for the certification processes can be started at least in some of the sites because of the

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
						forthcoming promulgation of the DA – DENR JAO for agriculture support services in or around PAs. Such JAO will begin to make available on a long term basis, BD friendly agricultural support services to these areas.
Pressures from overharvesting of wild resources.	Expected to increase over total area of KBAs/PAs in project sites by 10% each year.	Finalized TOR, scope of work and detailed annual implementation plan of the DENR Regional Offices, and NGO partners for each of the BPP sites. Forged MoA with NGO partners	Provided technical assistance to set up and implement information exchange systems between the LGUs, local DENR, local enforcement officers, and local conservation NGOs.	Pressure reduced in PAs totaling at least 260,000 hectares.	No available information yet that provide indication of reduced pressure at this juncture. Baseline data on land use, habitat maintenance, fragmentation and populations are being firmed up and will be completed in target sites in the 1st half of March. Y	Proactive LGU initiatives to prepare their CLUPs, CDPs and BD-friendly programs provides the platform for long term locally initiated interventions that will result to reduced pressures in PAs.
			Developed local-based wildlife trade monitoring system Implemented the	No net reduction in population of key species in selected sites	No available data yet. Baseline data will still be completed in target sites in the	Proactive LGU initiatives to prepare their CLUPs, CDPs and

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
			<p>system</p> <p>Assessed the effectiveness of the monitoring system (until 2015).</p> <p>Conducted continuing information and education on monitoring of sources of illegally traded wild plants and animals and information exchange between the LGUs and national authorities (until 2016).</p>	(e.g., hornbill, Philippine eagle, etc.)	1st Quarter of March. Promising initial data from NNNP indicate more than expected positive indication of population of one species. Please also see discussion on population counts under the Objective level indicators. Y	BD friendly programs provides the platform for long-term locally initiated interventions that will result to reduced pressures in PAs.
Private investments in biodiversity friendly business in selected project sites.	Nil	Finalized TOR, scope of work and detailed annual implementation plan of the DENR Regional Offices, and NGO partners for each of the BPP sites. Forged MoA with NGO partners.	<p>List of the identified potential BD-friendly tourism businesses in the pilot sites prepared.</p> <p>Conducted feasibility studies, financing, and linkage w/ consumer groups for BD friendly business.</p> <p>Existing structures of incentives and regulations to determine whether</p>	At least four businesses engaged in biodiversity-friendly enterprises in project sites by year 5.	At least 9 community based enterprise groups with support of their respective LGUs (9) are in varying stages of assessment and plan preparation and organization. They were identified using the agreed upon 3 sets of criteria, with the end in view to be engaged in BD friendly enterprises	The potential business identified are promising examples of sites chosen using the assessment framework agreed by key stakeholders including the DENR, DA and DTI and DOT. The project is engaging competent

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
			<p>these are sufficient to attract investments assessed.</p> <p>Assisted the LGUs in trade fairs on BD-friendly products.</p>		<p>by Year 5. These include the following enterprises and LGUs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lubeg wine and handicraft, in 3 sites in NECKBA (Lalo, Buguey and Sta Teresita) • Ecotourism and food products in Quirino province in QPL • Ecotourism in 2 LGUs in Malaympaya sound (Taytay and San Vicente) • Almaciga resin products from Gov Generoso in Mt Hamiguitan • Engineered bamboo and other crafts in Tubod, Tubay and Kicharao in Lake Maiinit. Y 	<p>technical resource groups that are providing support for value chain analysis (University of the Philippines Institutive for Small Scale Industries or UPISSI) and product design (Design Center of the Philippines or DCP)</p>
		<p>Part of the tasks of the Responsible partners is to identify and characterized the</p>	<p>Partnered with producers, conducted trainings for stakeholders in PAs/KBAs on BD</p>	<p>At least four producer groups in PAs/KBAs adhere to LGU investor codes of conduct.</p>	<p>At least 9 enterprise groups are being assisted to continue and be strengthened to be BD friendly</p>	<p>Some key features of investor codes of conduct are currently incorporated in the</p>

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
		existing and potential biodiversity-friendly businesses and enterprises within and around PAs/KBAs of the project sites. The data that will be gathered will serve as an input to the framework that characterize biodiversity friendly enterprise that DTI will develop.	friendly business.		through their training in BD enhanced value chain analysis. The de facto codes of conduct are contained in the 3 sets of criteria used in the identification and prioritization of BD friendly business Y	framework for BD friendly business and in the guidance provided to LGUs for the preparation of Investment Incentive Code (LIIC).
Communities receiving incentives for shifting to sustainable practices.	Nil	The mechanism of incentives for the communities will be done in 2014-2016 after the baseline information are gathered.	Pilot tested the implementation of 5 community conservation agreements in 5 sites to provide incentives for local groups to refrain from destructive forest activities.	Conservation agreements in place with at least two community groups in CPM and NNNP	Conservation agreements in the two sites not yet in place. Community based Conservation agreement in NECKBA, Lake Mainit, CPM, and SWN will be finalized after the completion of the Trans boundary plan in 2015. R	Competent NGO partners and DENR local teams are engaged with selected communities in KBAs towards the establishment and start-up of the agreements.
				PES schemes negotiated with two more community groups	There are no strong prospects for PES being contemplated in PPLS and NNNP	No active discussion yet

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
				in other sites in PPLS and NNNP.	at the moment. R	
				10 communities engaged in sustainable livelihoods.	At least 9 community based groups (which are primarily marginalized upland groups with strong women leadership) are currently engaged in varying levels of BD friendly based business as basis for sustainable livelihoods (Please see also discussion on BD friendly business). Y	Competent NGO partners and DENR local teams are engaged with these community groups to strengthen organizational capacity.
Data and knowledge management systems to support local initiatives.	Some LGUs have isolated data and knowledge management systems but not linked to national system.	The data and knowledge management systems to support local initiatives which include biodiversity assessment and conduct of information, education communication activities, monitoring system, access and sharing	Biodiversity monitoring/impact assessment tools implemented.	Rapid resource assessments completed/updated in eight project sites.	Rapid resource assessments are in varying stages of completion and use in at least 3 sites (CPM and NNP, NECKBA and Mt Hamiguitan). At least 7 LGUS who are updating their CLUP are utilizing these resource assessment s. Preliminary baseline data are available on	Local DENR teams and selected LGUs staff are receiving hands on training to help sustain intermittent resource assessments in the future.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
		of centralized biodiversity information are part of the activities of the project this year 2012.			two of the 4 objective level indicators (i.e. sustainable production land use and natural habitat). Y	
	Insufficient data to adequately monitor status and trends in biodiversity and impacts of development programs.		Biological assessments in the 8 sites to provide information on the conservation value of the PA/KBA & the ID of LCAs.	Population estimates of critically endangered species in eight sites determined.	Initial population estimates of 1 of 3 targeted species already available (Hornbill in NNNP) in 1 site and being subjected to further validation and for finalization by mid-2015. Y	The population estimates are facilitated by competent NGO partners with LGU and community participation.
			LGUs & stakeholders are trained in biodiversity assessment, monitoring record keeping, interpretation & sharing.	Monitoring system in place to determine progress in meeting conservation plan objectives, linked to knowledge management system.	The feasibility of LGU based Monitoring systems is still under study. A review has started on existing LGU based systems maintained by both the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) and LGUs themselves. Y	CSO partners of LGUs are participating in the study. Building on the existing monitoring system maintained by the LGUs and DILG is in the right direction.

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
			<p>IEC materials on biodiversity conservation and mainstreaming to local policy, planning and decision-making process prepared and produced.</p> <p>Broad based conservation awareness campaign implemented.</p>	<p>Increased public awareness and positive support to conservation efforts among local stakeholders.</p>	<p>Good quality Information Education and Communication (IEC products are being produced. Examples are the Webinar on Biodiversity for newly elected Local Chief Executives and the series of brochures on Biodiversity based business products from the project sites. Y</p>	<p>The effectiveness of these materials are not yet formally assessed. Anecdotal information indicates good acceptance levels among LGU officials of project interventions especially on information on BD friendly business.</p>
				<p>LGU level data and knowledge management system enhanced.</p>	<p>Resource management data in at least 22 LGUs have been updated from the BPP assisted resource assessments conducted during the CLUP planning process. Seven of these LGUs also benefiting from more detailed information updates in connection with the special studies to address objective level indicators.</p>	<p>LGUs knowledge data and knowledge management system will be addressed in 2015.</p>

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of-Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
					However work on date management system has not started yet. Y	
				LGU staff trained in use of data and knowledge management system.	CSO partners of LGUs have been targeted for immediate training on the national biodiversity knowledge management system while the recently established system is still undergoing fine-tuning. Y	The PKMIS plans to conduct the subsequent LGU training in 2015.
			Inter-LGU knowledge sharing on mainstreaming biodiversity conservation supported.	LGUs able to access and share data and information in national system.	LGUs are initially able to share data and information on a national scale through their partner CSOs to the BPP website. Preparations for inter LGU sharing including discussions with the League of Municipalities have been started. Most Local Project Steering Committees	Information on progress of project interventions are being shared by LGUs with assistance by CSO and DENR partners to the BMB based BPP website. This contributes to the start of a two way exchange being contemplated However, the

Indicator	2010 Baseline Level	2012 Level of 1 st PIR (self-reported)	2012-2014 Midterm Target	2016 End-of- Project target	2014 Midterm Level and Assessment	Justification
					of LPSCs have been established and are expected to facilitate the sharing process. Y	process for inter LGU knowledge sharing is not clearly planned yet.

(Based on the multi-year targets)

ATTACHMENT 5: MISSION ITENERARY

DATE (2014)	ACTIVITY AND THEME COVERED	KEY OFFICE /GROUP (NAME OF OFFICE OR NGO ONLY)
July 30	Inception Meeting	BMB, PMU
Aug 5	Meeting with PP on Evaluation Plan	BPP PMU
Aug 27 – 30	Field visit to NNNP site	DENR 6, PBCFI and partners
Sep 1	FGD on BD friendly Agriculture	DA TWG
Sep 1	KII on BD-Friendly Business	BOI, DCP, TA
Sep 2	KII on Value Chain Analysis (BD-Friendly Business) (MG)	UP ISSI
Sep 2	KII with BMB Director (EQ)	BMB DIR
Sep 5	KII on BD-enhanced local development planning (MG)	DILG-BLGD
Sep 8	KII on embedding BD in ADSDPP	PROF Serrate , TA
Sep 10-12	Visit to Lake Mainit site (EQ)	DENR 13, LGUs
Sep 12	KII with M& E TA	
Sep 17-19	Field visit to Central Panay M (MG)	BPP-CPM; CENRO-Culasi, Antique; LGU-Culasi; LGU-Sebaste; LGU-Lambunao;
Sep 17- 20	Field visit to QPL, Discussions with NEKCBA team (EQ)	NECKBA team, QPL Team and LGUs inc Quirino Governor
Sep 25-26	Sharing of initial impressions to the ITWG meeting (MG)	ITWG members and NGO partners
SEP 30	KII on CLUP	HLURB
Sep 31	KII on ADSDPP	NCIP
Oct 3	KII on Sustainable Tourism Framework (MG)	DOT
Oct 13	KII on Wildlife Trade Regulation (MG)	WRD, TA
Oct 13	individual KII with BWSM, BPI,ATI, (EQ)	BSWM, BPI, ATI
Oct 14	KII with BAFS, BAR and DA policy office (EQ)	BAFS, BAR ATI
Oct 16	Telephone interview with HLURB Field Staff (EQ)	HLURB Field staff in Mindanao and North Luzon
Oct 17	KII with UNDP Project Officer	UNDP Philippines
Oct 23	KII (telephone conversation) with BPP Project Manager (EQ)	BPP PMU
Oct 27	MTE Evaluation Team Meeting	MG, EQ
Nov 6	Sharing of initial findings with the Board	BPP Board
Nov 7	KII with BSWM – SAFDZ process (EQ)	BSWM
Dec 28	KII (telephone interview) with BMB officer in charge for PKMIS (EQ)	BMB
	KII with BPP TA for Training and IEC	PMU
	KII with BPP TA for BD Friendly Business	PMU
	KII (Skype) with GEF Focal person	GEF SE Asia Pacific

ATTACHMENT 6: PERSONS INTERVIEWED (NAME AND POSTION)

1. National government agencies (central offices), GEF AND UNDP

- **DENR**
 - Dir. Mundita Lim, BMB
 - Ms. Armida Andres, Head of Planning , BMB
 - WRD (BMB-DENR): Josefina L. De Leon, OIC Division Chief
 - Ms. Sarah Tayag, OIC for PKMIS
 - Atty. Alton Durban, TA

- **UNDP and GEF**
 - Ms. Amelia Superan, ARR, UNDP Philippines
 - Ms. Grace Tena, UNDP
 - Mr. Joseph D. Cruz, GEF

- **BPP PMU and TA**
 - Mr. Joey Regunay
 - Ms. Joy Eugenio
 - Mr. Benhur Vilorio
 - Mr. Jay Siasoco
 - Mr. Edge Genciagan
 - Mr. Felicisimo David Jr., TA for M& E
 - Mr. Vivian Castillon, TA for BD Business
 - Ms. Alo Lacsamana, TA for Training and IEC
 - Prof. Fred Serrote, TA for CLUP and ADSDPP
 - Prof. Nestor Altoveros, UPLB TA for PGRFA
 - Prof. Tess Borromeo, UPLBD TA for PGRFA

- **DA**
 - Ms. Charo Ampil, OIC Policy Service, DA
 - Ms. Grace Pastores, Policy Service, DA
 - Mr. Sammy Contreras, Chair TWG, BSWM
 - Ms. Edna Samar, TWG member, BSWM
 - Mr. Elmer
 - Mr. Manuel Ching, TWG member BPI
 - Ms. Marinel Espino, TWG member, BAR
 - Mr. Marilen
 - Dr. Andrew Gasmen, TWG member, ATI

- **NCIP**
 - Ms. Marlea Munez, Exec Director, NCIP
 - Mr. Carlos Bansuen , Director , Education Bureau
 - Ms. Grace Pascua, Director Socioeconomics Bureau

- DTI (BOI)
 - Ms Felicitas R. Agoncillo-Reyes, Assistant Secretary, Investments Promotion Group
 - Ms Gari Ann S. Valera, Technical-Administrative Staff, DTI-BOI BPP

- HLURB
 - Ms. Nora Diaz, HLURB HQ
 - Ms. Anabelle Guanzon, HLURB HQ
 - Mr. Harvey, CDO staff
 - Ms. Julie Collado, North Luzon Staff

- DILG
 - Ms. Angela Mamuyac, Focal Person

- DOT
 - Warner Andrada, Chief, Tourism Planning and Product Development Division
 - Ruth Tizon, Tourism Planning and Product Development Division

- UP ISSI
 - Mr. Leoncio T. Cubillas, Jr., Head of Business Enterprise Development Division

2. Interviewees in Project Sites

- **NNNP**
 - LGUS
 - Mayor Samoa, Calatrava
 - Mr. Jun Nunez, MPDC, Calatrava
 - Mayor Francis Palanca, Victorias
 - Mr. Fred Gonzaga, LGU - ENRO, Victorias
 - Ms. Ching Ledesma, ENRO, Salay
 - Ms. Pepsi San Jose, PEMO, Negros Occidental
 - Ms. Rowena Parcon, PEMO, Negros Occidental

 - DENR
 - PENRO Andres Untal
 - Mr. Dennis Piñosa, DENR 6
 - Ms. Cyndy Sol Rodrigo, DENR 6 BPP/Technical Assistant
 - Ms. Vodal E. Pendon, DENR 6 BPP/Technical Assistant

 - NGO PARTNER: PBCFI
 - Mr. Errol Gatumbato, Managing Director – PBCFI and Project Leader – BCC

- Ms. Kim John Doble, Budget Officer - BPP
- Ms. Lisa Paguntalan, Director for Field Operations, Conservation and Education –
- Ms. Joanne Mae Justo, Curator, BCC
- Mr. Godfrey Jakosalem, Senior Wildlife Biologist –PBCFI
- Mr. Andrew Ross Reintor, Research Assistant – BPP
- Ms. Anamor Bantolo, Admin and Finance

- Private Sector /Farmer Group
 - Chin Chin Uy , Organik na Negros Producers and Retailers Association (ONOPRA)
 - Eladio Pangilinan , ISF association , Silay City
 - BBB Team of Victorias (4) c/o Mr Jimmy Antiva and 3 members

- **NECKBA and QPL**
 - LGU Quirino
 - Gov. Junie Cua, Quirino
 - Ms. Elizabeth Nicolas, Provincial Administrator
 - Mr. Crispin A. Fernandez, OIC Assistant Provincial Agriculturist
 - Mr. Madela, MPDC

 - DENR
 - Ms. Nilda Labuguen, RTD/OIC, PAWCZ
 - Ms. Aida S. Adap – PAWCZ/Focal Person, NECKBA
 - Mr. Raymond Sesuca, Project Coordinator, NECKBA
 - Mr. Richard L. Batarao, Technical Assistant, BPP-BMB
 - Mr. Romulo N. Magabili, Jr. GIS Staff, BPP-NECKBA
 - Mr. Samuel P. Telon, Project Site Officer
 - Mr. Alexander P. Barayuge, PASu
 - Mr. Enrile M. Eniego

 - NGO partners
 - Mr. John Acay, CI
 - Mr. PO

- **Lake Mainit**
 - LGU
 - Mr. Fidel Bacoboc, MPDC Kicharao
 - Mr. Nestor Monteclaro, MPDC, Santiago
 - Mayor Arcialla, Tubod
 - Mr. Eludo, SB, Tubod
 - Ms. Rebecca Bagnol, OIC PAO, Surigao Del Norte

- Ms. Zena Piramide, PAO Surigao Del Norte
- PPDC, Surigao Del Sur
- DENR
 - Ms. Josephine Araojo, CMMD DENR 13
 - Ms. Joy Orozco
 - Mr. Abe Duyapat
 - Ms. Jim Vocales
 - Mr. Omar Barillo, BPP – Lake Mainit
 - Mr. Mario Eludo, Former RTD
- NEDA
 - Ms. Ester Oser, NEDA 13
- NGO /PO
 - PACO PO
- **Central Panay Mountains**
 - DENR Region 6 Team
 - Ms. Vivian B. Develos, BPP Focal Person, PENRO Antique
 - Mr. Vicente T. Mellizas, Jr., CENRO Culasi Antique
 - MPDC and SB Member, LGU-Culasi
 - Hon. Christopher A. Varona, Mayor of LGU-Sebaste (with MPDC and SB Members)
 - MENRO, LGU-Lambunao
 - HLURB Western Visayas Region

ATTACHMENT 7: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. PROJECT DOCUMENT
2. LOG FRAME
3. INCEPTION REPORTS
4. GTT SUBMITTED AT START OF PROJECT
5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS
6. PROJECT SITE CUMULATIVE REPORTS AS OF MID JUNE /SETP 2014
7. AGENCY ANNUAL REPORTS
8. PROJECT BOARD MEETINGS
9. TECHNICAL REPORTS OF THEMATIC AREAS
10. AVAILABLE PROCEEDINGS AND HIGHLIGHTS OF START UP THEMATIC WORKSHOPS
11. FRAMEWORK AND METHODS PAPER FOR THE THEMATIC AREAS
12. DRAFT MANUAL OF OPERATING PROCEDURES (MOP) FOR SELECTED THEMATIC AREAS
13. DRAFT AND PROMULGATED POLICY INSTRUMENTS
14. PARTIAL BIODIVERSITY MONITORING REPORTS
15. DRAFT LGU LAND USE PLANS
16. DRAFT LGU COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLANS
17. LGU ORDINANCES
18. SELECTED TRAINING MODULES
19. SELECTED TRAINING REPORTS
20. SELECTED INFORMATION CAMPAIGN MATERIALS
21. PROJECT WEBSITE

ATTACHMENT 8: CO-FINANCING INFORMATION

The following is the profile of co-financing as provided by the project team. The MTR interacted with selected LGUs in four sites and the pattern of decisions and actions made so far (e.g. land use planning exercises, formulation of plans and programs, support for marketing etc.) appear consistent with the information on initial investments that have been collected and organized below.

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$) ²	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
National Government-DENR	DENR	In-Kind total³	2,121,778	386,418.95	18%
	BMB-DENR	In-Kind	-	221,240.68	-
	DENR Region 2 - NECKBA	In-Kind	-	8,499.00	-
	DENR Region 4-B MSPLS	In-Kind	-	5,694.76	-
	DENR Region 6 - CPM	In-Kind	-	44,441.91	-
	DENR Region 11 - MHWRS	In-Kind	-	71,680.19	-
	DENR Region 13/LMDA - LMKBA	In-Kind	-	34,862.41	-
Partner National Government Agencies	Department of Agriculture	In kind total	0	333,804.10	NA
		In-Kind	0	13,804.10	NA
	DA-	Cash		50,000.00	-NA

² Line agencies other than the DENR (e.g. Department of Agriculture, Dept of Trade and Industry etc.) provided counterpart financing for their annual work plans. These additional co financing were not anticipated during the CEO endorsement.

³ The DENR co financing is further broken down to constituent agencies

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$) ²	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
	Alignment of the NAP-SLM to the UNCCD's 10-Strategic Plan and Framework				
	DA-BAR: ITPGRFA	Cash	0	270,000.00	NA
	Dept. of Trade and Industry-Board of Investments	In-Kind Total	0	71,585.70	NA
	Dept of Trade and Industry-Design Center of the Phils	In-Kind Total	0	9,518.04	NA
	Dept of Tourism	In Kind Total	0	11,389.52	NA
	HLURB	In Kind Total	0	13,667.43	NA
Academe	UP-ISSI	In Kind Total	0	4,555.81	NA
Local Government Units	All LGUs cited below	Grant total	6,720,343	0	0%
		In-Kind total	1,422,477	131,176.33	9%
	6 LGUs in Cagayan	In-Kind	-	17,824.01	-
	6 LGUs in Quirino	In-Kind	-	27,304.72	-
	Sablayan, Mindoro Occidental	In Kind	-	150.91	-
	Taytay, Palawan	In-Kind	-	35,856.83	-
	Province of	In-Kind	-	1,138.95	-

Source of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$) ²	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
	Iloilo and Aklan				
	10 LGUs in CPM	In-Kind	-	4,555.81	-
	LGUs in NNNP	In-Kind	-	10,706.15	-
	LGUs in MHWRS	In-Kind	-	12,847.38	-
	LGUs in Caraga	In-Kind	-	20,791.57	-
NGOs and Communities		Grant Total	611,457	2,000	0.3%
		In-Kind Total	1,344,602	202,956.93	15%
	CI-Philippines	In-Kind	-	69,725.56	-
	FFI	In-Kind	-	11,753.99	-
	Haribon	In-Kind	-	1,591.62	-
	PBCFI	In-Kind	-	101,662.53	-
	Save our Species-IUCN for NNNP	Cash	-	2,000.00	-
	PEF	In-Kind	-	18,223.23	-
UNDP		Grant	301,404	200,589	67%
		TOTAL	12,522,061	1,367,661	11%

Notes:

(a) Sources of co-financing: Bilateral Aid Agencies, Foundation, GEF Partner Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral agency(ies), Private Sector, Other

(b) Type of co-financing: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Others.

ATTACHMENT 9: SIGNED UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants⁴

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____Eduardo Queblatin

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): NA _____

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

Signed at *Makati City, Philippines* on *July 4, 2015* ____



Signature: _____

⁴ www.undp.org/uneocodeofconduct

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants⁵

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: MARK ANTHONY M. GAMBOA

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): NA _____

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

Signed at Quezon City, Philippines on *July 4, 2015*.



Signature: _____

⁵ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

ATTACHMENT 10: MTR FINAL REPORT CLEARANCE FORM