



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.



Final Project Report of the Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF - Small Grants Programme in the Philippines

LIST OF ACRONYMS

6NR	6 th National Report to Biodiversity Conservation
A7	Alliance of 7 Municipalities in Eastern Samar (Lawaan, Giporlos, Balanginga, Quinapondan, Mercedes, Guiuan and Salcedo)
ACTS	Agriculture, Commerce and Tourism Services
ADSDPP	Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan
AFA	Administration and Finance Associate
APA	Agricultural Protected Area
ASFA	Abaroan Small Farmers Association
AWFP	Annual Work and Financial Plan
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BGMPC	Bono-Bono Gintong Butil Multi-Purpose Cooperative
BCN	Biodiversity Conservation Network
BD	Biodiversity
BDFE	Biodiversity Friendly Enterprise
BEAT	Biodiversity Enterprise Assessment Tool
BEWA	Barangay Eco-Warriors Association
BIOFIN	Biodiversity Finance Initiative Project
BIRILAROSA	Biri, Lavezares, Rosario and San Jose
BLAFI	Bagong Lumad Artists Foundation Inc.
BMB	Biodiversity Management Bureau
BMS	Biodiversity Monitoring System
BPLS	BIRILAROSA Protected Landscape and Seascape
BTP-WEE AVC	Benchmark for Transformational Partnerships & Women's Economic Empowerment in Agriculture Value Chain
BTSC	Bloomfield Transportation Services Cooperative
C3 Phil.	Community Centered Conservation-Philippines
CADC	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Clan
CADT	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CAT	Climate Action Team
CBFMA	Community-Based Forest Management Agreement
CBMES	Community Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation System
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CBST	Community-Based Sustainable Tourism
CBSTO	Community-Based Sustainable Tourism Organization
CCC	Climate Change Commission
CDR	Combined Delivery Report
CEFA	Centralized Farmers Association
CEPA	Communication, Education, Promotion and Advocacy
CERD	Center for Empowerment and Resource Development
CFA	Cansangaya Fisherfolks Association
CFFQI	Community Forestry Farmers of Quirino Inc.

CFI	Culion Foundation Inc.
CIG	Calamianes Island Group
CLUP	Comprehensive Land Use Plan
CMEMP	Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Management Program
CMWUP	Coastal Marine Water Use Plan
CoMA	Co-Management Agreement
CPD	Country Program Director
CPM	Country Program Manager
CPMU	Country Program Management Unit
CRMF	Community Resource Management Framework
CRMP	Community Resource Management Plan
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DA	Department of Agriculture
DALUHAY	Daloy ng Buhay Inc.
DCA	Dugong Conservation Area
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DETFAWAI	Dimasalang Egongot Tribe Farmers and Weavers Association
DFMA	Demarcated Fishery Management Area
DOT	Department of Tourism
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
EA	Executing Agency
EDNPI	Earth Day Network Philippines Inc.
ENPA	Expanded-National Protected Area
ESSU	Eastern Samar State University
EVPRD	Eastern Visayas Partnerships for Rural Development
FASPS	Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Service
FEPMACO	Federation of Palali-Mamparang Conservationists
FFP	Forest Foundation Philippines
FLUP	Forest Land Use Plan
FPE	Foundation for Philippine Environment
FPIC	Free and Prior Informed Consent
FRENDS	Friends for the Environment for Development and Sustainability Inc.
FSI	Financial Systems Installation
GAD	Gender and Development
GDFI	Guiuan Development Foundation Inc.
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF7	Global Environment Facility-Operational Phase 7
GEF-CSO Network	Global Environment Facility- Civil Society Organizations Network
GMAI	Green Mindanao Association Inc.
GMFPC	Gabriela Masipag Farmers Producers Cooperative
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers
Haribon	Haribon Foundation for the Conservation of Natural Resources Inc.
IBA	Important Bird Area
ICCA	Indigenous Communities Conserved Area

ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IDEAS	Institute for Development Educational and ecological Alternatives Inc.
IFP	Indigenous Food Plant
IP	Implementing Party
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IPPF	Iwahig Prison and Penal Farm
IRDMP	Integrated River Development and Management Plan
ISD	Inclusive Sustainable Development Unit
ISEA	Institute for Social Entrepreneurship in Asia
IWP	Integrated Work Plan
KALAW	Katig-uban han mga Lawan-on
KBA	Key Biodiversity Area
KEF	Kalahan Educational Foundation
KM	Knowledge Management
KPBM	Kabuhayang Pangkababaihan ng Barangay Marufinas
LACBRMDC	Lawaan Community Based Resource Management and Development Council
LAPAS	Lakas at Pagkakaisa ng Asosasyon sa San Pedro
LAWIN	Landscape and Wildlife Indicators System
LCA	Local Conservation Area
LCCAP	Local Climate Change Action Plan
LGU	Local Government Unit
LRTC	Landscape Round Table Committee
LSM	Lower Sierra Madre
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MASABOR	Organization of Restaurant, Hotel and Lodging House Owners in PPSRNP
MBS-BDFEI	Model Building for Scaling Up-Biodiversity Friendly Enterprise Initiatives
MERF	Marine Environment Resource Foundation
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MIBCC	Magayen IT Buenavista Consumers Cooperative
MLPC	Malasi Lake Producers Cooperative
MMCPC	Maliit na Mangingisda ng Caramay Producers Cooperative
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MPAN	Marine Protected Area Network
NAC	Nortehanon Access Center
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan
NCIP	National Commission on Indigenous Peoples
NEDA	National Economic Development Authority
NGAs	National Government Agencies
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NIPAS	National Integrated Protected Areas System
NPD	National Program Director
NPS	North Philippine Sea
NSC	National Steering Committee

NSEP	Northern Samar Environment Protectors
NSIFDSNP	Nagkakaisang Samahan ng Isla Felomina Dive Site ng New Panggangan
NTCQ	Narunutan yang Tagbanua yang Calauit may Quezon
NTFP-EP	Non-Timber Forest Product – Exchange Program
ODA	Overseas Development Aid
PAKIBA	Pasay, Kinis, Bangus Association Inc.
PAMB	Protected Area Management Board
PA	Protected Area
PASO	Protected Area Superintendent Office
PA-WMP	Protected Area- Watershed Management Plan
PBCFI	Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation Inc.
PBSAP	Philippine Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan
PBSP	Philippine Business for Social Progress
PCART	Palawan Center for Agricultural Research Technology
PCC	Palawan Conservation Corps
PCSD	Palawan Council for Sustainable Development
PCW	Philippine Council for Women
PDPs	Philippine Development Plans
PENRO	Provincial Environment and Natural Resource Office
PGS	Participatory Guarantee System
PHP	Philippine Peso
PIF	Project Information Form
PKM-AVPP	Palawan Katutubo Mission – Archdiocesan Vicariate of Puerto Princesa
PLGU	Provincial Local Government Unit
PLS	Protected Landscape and Seascape
PMMR	Palali Mamparang Mountain Range
PMO	Project Management Office
PNNI	Palawan NGO Network Inc.
PO	People's Organization
PPA	Philippine Permaculture Association
PPSRNP	Puerto Princesa Subterranean River Natural Park
ProDoc	Project Document
PRRM	Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement
PSA	Philippine Statistics Authority
PSU-CSPG	Palawan State University – Center for Strategic Policy and Governance
PTRC	Project Technical Review Committee
QPR	Quarterly Progress Report
RA	Republic Act
ROI	Return of Investment
RP	Responsible Party
RUP	Resource Use Permit
SA4MB	Samahang Magtatambalang, Mangingisda, Magsasakang Taga Bantay ng Bakhaw
SABWELL	Sabang Wellness Spa Owners and Therapists Association
SACATODA	Sabang-Cabayugan Tricycle Operators and Drivers Association
SACRED	Samar Center for Rural Education and Development Inc.

SAE	Statement of Asset and Equipment
SARAGPUNTA	Kalipunan ng Pundasyon ng mga Tagbanua
SATRIKA	Samahan ng mga Tribung Tagbanua ng Kayasan
SB	Sangguniang Bayan
SCP	Sustainable Conservation Plan
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SEASPOC	South Eastern Samar PO Consortium
SERD	Sustainable Environment for Rural Development Association
SGP3	Small Grants Program Operational Phase 3
SGP4	Small Grants Program Operational Phase 4
SGP5	Small Grants Program Operational Phase 5
SGP-GEF	Small Grants Program – Global Environment Facility
SIBAAP	Samar Island Biodiversity Agenda and Action Plan
SINP	Samar Island Natural Park
SIPCA	Sawa-Iba Palaypay Community Association
SMMFPC	Sitio Maguli Marginal Farmers Producers Cooperative
SMPBGTAI	Sabang Mangrove Paddle Boat Tour Guide Association Inc.
SO	Strategic Objective
SP	Sangguniang Panlalawigan
SPKTM	Samahang Pagkakaisa ng mga Katutubong Tagbanua ng Marufinas
SPPI	Sentro ha Pagpapauswag ha Panginabuhi Inc.
SSMESI	Save Sierra Madre Environment Society Inc.
SSFMPCC	Sabang Seaferry Multi-Purpose Cooperative
SSMNA	Save Sierra Madre Network Alliance
SURSHA	Sabang Underground River Souvenirs and Handicraft Association
SWPA	Source Water Protection Area
TanimK	Tanim Kalikasan Inc.
TCD	Tribal Council for Development Inc.
TESDA	Training and Education Services Development Administration
TIKCA	Tinig ng mga Katutubo sa Cabayugan
TK	Tanggol Kalikasan
TNA	Training Needs Assessment
ToT	Training of Trainers
TSI	The Samdhana Institute
TWFR	Tumauini Watershed Forest Reserve
TWNP	Tumauini Watershed Natural Park
UEP	University of Eastern Philippines
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP-CO	United Nations Development Program– Country Office
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UP	University of the Philippines
UPLBFI	University of the Philippines Los Baños Foundation Inc.
UPVTC	University of the Philippines Visayas – Tacloban Campus

USD	United States Dollar
USM	Upper Sierra Madre
VAMR	Victoria Anepahan Mountain Range
WAIID	Women's Association for Inter-Island Development
WWF	World Wildlife Fund for Nature

Table of Contents

FINAL PROJECT REPORT.....	2
PROJECT INFORMATION AND RESOURCES.....	2
PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT.....	3
Progress towards achieving the Outcome.....	5
1. ACHIEVEMENTS AT THE OUTPUT LEVEL.....	7
Outcome 1- Effective models for community-based governance of protected areas demonstrated.....	7
Outcome 2 –Community managed land/seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives.....	10
Outcome 3 - Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products produced and marketed by 30 communities.....	18
Outcome 4- Training mechanisms develop for peer-to-peer learning.....	20
Outcome 5. Increased capacity of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends.....	24
Outcome 6 and 7. Project Management Unit.....	27
2. RESULTS AND RESOURCES.....	29
Summary of Expenditures as of December 2019.....	29
Outcome 1. Effective models for community-based governance of protected areas are demonstrated.....	29
Outcome 2. Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives.....	30
Outcome 3: Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries & forestry products produced and marketed by 30 communities.....	31
Outcome 4: Training mechanisms develop for peer-to-peer learning.....	32
3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE – IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES:.....	35
4. NIM/NGO AUDIT FINDINGS AND SPOT CHECK RECOMMENDATIONS:.....	39
5. SOFT ASSISTANCE NOT PROVIDED THROUGH PROJECTS OR PROGRAMMES.....	40
6. LESSONS LEARNED.....	44
7. PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIES.....	46
8. GENDER AND DEVELOPMENT MAINSTREAMING.....	47
9. REPORTING ON OTHER CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES.....	48
10. KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS AND DISSEMINATION PLAN:.....	48
11. SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS AND EXIT STRATEGY:.....	49

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

PROJECT INFORMATION AND RESOURCES	
Project ID:	00066837
Output ID:	0082868
Project Title:	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in the Philippines
Implementing Partner:	Biodiversity Management Bureau-Department of Environment and Natural Resources (BMB-DENR)
Responsible Parties (if applicable):	Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) contract ended October 2018
Donors:	Global Environment Facility, New Zealand Aid

Project Starting date		Project completion date	
Originally planned	Actual	Originally planned	Actual
June 1, 2013	November 2013	July 30, 2017	December 2019

Total Budget	Original Budget (US\$)	Latest Signed Revision (US\$)
	4,583,333.00	4,583,333.00

Total Expenditures	(US\$)
	4,544,872.28

Resources	Donor	Amount
Grant in Cash	GEF	US\$ 4,583, 333
BMB in Kind	BMB	US\$ 3,002,907
In Cash	New Zealand	US\$ 130,000
In Kind	Grantees	US\$ 1.1 M
In Kind	UNDP	US\$ 1M

PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The Philippines is both a megadiverse country and a global biodiversity hotspot. It hosts more than 50,000 described species, more than half of which is found nowhere else in the world. And yet, its forest cover is less than a quarter of what it was in the 1900s. The country is ranked within the world's top ten in terms of the level of endemism of its faunal species, especially reptiles, amphibians, mammals and birds. Considering land area with respect to flora and faunal density, the Philippines may be considered the world's most megadiverse country. It is in fact of the seventeen megadiverse countries, which together host 70-80% of the world's life forms. The country is believed to harbour more diversity of life than any other country on earth on a per hectare basis. However, its species are considered to be among the most threatened in the world with the whole country being a hotspot or one of the most severely threatened of the megadiverse countries. Much of biodiversity degradation is due to the threats of habitat destruction and land use change owing to destructive fishing and farming practices, overexploitation of valuable species and pollution.

The biodiversity crisis is a direct threat to the well-being of rural communities, and indigenous peoples. Biodiversity is a source of environmental services from shelter to food, fuel, water and even protection from disasters or extreme weather events. Half of the 93 million Filipinos live in the countryside. Of this, 80% are considered as rural poor, with most of them depending on subsistence farming and fishing for livelihood.

Coping has been a challenge for many poor biodiversity-dependent communities as they are hampered in their ability to form and manage community-based protected areas by inadequate organizational capacity. Organizational knowledge, experience and market barriers constrain the adoption of sustainable land-use plans and practices across landscapes. Also, peer-to-peer training mechanisms and networks and partnership platforms for peer-to-peer capacity building are not well developed and there are few capacity building opportunities available to local rural and small urban communities.

To contribute to overcoming the threats and barriers described above, SGP-5 in the Philippines supported local people's organizations, NGOs and community-based organizations in designing and implementing projects to contribute to global biodiversity conservation using the landscape approach and modeling and implementation of best practices. Individual small grant projects were intended to contribute concrete outputs to the achievement of SGP-5's inter-related components and their respective outcomes.

Designed and implemented solely under the Biodiversity Conservation Focal Area, the objective of SGP-5 in the Philippines was to secure global environmental benefits through community based biodiversity conservation initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines, namely, Palawan, Samar Island and the Sierra Madre Mountain Range. The project pursued three components: (i) Community-based actions improve the sustainability of protected areas (PAs); (ii) Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors (PLS); (iii) Cross-cutting capacity development and knowledge management.

1. CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNDAF and CPD OUTCOMES and OUTPUTS:

UNDAF 2012 – 2018 and UNDP 2012-2018 Country Programme Outcome

UNDAF/CPD Outcome - By 2018, capacities of national and local government officials and communities to conserve and sustainably manage the country's environment and natural resources, including biodiversity and sustainable energy sources are enhanced.

UNDAF 2012 – 2018 and UNDP 2012-2018 Country Programme Indicators

SGP5 contributed to Strategic Goals A to E of the **Aichi Targets** addressing both terrestrial, coastal, marine, and agricultural ecosystems, particularly Goals 6, sustainable exploitation; 7, biodiversity-friendly fisheries; 10, endangered ecosystems; 11, protected areas; and, 12, extinction of threatened species.

Most of SGP5 projects have locations in the eastern seaboard where an average of 20 typhoons are annually recorded. These are project sites hosting communities that are mostly affected by extreme weather events. Though SGP5 interventions were focused on biodiversity conservation, project designs were also geared towards mitigation and adaptation measures to prepare these communities to become resilient to climate change impacts. Notably, all 56 projects were anchored on **CPD-UNDAF Outcome 2**, addressing specifically 2.1 – to implement risk-informed climate and disaster resilient policies and programs and 2.3 - to improve natural resource management and financing.

To be noted as well is SGP5's interventions which were in consonance with the **SDGs**. These interventions cut across six out of 17 SDGs, namely, SDG 1-Poverty; SDG 11-Sustainable Cities and communities; SDG 13- Climate Action; SDG 14- Life Below Water; SDG 15 -Life on Land; and SDG 17 - Partnerships for the Goals.




At the national front, SGP5 contributed to the attainment of the **Philippine Development Plan (PDP)** mandate of the DENR to "Ensure Ecological Integrity, Clean and Healthy Environment". It contributed to the enhancement of biodiversity and functioning of ecosystem services with community-managed local conservation areas established. A total of 41 BDFEs benefiting 17,217 individuals also addressed poverty reduction. On the whole, it responded to the call to actions contained in Chapter 20 of the PDP.

More specifically, at sectoral level, all 54 community-managed projects contributed to the attainment of 10 out 20 **Philippine Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (PBSAP)** targets with an aggregate total of PHP164,103,096.90 invested in these projects. Twenty of these projects addressed Target 12 with six projects showing increased METT scores and the rest were in various stages of management of locally conserved biodiversity rich areas. Another 14 projects contributed to increasing biodiversity conservation-related jobs including 41 BDFEs, including organic farming and sustainable agriculture practices. The remaining others were into species protection and preservation; habitat and ecosystems rehabilitation and restoration; and few others were into enforcement, program and policy advocacy.

The table below indicates SGP5's contribution to PBSAP targets, number of projects, and an aggregate total of investment per target.

PBSAP Target	Total No. of SGP5 projects	Aggregate Total (Grant and co-financing in PhP)
---------------------	-----------------------------------	--

PBSAP Target	Total No. of SGP5 projects	Aggregate Total (Grant and co-financing in PhP)
Target 1: by 2028, the conservation status of nationally and globally threatened species in the country from 2016 levels is maintained or improved	3	19,915,922.53
Target 3: By 2028, there will be no net loss in presence an area distribution of live coral cover, mangrove and sea grasses	3	7,523,867.45
Target 4: By 2028, over 50% of genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and wild relatives will be conserved or maintained	1	4,113,544.38
Target 9: By 2028, there will be an annual increase of at least 5% in biodiversity conservation-related jobs (ecotourism, sustainable agriculture, ecosystem restoration)	14	73,200,711.65
Target 11: By 2028, there will be a 10% increase in agricultural areas devoted to all types of biodiversity-friendly agriculture	3	8,113,631.18
Target 12: By 2028, capacity for biodiversity conservation of public and private sector groups in terrestrial and marine Pas/KBAs will be strengthened a) Proportion of PA management structures with high management effectiveness assessment scores; b) Number of private companies, POs/ NGOs, communities involved in biodiversity conservation	20	121,097,357.06
Target 14: By 2028, 1 million ha of degraded ecosystems will be restored and/or will be under various stages of restoration	3	9,264,496.00
Target 18: By 2028, there will be a 10% annual increase from the 2015 baseline in the number of schools, POs, media organizations, LGUs, private companies, policy makers, government officers that are aware and supportive of biodiversity, its importance, threats and benefits of protecting it	1	3,555,300.00
Target 19: By 2028, there will be a 10% increase in total are from 2015 levels of terrestrial, including inland wetlands, Pas managed through NIPAS, and other conservation measures (indigenous community conserved areas, local conservation areas, critical habitats) that overlap with KBAs	3	16,494,323.56
Target 20: By 2028, there will be a 20% increase from 205 levels in the coverage of established MPA/s sanctuaries across various aquatic habitat	3	21,921,300.15
Total	54	PhP 285,200,453.96

Rating:	
	Positive change
	Negative change
	Unchanged

ACHIEVEMENTS AT THE OUTPUT LEVEL

Outcome 1- Effective models for community-based governance of protected areas demonstrated

Output 1.1- establishment or enhancement of at least 10 community-managed protected or conservation areas encompassing at least 100,000 hectares;

A total of **134,863 hectares of 85 community protected areas¹** were established or enhanced with management instruments and structures put in place. These exhibited **16 potential models** of community solutions to biodiversity conservation². These are: 1) the *Community Based Sustainable Tourism (CBST)* which is strongly established and promoted in the Puerto Princesa Subterranean River and Natural Park, Binduyan and Babuyan LCAs in Puerto Princesa City, and the Barbacan River mangrove Cruise in Roxas, Palawan; 2) the *Conservation Trade Off* (Payment for Carabao Loan Amount in the form of Mangrove Planting) developed by PCART; 3) the locally declared *BDFE demonstration sites* (salt-making in a mangrove area, lato production in muddy flat areas and kasuy (cashew nut) production areas in the lowland and hilly areas of Magsaysay, Palawan; 4) the *Indigenous Food Plants (IFPs) Production and Conservation Areas* within the ancestral domains of the Tagbanwa and Palaw'an in Quezon, Palawan; 5) the *Dugong Conservation and Ecotourism Area* of the Tagbanwa in Busuanga, Palawan (Calamian Island); 6) the *Social Fencing Scheme through the establishment Organized Production Area within the Buffer Zone of SINP and Marketing of Abaca* by the Eastern Visayas Partnership for Rural Development (EVPRD), in partnership with the Centralized Farmers Association (CEFA) Inc. in Mondragon, Northern Samar; 7) the *Rizal Crocodile Sanctuary* in the mangrove areas of Rizal, Palawan established by the Municipal LGU upon the initiative of the Palawan NGO Network, Inc. (PNNI); 8) the *Agricultural Ecosystem Biodiversity Conservation Area* which is a food security, climate resiliency, biodiversity (agricultural ecosystem) research and a livelihood (BDFE) initiative spearheaded by Nortehanon Access Center (NAC) in Northern Samar; 9) the Nueva Vizcaya provincial government declaration of the 24,000 ha. Palali Mamparang Mountain Range (PMMR) as *Provincial Local Conservation Area (PLCA)*, with strong participation and support of the four municipalities of Quezon, Kasibu, Bayombong and Bambang, CSO (FRENDS) and a PO federation comprised of 24 PO's surrounding the PLCA; 10) the *women led (WAIIDD seagrass and mangrove management in Lalaguna Bay* within the BIRILAROSA Protected Landscape and Seascape (BPLS) in Lavizares, Northern Samar; 11) the *seaweed farms established and protected areas* which is a BDFE initiative cum conservation and protection in the marine areas of Northern and Eastern Samar; 12) the *Bolusao Watershed and Marine Protected Areas, Integrating Ecotourism in Lawaan, Eastern Samar* initiated by the Guiuan Development Foundation (GDFI) in partnership with the Municipal Government of Lawaan, the UP-Visayas Tacloban campus, SEASPOC (South Eastern Samar PO Consortium) and the LACBRMDC (Lawaan Community Based Resource Management and Development Council); 13) the *Malasi Lake wetland and critical habitat conservation and monitoring program* of Philippine Duck (*Anas luzonica*) and migratory birds in Malasi Lake by a PO (Malasi Lake Producers Cooperative-MLPC) in partnership with CENRO-Cabagan in Cabagan, Isabela; 14) the *Ridge to River (Addalem River) program* of the SERD (Sustainable Environment for Resource Development) in partnership with Quirino State University and the Local Government of Cabbaroguis

¹ See Annex 1, Summary of Grantees' Contributions to SGP5 Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1 and 2.2.

² See Annex 2, List of 16 community managed or co-management models.

and Barangays Dibibi and Eden; 15) the *Participatory Guarantee System* which is a farmer-to-farmer organic production and products certification as alternative to the very expensive Organic Certification System of the government and will promote soil and water conservation practices in upland agricultural areas, promoted by PRRM in the Upper Sierra Madre in partnership with PGS Philippines; and, the 16) Agricultural Protected Area (APA) established in the Egongot Ancestral Domain in Maria Aurora, Aurora Province by the Egongot Tribal Council.

The CSO's and communities working in these areas showed the potential of modelling innovative ways of doing conservation work. However, proving their long-term effectiveness cannot be claimed as of yet, given the short period of implementation of their innovations.

The programme exceeded the target 100,000 hectares by almost 35%. These community protected areas are legally declared through various instruments, such as provincial, municipal and barangay ordinances, Community Based Forest Management Agreements (CBFMA), Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT)/Indigenous Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs), Co-Management Agreements (CoMA) and, Local Conservation Areas (LCAs). These areas are integrated in the different local government plans such as: Forest Land Use Plans (FLUPs), Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs), Protected Area/Watershed Management Plans (PA/WMPs), Coastal Resource Management Plans (CRMPs), LCA Mgt. Plans, Community Resource Management Framework (CRMF) and Marine Protected Area Management Plans (MPA/Network MPs).

Since established, these PAs were put under the protection and management of local community organizations in partnership with the DENR, created Management Committees, Local Government Units and in some areas (Quirino, Palawan, Tanay, Eastern Samar), with academic institutions. Along with the establishment of these PAs are the creation of protection and conservation mechanisms such as: Forest and Fishery Wardens (Bantay Gubat/Dagat); establishment and creation of biodiversity monitoring systems (BMS); issuance of biodiversity and BDFE related policies and regulations; creation of Technical Working Group or Management Committees; and other conservation mechanisms that will ensure the continuity of efforts started and installed by SGP5. Thirty-nine grantees worked with local community organizations (CBOs), located in 17 provinces, 62 municipalities and 226 barangays³ distributed within the three SGP5 sites, Samar Island, Sierra Madre Mountain Range and the Island of Palawan. These are the communities of farmers, fishers, indigenous peoples, women, who are heavily dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods.

Palawan grantees established 36 PAs with a total area of 77,135 ha categorized as Marine Protected Areas/sanctuaries, ICCAs/CADTs, LCAs, protection areas in CBFMA, wildlife habitats and watersheds. Marine Protected Area Networks (MPAN) which are mostly expansion of previous SGP, LGU and other NGO efforts constitute the large areas of established PAs. In the Sierra Madre Mountain Range, grantees and their partners worked on 24 PAs with a total area of 48,395 ha. Palali-Mamparang Mountain Range (PMMR) is one of the largest established PA (with a Protection Zone of 8,669 ha.) in Sierra Madre which was legislated and attained sustainable partnership with the Provincial Government of Nueva Vizcaya. PMMR was declared as Local Conservation Area (LCA) by the Sangguniang Panlalawigan (SP) of Nueva Vizcaya thru Ordinance No. 2017-138. The ordinance provides for the creation of corresponding management committees and annual budget allocation of ₱6M per year for its

³ Annex 3, List of provinces, municipalities and barangays reached by SGP5.

management. The ordinance also provides for the creation of functional provincial-level management council and formulation of PMMR management plan.

The CADTs and MPAs in Aurora, Quezon, Nueva Vizcaya and Quirino largely contribute to this established community managed PAs. The delineation of ICCAs/CADT areas of the ancestral domains of the Egongot and Ilongot tribe in Aurora and Quirino; the Kalanguya in Imugan, Sta. Fe, Nueva Viscaya and the Dumagat tribes in Quezon, Bulacan, Rizal, Nueva Ecija, and Quirino provinces, the Tagbanwa of Calamianes and Palawan, also boost their confidence to process their CADT applications. Their experience also provided valuable inputs in the on-going legislative discussion on ICCA Bill. There are also areas identified as critical habitats for specialized species such as Katala in the Iwahig Prison and Penal Farm (IPPF), the Crocodile Sanctuary in Canipaan, Rizal, Palawan, the Philippine Duck and other migratory birds in the Malasi Lake Tree Park and Wildlife Sanctuary in Cabagan, Isabela, the Dugong (Sea cow) in Calawit, Busuanga, and equally important habitats that provide “home” to these species, were also declared as PAs and managed by communities. Small watersheds which are sources of domestic and irrigation waters for the communities were likewise given importance and secured through these declarations and management.

Output 1.2 – *40% increase in relevant dimension of management effectiveness in target protected areas, as measured by the METT (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool); and*

Twelve of the 85 community managed PAs covering more than 40,000 hectares monitored the impact of the project on the management of their established/enhanced PAs, using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Despite the limited time frame (2 years) of SGP5-assisted projects, the pre- (2016/2017) and post- (2018) assessments conducted in the 12 PAs was able to record an average increase of 47.28% (above the 40% target) in METT dimensions.

These 12 community protected areas with METT were:

- 1) Neo MPA (Marine Protected Area) of San Luis, Aurora, which recorded a 173% increase;
- 2) Baler Seagrass Mangrove Protected Area, with 66.67% increase;
- 3) Bogtong Local Conservation Area (LCA) in Busuanga, Palawan with 57.69% increase in Context, Planning, Process and Inputs;
- 4) Malacampo MPA, with 51.53% increase;
- 5) Rizal MPA, with 46.51% increase;
- 6) Johnson MPA, with 34.04% increase;
- 7) Malasi Lake Tree Park and Wildlife Sanctuary, with 32% increase;
- 8) Tinitian MPA, with 31.91% increase;
- 9) San Miguel MPA, with 26.67% increase;
- 10) Tumauini Watershed Natural Park, with 22.64%;
- 11) Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park, with 13.92%; and,
- 12) Caramay MPA with 10.29%.

The last three PAs who got the lowest increase in METT scores (TWNP, PPSRNP and Caramay MPA) are already established PAs and have management structures and systems in place before SGP5 funding came in. However, with the SGP funding, TWNP was included in the ENIPAS and became regular component of the PA system in the Philippines; PPSRNP broadened and strengthened community participation in PPSRNP management (through representation in the PAMB by representatives of the People's Forum, a network which was created by, and consists of, SGP5 beneficiaries in the area); and, expanded Communication, Education, Protection and Advocacy (CEPA) in the case of Caramay.

The first three with highest increase in METT rating are new Protected Areas declared through Municipal Ordinances. The SGP funding helped in strengthening LGU-CSO partnership and collaboration and building of strong community-support system.

Output 1.3 - 1,000 hectares of mangrove and/or seagrass areas within the 100,000 hectares community-managed protected or conserved areas are rehabilitated or protected.

Of the 134,863-hectare community-managed protected areas, **8,812 hectares (or 6.53%) are mangroves and seagrass beds**. Palawan delivered the highest number of mangrove forests (at 6,873 hectares) declared as protected areas through local ordinances (municipal and barangay level). The largest of these are the declared Rizal Crocodile Sanctuary (PNNI, with 1,840 hectares); Barbacan River and Mangrove forest in Roxas (PCART, with 1,747 hectares); Bataraza Mangrove Conservation Area (BBGMPC, with 1,331 hectares); part of Coron, Culion and Busuanga CADC areas of the Tagbanua ICC (Saragpunta with 1,225 hectares); and the rest are small contributions from LCAs and MPAs in Busuanga (C3), Puerto Princesa City (PCC, MMPC, SSFMPC and SMPBGTAI); and demonstration farms in Cuyo Island (PSU-CSPG).

Rating:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not achieved
<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially achieved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fully achieved

Outcome 2 –Community managed land/seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives

Output 2.1 - 400,000 hectares of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management arrangements, mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives, thereby reducing threats to biodiversity.

A total of **680,644 hectares of production landscapes and seascapes** were established and are now under community management or co-management arrangements, integrating biodiversity conservation objectives. This exceeded the 400,000-hectare target by 58.77%.

Samar Island the biggest contributor to this output, with an aggregate of 394,720 hectares. The largest of these was Eastern Samar’s seascape. Upon the initiative of the Guiuan Development Foundation, Inc. (GDFI), a unified ordinance was enacted by the seven municipalities of Lawaan, Giporlos, Quinapondan, Mercedes, Balangiga, Guiuan, Salcedo, which are also known as the Alliance of 7 or A7. Said unified ordinance affirmed the Integrated Coastal Management Zone (IZCM) covering an area of production land/seascape, providing management and protection of the coastal and marine resources in their municipal waters, as provided for under the Local Government Code and the Revised Fisheries Code. The seaweed production areas of SPPI in Northern and Eastern Samar, the agricultural production area of CEFA (EVPRD), NAC, SACRED and PBSP, contributed as well to the landscape and seascape of Samar⁴.

⁴ Annex 4, Details of declared production landscapes and seascapes contribution to Outcome 2.

In Palawan, the community managed production areas are within the ancestral domains of the Tagbanua, Palaw'an and Batak Indigenous Cultural Communities (ICC) in Coron, Busuanga, Culion, Narra, Quezon and Puerto Princesa where there is strong participation of women and youth in biodiversity and cultural diversity conservation activities and programmes. The fishery areas within the Green Island Bay in Roxas and San Antonio Bay in Bataraza, which were established as MPA networks, also contributed to this output. The community co-managed production landscapes and seascapes of Palawan has an aggregate area of 212,948 hectares, or 31% of the total area established in all three areas of SGP5.

The Sierra Madre Mountain Range's share in this output is 57,921.41 hectares, wherein Palali Mamparang Mountain Range accounted for 17,448 hectares (30.12%) of the production landscape of this priority site. In the CADT/ICCA/CADC areas in the provinces of Aurora, Nueva Vizcaya, Rizal and Quezon, soil, water and biodiversity conservation measures were integrated and mainstreamed in communities' agricultural production practices Agricultural/agroforestry areas within the ancestral domains of the Agta-Remontado, Ilongot, Egongot, Kalanguya in Aurora (Daluhay), Sta. Fe in Nueva Vizcaya (Kalahan Educational Foundation), Quirino (SERD, GMFPC, CFFQI) and Isabela (MLPC, SMMFPC) provinces were established and continuously promoted/advocated. The sustainable management of these areas are also integrated in four Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protected Plans (ADSDPP), five updated Community Resource Use and Management Framework (CRMF) for the Community-Based Forest Management Agreements (CBFMA), nine Local Conservation Area (LCA) management plans, 11 (Marine Protected Areas Network (MPAN) management plans, six Protected Area Management Plans and three Wildlife Sanctuary/Habitat Management Plans, all facilitated and formulated by SGP5 grantees.

Output 2.2 - *At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.*

A total of **38 land use management plans** out of the 30 targeted plans were developed/updated. Grantees participated in various forms of engagement in the planning processes spearheaded by local government units, CSOs and other government agencies and stakeholders. Some grantees facilitated the management planning workshops, shared their expertise in resource assessment and biophysical surveys, monitoring and law enforcement, and in gathering and analysis of baseline information which served as inputs to the management plans. Others shared resources such as manpower, food, venue, accommodation, training materials for the workshops. Some wrote and packaged the plan. Others lobbied to the LGUs and government agencies for the adoption and approval of the plans.

The following table enumerates the 38 plans developed, with their corresponding areas of coverage:

Land Use Management Plan	Area Covered (in ha.)	No. of Plans
1. CEFA CBFMA Updated Community Resource	315	1

Management Framework (CRMF)		
2. Demarcated Fishery Management Area (DFMA) integrated in Mondragon Local Climate Change Action Plan (LCCAP)	3,500	1
3. MPA Mgt. Plans (inclusion of seaweed farms as production areas) (established thru SPPI)	13,710	7
4. Cansangaya MPA Mgt. Plan (inclusion of fishery, mangrove and corals outside of the PA)	400	1
5. Inclusion of Bolusao Watershed in the Draft Lawaan FLUP	7,179	1
6. Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan of Aliance of 7 (ICZMP of A7) municipalities (Lawaan, Giporlos, Quinapongdan, Mercedes, Guiuan, Salcedo, Balangiga) of Eastern Samar for Leyte Gulf	394,720	1
7. Mangrove and Coffee Plantation Area integrated in Mercedes Coastal Resource Management Plan (CRMP) 2018-2022	15	1
8. Malanut Watershed Management Plan (re-validated) (within Victoria Anepahan Mountain Range (VAMR))	4,900	1
9. Tutud Watershed Management Plan facilitated by Abaroan Small Farmers Association (ASFA)	2, 526.73	1
10. Mudcrab fattening and crablets collection / rehabilitation area, incorporated into Busuanga's Coastal and Marine Water Use Plan (CMWUP)	300	1
11. Ancestral Domain Sustainable and Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP) of 4 Tagbanwa clusters composed of 14 communities in Coron, Culion and Busuanga, Palawan (facilitated by Saragpunta)	1, 095	4
12. Binduyan and Babuyan Local Conservation Areas (LCA) Management Plans facilitated by Palawan Conservation Corps (PCC)	1,196	2
13. Green Island Bay MPA Network (MPAN) draft Management Plan of Roxas, Palawan facilitated by MMCP	132,326.27	1
14. Multiple Use Zone of the declared San Antonio Bay Marine Protected Area Network of Bataraza, Palawan	11,322	1
15. Samahang Pagkakaisa ng mga Katutubong Tagbanua ng Marufinas (SPKTM) ADSDPP	8,288	1
16. Puerto Princesa Subterranean River Natural Park (PPSRNP) Management Plan	17,625.83	1
17. Candis III Updated CRMF with 5Year Work and Financial Plan and Resource Use Plan (RUP)	127	1
18. ADSDPP of Isugod and Isaub Tagbanwa in Quezon,	11,000	1

Palawan		
19. Integrated River Development and Management Plan (IRDMP) of the Addalem River in Cabarroguis, Quirino (tributary of Cagayan River) facilitated by SERD	1,552	1
20. San Luis Draft Forest Land Use Plan 2017-2026 (for SB Adoption) facilitated by Daluhay	11,466	1
21. Ikalahan ADSDPP of the Kalanguya tribe ICCA in Sta. Fe Nueva Viscaya, facilitated by the Kalahan Educational Foundation (KEF)	11,154	3
22. Palali-Mamparang Mountain Range (PMMR) Provincial LCA (PLCA) Management Plan covering 4 municipalities (Quezon, Bayombong, Bambang and Kasibu) in Nueva Viscaya	17,447.59	1
23. Tumauni Natural Park (formerly Tumauni Watershed Forest Reserve-TWFR) Management Plan	3,000	1
24. SAGIBIN Community Conservation Plan in General Nakar, Quezon facilitated by TCD)	40	1
25. Updated CRMF of Gabriela Masipag Farmers Producers Cooperative's (GMFPC) CBFMA in Diffun, Quirino	904	1
26. Malasi Tree Park & Wildlife Sanctuary Critical Habitat Management Plan 2017 facilitated by CENRO-Cabagan and MLPC (Malasi Lake Producers Cooperative)	130	1
TOTAL	645,085.42	38

The implementation of these management plans would need further assistance and guidance, where other funding agencies can support.

The landscapes and seascapes formed through the implementation of SGP5 projects did not only result in mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in agricultural and fishery production areas and practices, but also paved the way for the formation of ecosystems and biophysical connectivity, as well as social networks and partnerships. Each of these formations have their own stories to tell:

1. The Calamianes Landscape and Seascape

The Calamianes story showcased the interplay between biological and cultural diversity, with the five SGP5 grantees individually pursuing separate projects that synergistically achieved positive results.

Saragpunta pursued a participatory process of formulating the Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan (ADSDPP) of the four clusters of 14 IP communities in the municipalities of Coron, Culion, and Busuanga, while securing the requirements for Certificate of Ancestral Domain

Title (CADT) applications with the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP). *The Samdhana Institute (TSI)* complemented the work of Saragpunta by capacitating the Tagbanua women and youth as conservation leaders and ancestral domain caretakers through trainings, youth camps, mangrove rehabilitation, and livelihood development. PBCFI and C3 worked for the declaration of identified conservation areas as Local Conservation Areas (LCAs) and Dugong Conservation Area (DCA) in the municipality of Busuanga. Both are science-based organizations, thus, their projects were anchored on applied research and focused on wildlife habitat and species conservation. In particular, PBCFI worked for habitat and wildlife conservation in the uplands of Chinabayan Mountain Range through the Wayan Mountain Range, cutting across the island of Busuanga,⁵ down to the mangroves and marine habitats where C3's dugong conservation intervention is taking place. These areas also happen to be habitats of several Calamian endemic taxa and globally important populations of other threatened Palawan endemic species such as the Calamian deer, (*Axis calamianensis* – Critically Endangered), Palawan hornbill (*Anthracoceros marchei* – Vulnerable); Palawan bearded pig, (*Sus ahoenobarbus* – Vulnerable), Palawan flying fox (*Acerodon leucotis* – Vulnerable), Philippine flat-headed frog (*Barbourula busuangensis* – Vulnerable), and Philippine endemic Philippine cockatoo, (*Cacatua haematuropygia* – Critically Endangered), and the Vulnerable Dugong (*Dugong dugon*).

Most of the livelihood projects were supported by CFI through consolidation, product development, and marketing of biodiversity-friendly products. CFI provided training on product development, processing, packaging and marketing, as well as the intricacies of business management. From its own microfinance program and resources, CFI also provided interested individuals or groups with seed capital to start or expand their businesses.

The projects triggered the formation of partnerships, management bodies and community organizations that continue to work with the LGUs, the Palawan Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD), other non-government organizations, academic institutions and national government agencies.

In sum, these Calamianes projects helped secure IP and conservation territories, thus, building a shield against land conversion, overexploitation and unsustainable resource use especially brought about by migrants, poachers and speculators due to the burgeoning tourism industry in the islands.

2. *The PPSRNP Landscape and Seascape*

As a measure to mitigate the impacts of tourism to the world-renowned and World Heritage Site Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park (PPSRNP), the Protected Area Management Board (PAMB), together with the five surrounding barangays of the Park (Buenavista, Tagabenit, Cabayugan, Marufinas, and New Panggangan), promoted the "buffer-to-buffer" framework of biodiversity protection, i.e., providing a strong social fence to curb destructive activities within the Park. This concept was applied and tested through the implementation of the SGP5 supported projects in this area.

Two grantees, the SMPBTGAI and the SSMFPC, served as mother organizations to 12 small POs under their umbrella. In addition, the PCC established two local conservation areas in the Park-adjacent barangays of Babuyan and Binduyan as added social fences, both of which were legislated by the City government. These organizations worked closely with the PPSRNP Management Office and the Puerto Princesa City Government (through the Tourism Office), in the implementation of the projects using the Community-Based Sustainable Tourism (CBST) approach/framework. Their projects, which were all tourism-related, provided an opportunity for the local communities to partake of the benefits of the tourism in the area, which is otherwise dominated by big investors. Too, by providing alternative and additional destinations in the site, they have greatly contributed to the mitigation of overcrowding in the

⁵ Busuanga Island hosts two municipalities, Coron and Busuanga.

famous Underground River. Now that they are eking out a living from tourism, the communities have become better partners of the PAMB in protecting the Park.

Realizing their collective strength, the SGP5 grantees formed the People's Council to have a voice in the management of the Park. In fact, one of its members, the SSMFPC, has already been given a seat in the PAMB as well as the City Tourism Council, championing their agenda. Starting out with 14 members, the People's Council was already 24-strong by the end of SGP5, with 10 other POs joining in the process. For more effective and comprehensive representation, the People's Council created five clusters: (1) CBST Organizations (CBSTO), Service Providers/ Experience Enhancers; (2) CBST Sites (CBSTS); (3) Farmer's Organizations; (4) Indigenous Peoples (IPs); and, (5) Interest Groups (youth, senior citizens, women, PPSRNP employees).

With their three battlecries, “protecting the people is protecting biodiversity,” “biodiversity protection is an economic activity,” and “attaining balance between economic improvement and biodiversity protection is doable,” these projects have established a strong social fence around the park.

3. The Northern Samar Ridge-to-Reef Landscape and Seascape

The Northern Samar Landscape and Seascape was naturally formed as the project sites ecologically connect (as bionetwork) the two key protected areas in Samar — the Samar Island Natural Park (SINP) in the uplands and the Biri LaRoSa Protected Landscape and Seascape (BPLS) in the seas/oceans. The SGP5 projects in these areas showed distinct but complementary approaches in promoting biodiversity conservation and creating benefits for local communities.

In the buffer zone of SINP within the municipality of Mondragon, Northern Samar, EVPRD and its partner PO, CEFA, demonstrated a resource management approach using the Community-Based Forest Management Agreement (CBFMA) framework. The project showed how an agroforestry technology benefits both the forest and the people by integrating native species of abaca (Manila Hemp) with forest trees and cash crops, providing livelihoods for CEFA's members. Because benefits were directly obtained, community participation in the project became more active. CEFA grew stronger and relentlessly pursued the scaling up of the abaca industry as a consolidator, providing more stable income for the people and higher potential for resource management sustainability.

Downstream to the agricultural plains, NAC employed an agro-biodiversity technology called Integrated Rice Duck Farming System (IRDFS). The project piloted farmer cooperators to demonstrate organic production of native rice species while growing ducks as pest management strategy. Duck eggs were processed into salted eggs and marketed by members of the Barangay Eco-Women Association (BEWA), a PO organized by NAC.

In the coastal, mangrove, and marine ecosystems were five projects. CERD established and set up the management of Monbon Sanctuary and Mondragon Beach Forest, SPPI strengthened the seaweed farming, consolidation, and marketing industry, NSEP introduced various small livelihoods to community-based organizations in the municipality of Lavezares, LAPAS partnered with the BPLS for the establishment and community management of the Matambakahan Marine Sanctuary and ecosystems network, and so did PAKIBA for their women-management mangrove sanctuary and mud-crab ranching. These projects promoted the protection and management of mangrove, seaweeds, seagrass, corals and fishery resources through the establishment of marine protected areas while also enhancing the communities' livelihoods.

The Northern Samar landscape/seascape did not only show ecosystem connectivity but also espoused social connectivity. It showcased how the “hub system” developed by SGP5 as a strategy for networking, capacity building, and creating a biodiversity conservation movement in Samar Island worked. Spearheaded by CERD as the hub for Samar Island, the SGP5 grantees were able to establish a strong

social structure, the first in Samar, called the Biodiversity Conservation Network (BCN). The network then developed the Samar Island Biodiversity Agenda and Action Plan (SIBAAP), which became the blueprint for the CSOs, LGUs and government agencies in developing biodiversity, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and resource management programs and action plans for Samar island.

4. The Eastern Samar Landscape and Seascape

The initiative of GDFI spanned the connected ecosystems from the buffer zone of Samar Island Natural Park (SINP), particularly the Bolusao watershed, to the river, shoreline, mangroves, coral reefs, and seagrass areas in the municipality of Lawaan. In partnership with Lawaan LGU, University of the Philippines Visayas Tacloban campus (UPVTC), and the CBOs such as the Southeast Samar PO Consortium (SEASPOC), Lawaan Association for Community-Based Resource Management and Development (LACRMD), Taguile Fisherfolks and Farmers Association (TFFA), and the Katig-uban han mga Lawan-on (KALAW), the project was able to form and create more capable resource conservation groups, communities and advocates and established six marine protected areas. It also helped strengthen environmental governance in Lawaan through the formulation of Lawaan Forest Land Use Plan and Coastal Resource Management Plan; rekindled the commitment of the seven municipalities of Eastern Samar (Lawaan, Mercedes, Giporlos, Balangiga, Quinapondan, Guiuan, and Salcedo) through the signing of an amended Memorandum of Agreement for the A7 for ICZM (Alliance of 7 Municipalities for Integrated Coastal Zone Management)⁶ and strengthening of the MPAs and MPA networks in Eastern Samar. A7 for ICZM, is committed to pursue a regional consortium of different inter-local organizations focusing on natural ecosystems management, conservation, and resource development that in effect will inspire the neighboring regions, and whole country to adapt the same strategy.

Adjacent to Lawaan is the municipality of Basey, which is already part of the Samar province. SGP5 supported the project of GMAI which is the establishment of Kapongturan Island Wildlife Sanctuary, enhancement of nipa plantation and production areas. Production of nipa into shingles became the livelihood project of SIPCA (Sawa-Iba-Palaypay Community Association), a women-dominated community organization formed by GMAI under the SGP5 project.

Further down southeast of Lawaan and still part of the A7 is the municipality of Mercedes, where the “Mercedes Mangrove Area Rehabilitation and Livelihood (Coffee Farming) Project” of the Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP) was implemented. This project carried out mangrove rehabilitation and integrated coffee in upland agroforestry in Barangay Sung-an, and Buyayawon. The project is integrated in the municipalities’ Coastal Resource Management Plan (CRMP).

Farthest to Lawaan is the Cansangaya Fisherfolks Association (CFA) Marine Protected Area project in Barangay Cansangaya, Can-avid, Eastern Samar. This PO, in partnership with Can-avid LGU and the Eastern Samar State University (ESSU), was able to declare and manage a 78 hectares marine protected area (MPA) in Cansangaya.

This landscape and seascape also demonstrates a bionetwork connectivity of the SINP and the Leyte Gulf, and a social network that works for its rehabilitation, conservation and protection. The SGP5 project initiatives in this part of Samar, helped lay the foundation for wider and unified biodiversity and sustainable development vision, cooperation and programs by and among stakeholders.

⁶ A7 for ICZM is an inter-local cooperation of seven municipalities in the province of Eastern Samar envisioned itself to empower coastal communities and productive coastal zone sustaining coastal fisheries and livelihood of the people in the member municipalities.

5. The Nueva Vizcaya Landscape

Three projects in Nueva Vizcaya, which is part of the Sierra Madre Mountain Range showcased conservation efforts in the Palali-Mamparang Mountain Range (PMMR) and the adjacent mountains of Sta. Fe, ancestral domain of the Ikalahan Indigenous Cultural Community. These are important areas connecting the high biodiversity corridors of the Sierra Madre and Cordillera Mountain Ranges, thus, providing habitat and mobility corridors for wildlife.

FRENDS facilitated the establishment of a provincial local conservation area (PLCA) covering the municipalities of Quezon, Bayombong, Bambang, and Kasibu, while KEF worked towards strengthening community resource management efforts in their ICCAs in Sta. Fe. For its part, PRRM provided capability building to strengthen the social network.

FRENDS worked closely with the barangay, municipal, and provincial governments of Nueva Vizcaya, resulting in the issuance of Provincial Ordinance No. 2017-138, declaring 26,116.57 hectares of the Palali Mamparang Mountain Range as Local Conservation Area for Biodiversity Conservation. The ordinance also provided for an annual operations budget of PhP6 Million. A management plan was developed and adopted, and created the multi-sectoral PMMR LCA Management Council. To complement the PLCA, three barangays (Abian, Abinganan, and Mabuslo) in the municipality of Bambang declared their own Source Water Protection Areas (SWPA) to protect their watersheds.

FRENDS also organized and strengthened 22 people's organizations, established Bantay Kalikasan groups and trained 160 individuals on the LAWIN forest and biodiversity protection system, and established 288 agroforestry farms located in the declared production/multiple use zone of the PMMR-LCA. Aside from agroforestry, biodiversity-friendly livelihoods, such as livestock and poultry raising, mushroom production and organic vegetable farming and processing were also started.

The KEF support from SGP5 was for the establishment and delineation of three ICCAs (Bantay Lakay, Akbob and the Golgolon wildlife sanctuaries) as well as some livelihood projects.

PRRM provided organizational development and management capability trainings, organic farming technology training, and promotion of Participatory Guarantee System (PGS) which also trained farmers to become Organic Farm/Products Monitors, Validators and Guarantors.

SGP5 projects laid down the foundation for several landscapes and seascapes. Legal declarations were secured through local ordinances, resolutions and certifications. Management plans were formulated and adopted, and management structures put in place. Many communities were organized and their capabilities and capacities enhanced. Partnerships were forged among major stakeholders, and people's livelihood opportunities were created. Though they have gained certain levels of functionality as landscapes/seascapes, there is still the challenge of ensuring the sustainability, institutionalization, and scaling up of these formations.

Rating:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not achieved
<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially achieved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fully achieved

Outcome 3 - Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products produced and marketed by 30 communities

Output 3.1 - 30 communities producing and marketing biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry, and ecotourism products.

Forty-one grantees partnered with 141 People's Organizations implemented projects that produced and marketed alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products, directly and indirectly benefitting 17,217 individuals of which 9,580 or 55.64% are men, and 7,637 or 44.4% are women.⁷ Most of these projects were: agroforestry, handicraft/rattan, seaweeds farming, cashew, abaca farming and processing to abaca fiber, growing of organic rice and vegetables, rice-duck/eggs, crab fattening, coffee, cacao production and processing, roselle production and processing, wild fruit processing, swine and poultry raising, ecotourism, commercial nursery of indigenous tree and mangrove species, gathering and trading and honey, harvesting of almaciga resin, and coco sugar production and trading.

The projects also saw the beneficiaries in various levels of the value chain, bearing out various business models. Some were into production of raw materials, such as in the case of KEF's mushroom production, the almaciga resin business of the NTFP-EP, and the mud crab grow out of project of PAKIBA. In the case of SPPI, its project was able to establish a consolidation system for their seaweeds, mostly with women as consolidators at the community level. This was also the case in EVPRD's abaca project, which developed CEFA as community consolidator of the abaca fiber produced by community members. In the case of IDEAS, the organization developed new products (e.g., rice beverage with turmeric) with community products as ingredients, and then, processed, packaged and marketed them. CFI, meanwhile, consolidated, packaged and marketed the finished products of their community partners albeit imposing quality standards. The same is true in the case of Tanim Kalikasan's cacao growing and chocolate processing project in Dolores, Quezon. In addition, Tanim Kalikasan expanded the value chain by passing on the business of packaging to other community members. Coconut farmers were asked to produce shaved/cleaned coconut shells to hold the chocolate tablets (tablea). This is similar to the NAC project, where the rice duck eggs produced by its partner rice farmer were passed on to a women's group, which processed them into salted eggs. In the case of PAKIBA, it is the PO itself that does the processing, packaging and marketing of their fish products. In Magsaysay, Palawan, the partner POs of the PSU-CLRG produced, consolidated, processed, packaged and marketed their cashew products. The SMMFPC planted indigenous tree seedlings, which it marketed to the public, including the protected area management. Thereafter, its members and other community members were engaged to plant the trees, thus, giving monetary benefits to both their organization and individual families.

Notable also are the ecotourism projects whose products consisted of personal and ecosystem services. SABWELL, a partner of SSFMPC, upgraded their skills with the help of the government's Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) for its members

⁷ See Annex 5, for the List of Grantees, partner CBOs and Type of BDFEs implemented.

to be able to offer quality massage to visitors of PPSRNP. The SMBTGAI, PCC and their partner POs offer tours of the areas they protect.

Although not directly business enterprises nor funded as livelihood projects, some emerging trends with regard enterprise building are observable. The SSFMPC, a cooperative of boat operators that ferry tourists to the Underground River, built a prototype of a fiberglass boat that shall serve as model for its members as they transition from sailing wooden hulled boats. The 80 or so ferry boat operators in the area have admitted to poaching timber from the PPSRNP to build their boats. The wooden hulls are replaced every five years, thus, causing a lot of destruction in the forest stands of the national park. What was also interesting there was that SSFMPC had some of its members trained in fiberglass boat building, thus, opening up opportunities for the organization and its members to engage in this burgeoning industry. In Northern Samar, the NGOs grantees (CERD, EVPRD, NAC and SPPI) bonded together to lobby provincial and municipal governments for policy and budget reforms. They also helped some of them to do their Disaster Risk and Management Assessments as well as their Local Climate Change Adaptation Plan, which are mandated by the law. Realizing their combined expertise, other LGUs in the province started to engage their services. They have recently incorporated to enable them to engage as a single entity. BLAFI's cultural training as a component of biodiversity conservation was recently accredited by TESDA as a course. This gives BLAFI the opportunity to market the training for certification of local artists and community workers. DALUHAY is also in talks with TESDA for the accreditation of its training course for community-based natural resource managers.

For branding and for consistency with existing policy, SGP5 used the term Biodiversity-Friendly Enterprises (BDFE) to refer to these biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry, and ecotourism initiatives. BDFE was coined by the Biodiversity Partnerships Project (BPP), an earlier GEF-funded project and also implemented by the UNDP and the DENR. Adopting the BDFE concept, DENR Technical Bulletin 2017-11 defined BDFE as “economic activities and practices of micro-, small-, and medium-enterprises, Local Government Units (LGUs) and People’s Organizations (POs) that promote the sustainable use of biological resources, create wealth and value, and open opportunities for the equitable sharing of benefits among stakeholders.”

By its above-cited definition, however, BDFE is not merely a brand; neither is it a traditional business enterprise. It has three imposing components, namely, ecosystems, economics and equity, the achievement or satisfaction of which is simply challenging. The BPP enumerated several criteria with corresponding points for "being BDFE". Certain that none of the project proponents would be able to satisfy all the criteria, SGP5 converted the point system into a checklist as guide for developing the livelihood projects of the grantees. SGP5, therefore, saw BDFE as a process, a journey, that community organizations will have to take time and build capital on before towards its achievement.

Towards the end of the operational phase, it was already apparent that a good number of the SGP5-supported projects were ready to scale up. Considering, however, the definition of BDFE, scaling up should mean not only expanding their businesses but also advancing their journey towards becoming more BDFEs. For these two main purposes, the CPMU engaged the services of Ms. Rina Maria P. Rosales to assist select grantees in doing their business plans. Through on-site training-workshops conducted by said consultants, 28 grantees were trained in business planning, with 24 completing their business plans. An important aspect of this engagement was the formulation and pilot-testing of the

Biodiversity Enterprise Assessment Tool (BEAT), which measured the level of compliance of the community enterprises with BDFE standards as an input to their business plans. The result of the assessment showed that many of these projects started out as mere incentives for communities to participate in biodiversity conservation. They were largely viewed as opportunities to generate income through the use of natural resources and/or ecosystem services. In the process, however, these communities have to realize that including ecology and equity in the equation is necessary to ensure the flourishing and sustainability of these livelihood projects. Considering these three criteria must ultimately make good business sense. Most of the livelihood projects still have a long way to go before they can be considered BDFEs, as it is defined by BMB in Technical Bulletin 2018-11. This finding actually validated the initial impression of the CPMU on BDFE criteria.

In addition, a grant was awarded the Institute for Social Entrepreneurship in Asia (ISEA), an academe-based NGO that has a long track record in social enterprise development around Southeast Asia. ISEA had developed its tool, Benchmarks for Transformational Partnerships and Women’s Economic Empowerment in Agricultural Value Chains (BTP-WEE AVC), and applied it to agriculture-based social enterprises. The objective was to expand the applicability of the tool to social enterprises in the context of biodiversity conservation as a tool for scaling up these enterprises. A three-day training on social enterprises was conducted for 10 grantees with potential for BDFE scaling-up. A selection process was also done to choose a model for scaling up planning. Finally, the abaca sub-sector showed the highest potential and was assisted by ISEA for the scaling up. With the scaling up, CEFA is envisioned to be transformed into a municipal or provincial marketing organization or cooperative to handle the marketing needs of its members. It can assume the trader’s role, and to some extent, the consolidator’s role in Mondragon or in Northern Samar. A one-year action plan was prepared by EVPRD and CEFA upon the guidance of ISEA. A Php3M grant was awarded by ISEA to EVPRD and CEFA to jumpstart the implementation of the action plan.

A Handbook on BDFE entitled: “*Makakalikasang Negosyo*” was produced and published by SGP5 in 2017, and a Resource Book on: “*Scaling Up Biodiversity-Friendly Enterprises*” will be published in 2020.

Rating:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not achieved
<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially achieved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fully achieved

Outcome 4- Training mechanisms developed for peer-to-peer learning.

Output 4.1- at least 4,000 community-level resource users and managers are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools

A total of 9,555 participants coming from project staff, partner communities and other stakeholders were trained on various aspects of SGP5 work in attempts to standardize approaches. This figure accounts for 238.87% of the total target of 4,000 community-level resource users and managers.

To enhance peer-to-peer learning, cross-cutting trainings were designed through the participation of grantees who have recognized expertise in specific fields of work. With help from consultants, the inputs of the local grantees were incorporated in the training modules. These modules were piloted in Trainings of Trainers (TOT) in Community-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (CBMES) framework,

Ecosystem Valuation, Basic Orientation on BDFE, Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) and Knowledge Management. A total of 88 trainers were produced by the TOTs who, in turn, rolled out the trainings in their respective sites. The training handbooks were published and distributed to the grantees and other stakeholders who might find them useful. More copies were retained for use of future SGP grantees.

In addition, and as already mentioned in Outcome 3.1 above, capability-building trainings in scaling up BDFEs were conducted by ISEA and Ms. Rina Maria Rosales.

Peer-to-peer learning was also done through conferences where grantees and other stakeholders shared their experiences and insights from the implementation of their projects. These conferences also gave occasion for the grantees to identify and agree on common issues and advocacy points. Each site hub conducted two annual conferences each, making a total of eight site-based conferences. Meanwhile, the CPMU spearheaded the conduct of the First National Biodiversity Congress in May 2017, with support from DENR, other national government agencies, biodiversity-oriented projects of UNDP and other institutions as well as other funding agencies. In July 2018, the CPMU conducted the final SGP5 National Conference with the theme "Realizing Stronger Community-Based Biodiversity Conservation". All these conferences were dominated by presentations from SGP5 grantees discussing various aspects of their project implementation experiences.

The social media, specifically Facebook, was also used for peer-to-peer learning and information exchange. The CPMU started the SGP5 official Facebook page at the inception of the operational phase. This became the platform for announcements and news. Eventually, as the grantees increased in number and as they got to know each other, they, by their own volition, created another Facebook page they called SGP5 Grantees. They used this page for information exchange and for announcing the progress of their project implementation as well as for advancing their advocacies. These pages remain active even after the closure of the operational phase and may be used by the succeeding phase.

It also behooves to note that the CPMU started a platform for dialogue between Participatory Guarantee System (PGS)-Pilipinas, CSOs and the DENR-BMB to jumpstart policy discussions on BDFE certification, advancing the idea that community-based certification or guaranty system should be an important policy consideration specially because existing government certification systems are unaffordable and/or inaccessible to very small community-based enterprises. In addition, SGP5 also supported the GEF-CSO Network Consultation workshops to help ensure that CSOs, most specially the SGP5 partners, can have a voice in the governance of GEF funds in the Philippines. SGP5 was also instrumental in integrating NGO contributions to the 6th National Report (6NR) to Aichi Targets particularly in Regions 8 (Samar), 4-B (Palawan), and in Regions 2, 3 and 4-A (Sierra Madre).

The CPMU also maintained a website (www.sgp.org.ph) for information dissemination. It contains facts and figures about SGP as well as photographs and news items on SGP5 implementation. The website remains active and will still be available for use by the succeeding

operational phase. The CPMU temporarily put it under the care of the DENR-BMB while waiting for the next phase.

Several knowledge products were also produced by the CPMU not only for use by SGP5 and future OP grantees, but also for other stakeholders to hopefully influence practice and policy.

Output 4.2 - Conservation and sustainable use approaches of the projects are replicated in at least 20 new grants by year 4

Several of the project grantees have submitted project proposal for replication projects, as of this writing some of them have already received advice from their donor funder approving their proposals. In addition, the CPMU is working with grantees, the UNDP CO and the Biodiversity Management Bureau to support grantees in accessing funds for replication and expansion of SGP initiatives. By the end of the project, 23 replication and scaling up projects have been granted funds:

1. NAC was granted an additional PHP800,000 by SGP5 to replicate the experience by adding 20 more farmer cooperators, and to scale up its initiative by starting to produce organic feeds for rice ducks
2. NAC was also awarded PHP1 Million for the duck rice project by the Philippine Rural Development Program, funded by the World Bank and implemented by the Department of Agriculture
3. EVPRD's partner, CEFA, has been granted PHP3 Million for Scaling Up Abaca Production using the New Zealand Aid fund, which was coursed through the UNDP CO in the Philippines
4. DALUHAY's scaling up project, entitled "Initiating a Network of Indigenous Communities Conserved Areas in the Central Sierra Madre", has been granted funds by the Forest Foundation Philippines (FFP)
5. The ridge-to-river project of SERD in Quirino Provinces in being scaled up through a grant from FFP
6. SERD also got additional fund from FFP for the improvement of arboretum in CBFM area
7. FFP is also funding the scaling up and expansion of PCC in the environs of the PSSRNP in Palawan
8. CFFQI's scaling up project for capability building for POs who are CBFM holders is being funded by FFP
9. FFP is also funding the furtherance of SSMNA's landscape planning process in the Sierra Madre Mountain Range
10. SPPI and the Samar Hub was also awarded grant by FF for the Pambujan Watershed Assessment
11. C3's expansion project, mangrove management in Calamianes Group of Islands in Palawan, is also being funded by FFP
12. IDEAS's stakeholders' consultation for the Victoria-Anepahan Mountain Range is also funded by the FFP
13. The Samdhana Institute's "Rapid Assessment of Mangrove Sites within Tagbanua Ancestral Domains to Develop a Full Project Proposal for Mangrove Rehabilitation and Conservation in Calamian Group of Islands, Northern Palawan" is also funded by FFP
14. PKM-AVPP's "Community Empowerment through Protection and Restoration of the Environment towards Sustainable Livelihood" is also being funded by FFP
15. The Provincial Government of Nueva Vizcaya has allocated an annual operation budget of Php 6 Million to scale up the work of FREEDS in the Mt. Palali-Mamparang Range Locally Conserved Areas
16. PPA's permaculture project in Divilacan, Isabela is being replicated in Ilagan, Isabela

17. CFI's livelihood projects in the Calamianes in Palawan is being continued through funding from the USAID-funded FishRight Project
18. Kauswagan san Pangabuhingan Kapalibutanm, Inc., a PO partner of CERD and SPPI in the Biri LaRoSa Protected Landscape and Seascape in Northern Samar has been awarded a grant by the DENR under the Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Management Program (CMEMP) to replicate the seaweed farming technology espoused by SPPI under SGP5
19. Similarly, the Magsaysay Fisherfolk Association, also a PO partner of CERD and SPPI, has been awarded a grant by CEMEMP for the same purpose
20. Also awarded a grant for the same purpose was the Jamoog Farmer and Forest Livelihood Association, another PO partner of CERD and SPPI
21. CMEMP also awarded a grant to the Taytay Abante Kababayin-an Association, a PO partner of GDFI in Eastern Samar, to replicate good MPA management within the Guiuan Marine Resource Protected Landscape and Seascape
22. Also awarded a grant by CMEMP was An Samahan Bantay Dagat ng SUNGUBA han Nagkahirusa, another PO partner of GDFI
23. A grant was given by the Municipal Government of Roxas, Palawan to PCART to expand its SGP5 initiative in Barbacan River

Output 4.3 - 50% increase in amount of co-funding for Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3

A total of **PhP 144,721,847.44** was delivered by partners out of **PhP 133,067,772.40** commitment fund for SGP-5 co-financing. These figures show that grantees and partners did not only complied with the required 1:1 counterpart ratio but has exceeded 8.7%. These counterparts came from grantees, community partners, LGUs, DENR, academic institutions and other stakeholders in their project sites, in the forms of cash, in-kind and services.

Output 4.4 - Community-based partnership initiatives for GEF-SGP launched by at least 4 LGUs by end of Year 4

A total of nine partnership initiatives for GEF-SGP projects were launched by LGUs and SGP5 grantees, along with other stakeholders that include the private sector, other national government agencies, other NGOs and academic institutions. These are the following:

1. The multi-sectoral agreement initiated by the Provincial Government of Nueva Vizcaya and FREEDS for the management of the Palali-Mamparang Mountain Range as a network of Locally Conserved Areas that became the basis of a Provincial Ordinance providing for the management system for the area, and an annual budget of at least PHP6 Million
2. Agreement between PNNI and the Municipal Government of Rizal, Palawan for the establishment and management of the Rizal Crocodile Sanctuary
3. Agreement between the Municipal Government of General Nakar, Quezon Province with Tanim Kalikasanm, Tanggol Kalikasan, TCD and other NGOs to manage a 15,000+ ha landscape
4. Agreement between the Municipal Government of Busuanga, Palwan with PBCFI and C3 for the establishment and management of the Dugong Sanctuary

5. Agreement between the Barangay Council of Ibabang Palale in Tayabas, Quezon and Tanim Kalikasan for the establishment and management of Dagatan Lake as a critical habitat
6. Agreement between the Municipal Government of Lawaan, Eastern Samar with GDFI, the UP Visayas Tacloban campus and SINP PAMB for the rehabilitation, protection and management of Bolusao watershed
7. Agreement between the A7 municipalities of Eastern Samar and GDFI to strengthen and re-affirm the ICZM Plan for the municipal waters within Leyte Gulf
8. Agreement between the City Government of Puerto Princesa, the barangay councils of Binduyana nd Babuyan and PCC for the management and development of declared LCA in Binduyan (Olanguan Waterfalls) and Babuyan (twin sandbar)
9. Agreement between the Municipal Government of Mondragon, Northern Samar and the consortium of SGP grantees in Northern Samar (CERD, SPPI, NAC, EVPRD, aka Samar Biodiversity Conservation Network) for the development of municipal Environment Code
10. Municipal Ordinance enacted by the Municipal Government of Can-avid, Western Samar establishing the MPA in the municipality, and giving its management to the CFA as well as allocating funds for law enforcement
11. Municipal Ordinance enacted by the Municipal Government of San Luis, Aurora establishing the MPA Network covering the municipal waters
12. Expansion fund given by the Municipal Government of Roxas, Palawan to PCART

Overall, SGP5's work in capacitating grantees and partner communities was rated satisfactory by an external evaluator. Series of peer-to-peer learning platforms could be gleaned from the list of trainings attached.

Rating:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not achieved
<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially achieved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fully achieved

Outcome 5. Increased capacity of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends.

Output 5.1 - SGP Philippines M&E framework is established

During the national and site-based inception workshops, SGP5 stakeholders reviewed the indicators of SGP5 as stated in the Project Document, particularly the Project Results Framework (PRF). Taking off from the discussions in the inception workshops, the CPMU recommended changes in the indicators, which were adopted by the NSC, endorsed by the CPMT, and eventually approved by the GEF, as shown in the following table:

Outcomes	Original Indicators (PRF)	Changes	Reasons
1	At least 10 community management or co-	At least 10 communities exhibit	Focus should be on the number of communities that innovate.

	management models established and operational.	management or co-management models of protected areas	
	(1) At least 20 community PA established or enhanced; (2) encompassing 100,000 ha.	At least 10 community-managed protected or conservation areas established or enhanced encompassing at least 100,000 hectares	The target 20 might be too big as what is important is the size of the area covered. Protected areas are often perceived as no-touch zones, which does not happen in reality. Emphasis should be put on the sustainable management of KBAs to ensure both economic and ecological benefits to communities.
	1,000 ha of mangrove rehabilitated or protected within one or more PAs.	1,000 hectares of mangrove and/or seagrass areas within the 100,000 ha community-managed protected or conserved areas are rehabilitated or protected	Mangroves are not the only habitats important in coastal areas. A habitat that needs attention is seagrass beds.
2	400,000 ha under improved community “mainstreamed” management within PLS, reducing threats to BD from slash and burn farming; over-harvesting of timber, and destructive fishing.	400,000 hectares of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management arrangements, mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives, thereby reducing threats to biodiversity	The original statement is convoluted, and the term "mainstreamed" is unclear. The clause “from slash and burn farming; over-harvesting of timber, and destructive fishing” is limiting considering the many problems attending biodiversity in various communities.
	40 community-based land use plans or Ancestral Domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations by end of project.	At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services	There is no difference between the two items. “TEV” is removed as it is just one of the approaches for valuation and is too expensive. The number is rationalized considering the funding capacity of SGP-5.

	TEV or similar ecosystem valuation reports being used by at least 20 communities in the development of ADSPs (<i>should be ADSDPPs</i>) or other community land-use plans.	valuations.	“Local land-use plans” is preferred because it is more encompassing.
3	30 community-level regulations or enactments for biodiversity-friendly production in key sectors.	30 communities produce and market biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products.	The intent is that communities produce and market products, thus, should be stated as such.
4	Replication of conservation and sustainable use approaches in at least 30 new grants by year 4	Conservation and sustainable use approaches of the projects are replicated in at least 20 new grants by year 4	The original target of 30 replication projects is too ambitious.
5	At least 80 community groups grantees participate in training; Improvement of 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E	SGP Philippines M&E framework is established All project grantees, except Planning Grant recipients, are trained on GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, improving 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E At least 80% of projects, except Planning Grants, adopt/adapt and implement GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, and improve on the quality and accuracy of project monitoring reports, as assessed by progress reports	The elements of the articulations in the Project Document are merely broken down in the restatements.

Noting that the indicators are all quantitative, the CPMU engaged the services of a consultant to help identify qualitative indicators to enable the grantees and the programme to tell stories of change. After all, SGP is about achieving or effecting change in the lives of communities. In December 2015, a training of trainers (TOT) for the infusion of qualitative indicators was conducted. The TOT piloted the framework prepared by the consultant. Around five trainers from each priority site attended the training. Thereafter, these trainers echoed the framework to all the grantees in their respective sites, through the site hubs.

In late 2017, when the projects were about to end, the CPMU and the RP again evaluated the progress reports of the grantees. It was realized that many grantees were not telling their stories of change. The CPMU observed that because the items in the progress report template needed to elicit narratives rather than synoptic answers. In response, the CPMU redesigned the template for the Terminal Report, with items that allowed the grantees to expound on the changes their projects were able to effect, the lessons learned from their implementation experience and their way forward. The template was sent to each grantee all of whom tailored their Terminal Reports according to said template.

Output 5.2 - All project grantees, except Planning Grant recipients, are trained on GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, improving 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E

All project grantees that implemented site-based projects (100%) were trained on the SGP-5 M&E framework and protocols.

In December 2015, the CPMU conducted a training of trainers (TOT) on the M&E framework. Each of the hubs sent five trainers from their sites, who subsequently rolled out the training to all SGP5 grantees in their respective sites. Thereupon, the RP noted much improvement in the progress reports of the grantees.

Output 5.3 - at least 80% of projects, except Planning Grants, adopt/adapt and implement GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, and improve on the quality and accuracy of project monitoring reports, as assessed by progress reports

All site-based projects adopted/adapted and implemented the SGP5 M&E framework, especially the Terminal Report template, thus, allowing them to tell their stories in the best way they could. The improvement on the quality and accuracy of the reports were very evident.

Rating:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not achieved
<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially achieved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fully achieved

Outcome 6 and 7. Project Management Unit

Project Management Organization. SGP5 was managed in accordance with the organizational structure provided in the Project Document.

The Country Programme Manager (CPM) was hired by UNDP in October 2013, which also signaled the institution of the **Country Programme Management Unit** (CPMU). The rest of the staff (Project Associate and Administrative and Finance Assistant) were hired in January 2014. Thus, by January 2014, the CPMU was already established and functioning.

The first **National Steering Committee** (NSC) Meeting was held in December 2013. Throughout the lifetime of the operational phase, the NSC was able to hold 15 meetings. As it was its mandate, the NSC decided on policy matters, the Annual Work and Financial Plans and their revisions, and the approval of project proposals for grants. While most of the NSC decisions were made during personal meetings, the difficulty of obtaining quorums, the members of the NSC would make some decisions by way of ad referendum online, when necessary.

It was also the NSC that approved the Terms of Reference of the **Responsible Party** (RP) and gave the green light for the search. The RP, as provided by the Project Document, was an NGO that would act as grants manager for SGP5. Unfortunately, the RP was not identified by the Project Document, thus, the selection had to go through the procurement process of the UNDP CO, which took around six months to do mainly due to the small turn out of bidders (there was failure of bidding in the first attempt) and the requirement to seek the approval of the UNDP Regional Office in Bangkok due to the contract amount. The RP, the Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE), was engaged only towards the end of the third quarter of 2014.

It was part of the mandate of the RP to convene the **Project Technical Review Committee** (PTRC), a body of technical experts that made the technical evaluation and recommended the approval of project proposals to the NSC.

Equipment and Assets. There were two general sets of equipment and assets acquired under the operational phase. The first set comprised those that were procured by/for the CPMU. All these were transferred to the IP by donation (with UNDP as donor) at the end of the project.

The other set of equipment and assets were those acquired by the grantees. The grant agreements provided that all assets and equipment acquired using grant funds were owned by UNDP unless and until transferred by the latter to the ownership of the grantees. Similarly, all these properties had been transferred by UNDP to the ownership of the grantees by the end of the operational phase.

Reports. The CPMU was charged with preparing and submitting all reports required by GEF, the CPMT in UNDP - New York, UNDP CO and the DENR. All such reports were submitted. In addition to the regular reports submitted to the UNDP CO, the CPMU also submitted the annual Quality Assurance Assessment.

Audits. The IP/CPMU underwent three Spot Checks and three Performance Audits. All Spot Checks were conducted by Manila Consulting, and all Performance Audits were conducted by the Commission on Audit as commissioned by the UNDP CO. Discussions on these audits are found in Item 4 of this report.

Rating:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not achieved
<input type="checkbox"/>	Partially achieved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fully achieved

2. RESULTS AND RESOURCES

According to the Project Document, SGP-5 should have started on 01 June 2013 and ended on 30 July 2017. However, there were snags in project implementation mainly caused by: (1) delay in

project inception by almost six months; (2) delay in selection of Responsible Party for another six months; and, (3) slow process of Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) Process of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) in ancestral domain area. Seeing the implications of those challenges, the NSC, in its 9th Meeting on 06 December 2016, agreed to seek an 18-month extension of the operational phase. This was eventually approved by the GEF, thus, extending SGP-5 until 31 December 2018. This resulted in NSC's approval of an extension of SGP-5 termination from July 2017 to December 30, 2018 during the 12th NSC Meeting held on 06 December 2016. It should be noted that most of the grantees were only able to complete their projects in mid-2018 and submit their terminal reports during the last quarter of 2018. Thus, SGP-5 ended on the last day of 2018. The year 2019 was spent for performance audit and financial closure activities.

Summary Of Expenditures As Of December 2019

Outcome	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1		94,941.68	147,713.79	543,745.53	559,448.12	129,504.31	-7,110.02	1,468,243.41
2		53,932.34	145,138.20	438,863.73	305,487.34	158,294.44	2,585.73	1,104,301.78
3		11,813.52	3,094.37	380,317.29	294,239.04	954.49	-1,337.23	689,081.48
4		23,765.30	47,326.75	156,606.02	161,271.90	217,044.88	19,248.06	625,262.91
5 & 6		6,275.80	7,146.05	17,881.15	62,047.54	46,962.14	61,450.63	201,763.31
7	25,056.14	75,510.99	71,575.44	88,192.38	84,477.56	108,912.73	2,494.15	456,219.39
Total	25,056.14	266,239.63	421,994.60	1,625,606.10	1,466,971.50	661,672.99	77,331.32	4,544,872.28
GEF SGP-5		4,583,333.00						
Total Expenditure as of December 31, 2019		4,544,872.28 or 99%						
Balance		37,096.75 or 1%						

The following table shows the

Outputs and indicators	Key activities planned during the reporting period	Budget	Expenditures	Results	Reasons for deviations, if any
<i>(as per the signed Annual Work Plans)</i>	<i>(as per ProDoc or signed Annual Work Plans)</i>	<i>(as per ProDoc or signed Annual Work Plans)</i>	<i>(The final expenditure figures should match the final CDR)</i>	<i>(towards achieving outputs and targets achieved against indicators)</i>	
Outcome 1. Effective models for community-based governance of protected areas are demonstrated					
Baseline: zero Output 1.1 At least 10 communities exhibit	1. Consultation meetings and project development workshops orientation	US\$1,640,000	US\$1,468,243.41	16 models exhibited	

Outputs and indicators	Key activities planned during the reporting period	Budget	Expenditures	Results	Reasons for deviations, if any
management or co-management models of protected areas	2. Development of basic data sets for the benchmarking activity				
Baseline: zero Output 1.2 At least 10 community-managed protected or conservation areas established or enhanced encompassing at least 100,000 hectares	3. Rapid participatory assessment of the sites 4. Grant making			134,863 hectares of community managed protected areas	
Baseline: zero Output 1.3 40% increase on average in relevant dimensions of management effectiveness of target PAs				12 PAs have recorded more than 40% increase in post METT assessment using relevant dimensions	
Baseline: zero Output 1.4 1,000 hectares of mangrove and/or seagrass areas within the 100,000 ha community-managed protected or conserved areas are rehabilitated or protected				8,812 ha of the 134,863 ha community - managed protected areas are mangroves and seagrass beds	
Outcome 2. Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives					
Baseline: zero Output 2.1 400,000 hectares	1. Consultation meetings and project development	US\$1,813,333	US\$1,104,301.78	680,644.05 hectares of production land/seascapes	

Outputs and indicators	Key activities planned during the reporting period	Budget	Expenditures	Results	Reasons for deviations, if any
of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management arrangements.	workshops orientation 2. Development of basic data sets for the benchmarking activity 3. Rapid participatory assessment of the sites 4. Grant making			under community management or co-management arrangements	
Baseline: zero Output 2.2 At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.				38 land use plans crafted	
Outcome 3: Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products produced and marketed by 30 communities					
Baseline: zero Activity 3.1 30 communities' produce and market biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products.	1. Consultation meetings 2. Orientation briefings on the SGP5 programme framework 3. Project development workshops 4. Grant making	US\$480,000	US\$689,081.48	41 grantees, with their 141 community-based organization partners, produced and marketed biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products, benefitting 17,217 individuals, with 7,637 women and 9,580 men.	Most of the projects involved BDFE initiatives; towards the end of the operational phase, the CPMU, upn the mandate of the NSC, helped select grantees to prepare business plans as part of their exit strategies
Outcome 4: Training mechanisms developed for peer-to-peer learning					
Baseline: zero Activity 4.1 At least 4,000 community-level resource users	1. Training development 2. Conduct of ToTs 3. Roll out of trainings 4. Production and	No budget	US\$625,262.91	9,555 88 community-level resource users and managers individuals were	Upon the mandate of the NSC, the CPMU conducted trainings and

Outputs and indicators	Key activities planned during the reporting period	Budget	Expenditures	Results	Reasons for deviations, if any
<p>and managers are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.</p>	<p>distribution of Knowledge Products</p>			<p>trained and used the skills as part of the implementation of their projects. In addition, the CPMU was able to produce 88 trainers through trainings of trainers (TOT) conducted in Community-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (CBMES), Resource Valuation, Social Enterprise and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). The trainers were the ones who rolled out the site-based trainings in their respective hubs/sites.</p>	<p>produce Knowledge Products that could not be done through grants</p>
<p>Baseline: zero</p> <p>Activity 4.2 Conservation and sustainable use approaches of the projects are replicated in at least 20 new grants by year 4</p>				<p>23 replication projects have been completed or are being implemented. Several project grantees submitted proposals and gained approval, to other government and non-government funding institutions (FFP, CMEMP,</p>	

Outputs and indicators	Key activities planned during the reporting period	Budget	Expenditures	Results	Reasons for deviations, if any
				etc.) for project replication.	
Baseline: zero Activity 4.3 50% increase in amount of co-funding for Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3				PhP 144,721,847.44 was delivered by partners out of 133,067.772.40 commitment.	
Outcomes 5 & 6. Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environment trends					
Baseline: Zero SGP Philippines M&E framework is established	1. M&E Framework development 2. Conduct of ToT 3. Roll out of training 4. Monitoring of progress reports	US\$250,000	US\$201,763.31	M&E framework was completed	
All project grantees, except Planning Grant recipients, are trained on GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, improving 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E				ToT conducted with 25 trainers trained Trainers rolled out M&E training in sites with all grantees trained. RP reported improvement in reports by all grantees.	
At least 80% of projects, except Planning Grants, adopt/adapt and implement GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, and improve on the quality and accuracy of project monitoring reports, as					M&E framework adopted by all projects, except Planning Grants

Outputs and indicators	Key activities planned during the reporting period	Budget	Expenditures	Results	Reasons for deviations, if any
assessed by progress reports					
Outcome 7 Project Management					
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Setting up of PMU 2. Conduct of Inception Workshops 3. Selection of RP 4. Procurement of necessary equipment 5. Convening of NSC meetings 6. Conduct of Spot Checks 7. Conduct of HACT Audits 	US\$400,000	US\$456,219.39	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CPMU operational by year 1 2. 1 national and 4 site-level inception workshops conducted 3. Selection of RP completed in year 2014 4. All necessary equipment procured 5. 15 NSC Meetings held 6. Two Spot Checks done 7. Three HACT Audits done 	<p>Spot Checks of 2018 Extension</p> <p>2017 and 2018 HACT Audits were charged to this 33,577.24</p> <p>Travels for inventories, 18,000 in 2018</p> <p>Salaries for additional staff for closing activities, which included, inventories and transfer of assets and equipment, digitization of files, etc.</p>
Over-all Total		US\$4,583,333.00	US\$4,544,872.28		Total Expenditures represent 99% of Overall Budget

3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE – IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES:

3.1. Inadequacy in capabilities

The Project Document already identified inadequacy in capabilities and poor access to training in the project's problematique. It was well therefore that there was Outcome 4 for capability-building. The need for capability-building became very emphasized during the implementation.

Despite the ready recognition of the need for capability-building, the Project Document itself did not allocate budget for Outcome 4. Apparently, the expectation was that this area of work will be covered by grants. However, there were no proponents that applied for funding to conduct cross-cutting training. A pro-active search done by the CPMU also bore no results as there is a dearth of CSOs that specialize in training. Thus, it was necessary that the CPMU developed and conducted the trainings. To do that, the NSC had to rationalize the budget to allocate funds for Outcome 4. Foremost of these inadequacies are those that would address the capabilities needed to fulfill the target outputs of the components, namely: Community-Based Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation Systems (CBMES), a basic skill under Outcome 1; Ecosystems Valuation, a skill needed to pursue Outcome 2; Biodiversity-Friendly Enterprises, in pursuit of Outcome 3; and, Knowledge Management, for Outcome 4.

M&E and reporting were however the areas that posed the greater challenge. It was in these areas where the CPMU and the RP as well as the site hubs did a lot of handholding, especially to many POs. Apparently, the POs were not that skilled in monitoring the progress of their projects despite the very specific indicators identified in their respective project documents. Because of this difficulty, many grantees had problematic reports, which the RP had to return for revisions, because the accomplishments were not clearly stated in their progress reports. This was compounded by the difficulty of many grantees to express themselves in written form whether in English or any Filipino language. This limited their ability to tell their stories about the significant changes their projects were making in the lives of their beneficiaries and in their ecosystems. To remedy this, the CPMU further simplified the template of the Terminal Report and couple that with workshops, which proved helpful.

3.2. Achieving synergies in land/seascapes

SGP5 was the first time that SGP in the Philippines did the land/seascape approach. While not a new strategy, land/seascape approaches were done only by big ticket projects that engaged small NGOs and POs to help them pursue their set agenda. The SGP5 approach was the reverse. Small projects were supposed to achieve synergy so as to serve a land/seascape agenda that they would set. It took a series of dialogues and workshops to convince and enable the grantees to look beyond their projects and see them as part of a community of initiatives that make up their land/seascapes.

3.3. Time limitations

Considering that usual SGP5 projects only had maximum grants of USD50,000 (except for the few Strategic Grants that received a maximum of USD150,000), SGP-5 supported projects had little time to achieve their targets. SGP5 projects' experience showed that the process in establishing protected area is a long and tedious process. Most of the local legislation issuances declaring the areas as protected areas were secured towards the end of two years of implementation yet, prompting many grantees to ask for no cost project extensions. The

effectiveness of the management bodies that were put in place could not yet be ascertained within the short lifetime of the projects. There is need to ensure the continuity of these initiatives to show impacts and move towards sustainability.

Specific issues and constraints, recommendations and proposed actions on a per output basis are herein indicated.

Issues/constraints per output	Recommendations and proposed actions
<i>If applicable. Explores underlying factors and reasons for gaps impeding the achievement of outputs</i>	<i>Clear recommendations for the future approach to address the main challenges. Corrective measures, Responsibilities. Note any steps already taken</i>
Output 1- Effective models for community-based governance of protected areas are demonstrated	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Community indifference; poverty and lack of livelihood opportunities ii) Human intrusion, extraction of resources iii) Lack of enforcement to arrest illegal activities by community volunteers iv) Lack of coordination v) Lack of government support vi) Funding constraints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Provision of biodiversity friendly agriculture (i.e. rice-duck farming; CBST, organic farming, etc.) ii) Social fencing approach i.e. PPUR experience; LCAs' formulation and implementation of management plans; iii) Information and awareness campaigns, capacity building iv) Institutionalize partnerships through formal agreements and making civils society and community players part of LGU programs in biodiversity conservation v) Upscaling 'best practices' by securing other sources of project grants vi) Strict implementation of environmental laws and ordinances vii) Tap deputized community volunteers in enforcing laws

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> viii) Provide monitoring and enforcement functions of DENR frontline officers ix) Succeeding SGP (SGP-7) should help sustain many of the ongoing projects
Output 2 - Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives	
Constraints per Output	Recommendations and proposed actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No clear ecological interactions between different components of a landscape or seascape ii) How to connect jurisdictional and political boundaries within a landscape? iii) Issues on illegal logging, mangrove timber poaching, wildlife hunting and poaching, illegal wildlife trade, unsustainable fishery activities, by communities heavily dependent on the natural resource; iv) Unsecured tenure over the resource v) Indifference of LGUs, DENR and other stakeholders vi) Lack of funds, technical and logistical resources in managing PLS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Science-based research on ecosystems interactions within a land/seascape ii) Unified sectoral plans among LGUs and create a critical mass for a common landscape governance iii) Establish bio-fences to prevent further encroachment into the forest area; iv) Secure tenurial instruments such as CBFMA, Protected Areas Community-Based Resource Management Agreement (PACBRMA) to strengthen community/PO role in biodiversity conservation, and management of natural resources v) Work with LGU in formulating land use and sectoral plans to ensure that conservation objectives are integrated into their plans vi) Institutionalize co-management with DENR, LGU support by engaging them in meaningful activities e.g. community monitoring teams; vii) Tap resources from the above cited agencies
Output 3 - Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries & forestry products	

produced and marketed by 30 communities	
Constraints per Output	Recommendations and proposed actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Land tenurial issues in CBST sites ii. Mitigating impacts of tourism on CBST sites, lack of capacity of community to appropriately protect and manage natural resources iii. Community not well-organized and fragmented iv. BDFE Certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Resolve first any tenurial issues before starting any development ii. Conduct environmental education and awareness campaign (IEC) iii. Adopt community organizing approach revolving around BDFE that should advocate production/utilization that is compatible to conservation. iv. Sustain capacity-building partnerships with NGOs and academe, DOT, TESDA and other relevant agencies v. Fast track policy BMB guidelines on BDFE certification vi. Develop value chain development, feasibility/valuation study, marketing linkage, and policy development. vii. Assist BDFE holders in business planning viii. Forge more government and non-government support on BDFE investments to support community partners.
Output 4: Training mechanisms develop for peer-to-peer learning	
Constraints	Recommendations and proposed actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Intra/inter grantees learning platforms focused on regular updating only ii. No systematic training program at hub level iii. Lack communication plan in project designs iv. Lacking gender sensitive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide platforms for common tracking of outputs and outcomes within a landscape ii. Systematic training program at hub level based on needs assessment iii. Communication plan should be instituted at the onset of project

trainings and capacity building activities	implementation iv. Consciously convey gender sensitive and use gender-fair language in all aspects of project implementation
Output 5 - Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environment trends	
Constraints	Recommendations and proposed actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Lacking project baselines ii. Grantees experienced difficulty in M&E particularly using a result-based M&E tool iii. Slow progress on M&E tool application as most grantees needed hand holding to be able to measure metes and bounds of the project results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Evidence-based baselines as basis of tracking outputs and outcomes ii. M&E system should be thoroughly thought out in project's design stage and should allow exhaustive discussion based on no. 1 iii. Project outcomes should be regularly assessed iv. Sustained capacity enhancement in the use of result-based M&E tool
Output 7 – Project Management	
Constraints	Recommendations and proposed actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. No clear coordination between EA, IP, and CPMU j. Branding issue i.e. is the project under UNDP or DENR-BMB? k. Clarify procurement and charging protocols (IP and/or EA) l. Co-financing of the IP not factored in the project design m. Fast turn-over of PMU staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify roles and function of each to ensure smooth coordination 2. Branding issue should be clarified 3. For IP to come up with standards in computing co-financing for FASP 4. IP to include both cash and non-cash co-financing 5. Secure commitment from prospective staff to ensure that SGP implementation will not be disrupted by fast turn-over of staff

4. NIM/NGO AUDIT FINDINGS AND SPOT CHECK RECOMMENDATIONS:

Summary of Auditor's Opinion On Hact Audit

What follows is a summary of three annual HACT Audit results from 2016 to 2018 indicating financial report, amount audited, total amount of qualification of audit opinion, financial impact and the over-all

audit opinion. Details of the annual audit report showing observations, category of observation, risk rating, and management response could be gleaned from Annual HACT Audits⁸.

CY 2016				
Financial Report	Amount Audited & Certified for CDR/ Value of SAE and SCP	Total Amount of Qualification of Audit Opinion USD	Net Financial Impact	Audit Opinion
Combined Delivery Report (CDR)	1,447,802.59	242,969.52	16.78%	Qualified
Statement of Assets and Equipment	101,975.33	N/A	N/A	Unmodified
Statement of Cash Position	9,885.96	N/A	N/A	Unmodified

The audit of CDR disclosed that total expenditures in 12 budget line items exceeded the amount allotted in the AWP for CY 2016 by USD350, 857.56 with excess expenditures per line item ranging from 108 percent to 1,064 percent. The budget increase of USD130, 000.00 was not sufficient to cover the total excess expenses with net excess expenditures of USD220, 857.56. In addition, project expenditures amounting to USD16, 710.72 were misclassified in the UNDP CDR, while USD5, 401.24 were used to procure equipment and personnel incentives not covered in the AWP. Total qualification amounted to USD242, 969.52 representing 16.78 percent of the total expenses which is beyond the 2 percent materiality level.

CY 2017				
Financial Report	Amount Audited & Certified for CDR/ Value of SAE and SCP	Total Amount of Qualification of Audit Opinion USD	Net Financial Impact	Audit Opinion
Combined Delivery Report (CDR)	1,258,092.84	93,000.68	7.39%	Qualified
Statement of Assets and Equipment	189,163.39	N/A	N/A	Unmodified
Statement of Cash Position	20,374.26	N/A	N/A	Unmodified

The audit disclosed that the UNDP CDR includes USD6, 623.32 representing items not included in the AWP and succeeding releases to grantees of USD86, 377.36 not supported with the required deliverables. The total expenditures not in compliance with AWP amounting to USD93, 000.68 representing 7.39 percent of the total reported expenditures of USD 1,258,092.84 as at 31 December 2017.

CY 2018				
Financial Report	Amount Audited & Certified for CDR/ Value of SAE and SCP	Total Amount of Qualification of Audit Opinion USD	Net Financial Impact	Audit Opinion
Combined Delivery Report	432,801.34	138,531.85	32%	Adverse

⁸ HACT and Spot Checks Audit Results

(CDR)				
Statement of Assets and Equipment	47,827.47	N/A	N/A	Unmodified
Statement of Cash Position	6507.85	N/A	N/A	Unmodified

The reported Government Expenses in the UNDP CDR for CY 2018 is aggregately misstated by USD138, 531.85 due to erroneous entries in the UNDP CDR and the use of exchange rates. The misstatements represent 32.01 percent of the total audited amount of USD432, 801.34, net of UNDP support services of USD358, 533.7, at year-end and affected 66 or 49.25 percent of the total 134 accounts.

Report on the current year (2019) Observations and Recommendations and Updated Action Plan for Prior Years' Audit Recommendation attached as Annexes.

5. SOFT ASSISTANCE NOT PROVIDED THROUGH PROJECTS OR PROGRAMMES

What Are The Key Activities (If Any) Of Soft Assistance Undertaken By The Project?

At the inception phase, the CPMU already did interventions to ensure that project proposals are viable and can surmount the scrutiny of the PTRC and the NSC. From the beginning, the NSC made it clear that proposals should clearly establish the biodiversity conservation nexus of the project ideas based on the context of the place where they would be implemented. During the project implementation stage, the CPMU and the RP closely monitored the projects and diagnosed the challenges and problems they faced, and helped them find solutions or ways to cope. In this regard, the assistance of the site hubs is greatly appreciated. Given the several challenges that confronted the programme grantees, the CPMU and the RP made several interventions, among the more notable of which were the following:

1. Realizing the challenge for POs to prepare viable project proposals based on the SGP-5 Grant Making Manual approved by the NSC, the CPMU designed a standardized project development capability-building initiative. With the help of three consultants, proposal writing training-workshops were held in priority sites to help NGOs and POs develop their project documents.
2. Also realizing that some proponents who otherwise had good project ideas had difficulty putting them down on paper, the CPMU hired the services of proposal writers who helped specific proponents express their ideas in writing and enable them to hurdle the evaluation process and eventually render their project ideas and plans doable.
3. When DALUHAY was having difficulty securing a Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC)/ Certification Precondition (CP) for a portion of its project to be implemented inside the ancestral domain of the Egongot ICC in Maria, Aurora due to an internal strife among the community members, the CPMU conducted a five-day conflict management training with the intra-community conflict as laboratory. In the process, the conflict was diagnosed by the IPs and resolved in the end. The Certification Precondition was eventually issued by the NCIP.

4. The RP found the progress reports of SMPBTGAI and SSFMPC wanting in the financial aspect. The CPMU and the RP held a workshop with the grantees. It will be recalled that both grantees were given Strategic Grants as they partnered with an aggregate of 12 POs. It was found out that the difficulty lay in the limited capability of the POs to make accurate financial reports. A simpler matrix was then agreed upon by the parties. The POs were then trained on how to use the matrix. The RP reported that the financial reports had since become better.
5. The CPMU and the RP, in cooperation with the UNDP-CO and the site hubs, also conducted spot checks/investigations on problematic projects, as follows:

- a. At the inception of the project of the CFA in Can-avid, Western Samar, a letter was received by UNDP-CO raising issues about the fitness of CFA to receive and handle project funds due to allegations of corruption. Upon notice, the CPMU withheld the release of the first tranche of CFA's grant money and asked the assistance of CERD, the site hub in Samar Island, which then conducted an investigation. CERD found out that the letter came from a disgruntled member of the community who was expelled from CFA because of successive failure to attend meetings, thus, failed to maintain her good standing in the organization. The CPMU contacted the letter sender and asked for her comment. However, she failed to comment on the finding of CERD's investigation.

Later in its implementation, the CFA suddenly failed to submit its progress report. The CPMU sought the assistance of CERD, which tried to contact the CFA leadership through phone but to no avail. As the CFA's site was very distant, the CPMU and the RP conducted a spot check to determine the continuing viability of the project. It was found out that the person who used to volunteer to prepare their reports, a university professor, failed to visit them due to his tight schedule. However, in the meantime that they were waiting for his availability, they continued to implement their project, even using their own organizational funds just to be able to deliver. The team then assisted them in preparing their report, concluding for that matter that CFA was in fact delivering their committed outputs, thus, the project remained viable and was in fact performing very well.

- b. A letter was received by the CPMU complaining that SARAGPUNTA was not doing its project according to plan and that project money was being misappropriated by the management. In response, the CPMU created an ad hoc committee consisting of finance and M&E persons from the CPMU, the RP and the UNDP-CO to do a spot check of SARAGPUNTA. The committee reported that the project was delivering according to plan and the financial records show regularity of project fund utilization. The committee also mentioned that at the rate the project was being implemented, it was highly likely to deliver its committed outputs. It was also found out that the letter was sent by a former project employee who was pressured to resign due to his sexually-charged comments and acts towards his co-workers.

- c. Upon notice in its progress reports that BBGMPC was way far from hitting its targets, the CPMU asked the RP to do a spot check. The RP found out that indeed the project was not performing well. Its marine-based livelihood project (crab fattening) was discontinued because the ranching materials were allegedly stolen and they did not replace them. The five SCUBA sets they purchased were hardly used as they failed to sustain a reef monitoring team with the local government. A catch up plan, which was prepared with the organization, showed that even with a project extension, they would not be able to completely deliver their project. The RP then recommended that the project be pre-terminated, the remainder of the project funds not be released, and the SCUBA sets be donated to the Coastal and Marine Division of the BMB. The NSC approved the recommendation.
6. The CPMU also acted on extraneous adverse factors that affected the projects, as follows:
- a. SMMFPC's reforestation site in Tumauni, Isabela was devastated by a strong typhoon that visited Northern Philippines. In addition, the monitoring station and the tree nursery, which they established using SGP5 funds were brought to the ground. The CPMU asked PRRM, the site hub in Upper Sierra Madre, to help SMMFPC make an assessment and do a catch up plan. PRRM later reported that the partners of SMMFPC, i.e., the USAID-funded CWISER+ and the management of the Tumauni Watershed Natural Park, committed to help SMMFPC to rebuild whatever it had lost.
- b. TCD sent to the CPMU a copy of written statement made by a left-leaning group calling for cessation of measuring the metes and bounds of an ICCA in Sierra Madre as it was a means to grab ancestral lands. In response, the CPMU immediately visited the office of TCD in Infanta, Quezon to meet with its project staff. The project manager said that there is no other ICCA project in the area except TCD's thus the statement could only refer to their SGP5 initiative. The CPMU committed to support its plans. TCD then convened the Indigenous Political System (elders and leaders of the Dumagat/Remontado ICC) members in Infanta, Quezon and asked them to officially respond to the call of the left-leaning group. The elders and leaders made an official statement to the effect that ICCA is instead a powerful means of asserting IP rights over their ancestral domain, especially their sacred grounds, and that they give their full support to TCD's project. The statement was announced to the ICC.

A week thereafter, an armed encounter between government soldiers and the New People's Army (the armed group of the Communist Party of the Philippines / National Democratic Front) occurred right at the very project site of TCD, with two combatants who died in their tree nursery. Their reforestation site was also run over by the fighters. The CPMU advised them to refrain from going to the area until the situation has normalized. Meanwhile, the CPMU asked them if they could continue with the project, or under what conditions would they be able to so continue, if they could. TCD reported after a couple of weeks that they sought clearance from both the military and the rebels, and that they

were allowed to go to their project site to assess the situation. They affirmed that they could repair the damage and continue on with the project.

- c. Two months before the local elections in 2016, the BBGMPC wrote a letter to the CPMU asking that their project inception be delayed due to what seemed to be election-related violence. Two persons were slain in their municipality. They were concerned that their project might be viewed with political color as is the case in small towns in the Philippines, especially during election time. The CPMU adjusted the start of their project implementation.
7. SGP5 also supported the convening of the GEF-CSO Network during the conduct of the First National Biodiversity Congress in May 2017 to help strengthen the participation of the civil society in the governance of the allocated funds of GEF in the Philippines. The intervention paved the way for the inclusion of SGP5-supported NGOs in the Network's membership. They now have a voice in the conceptualization, design and selection of GEF-funded projects in the Philippines, especially those that are being developed by UNDP.
 8. Three terminal report writing workshops were conducted at site levels. Notably, many progress reports, while complete in themselves, were wanting in details that would allow the grantees to tell the stories of the effects of their SGP5 projects to individuals, families, sectors and communities. Because of this, the CPMU decided to re-draft the Terminal Report template to allow the grantees to communicate their project results more clearly and completely. The workshops were in the months of June and July 2018. All terminal reports followed the revised template.
 9. The CPMU SGP5 was also involved in the conceptualization and development of the PIF for the next operational phase, which was initiated by the UNDP CO. Several brainstorming sessions were held from June to September 2018 where the direction of SGP7 was discussed, particularly, its overall design, the criteria for the selection of priority sites and the focal areas it shall cover. The CO has also engaged the services a consultant to write the PIF, who also worked closely with the CPMU to ensure that the next operational phase shall stand on the gains SGP5. The PIF was eventually approved and the CO hired the consultants (PPG Team) for the preparation of the SGP7 Project Document. Similarly, the CPMU worked closely with the PPG Team while the financial closure was still underway.
 10. The CPMU and the RP also did constant site visits to help grantees diagnose their challenges and assist them in finding solutions thereto. The presence of the CPMU and the RP in meetings and discussions with other stakeholders, especially the local offices of national government agencies and local governments, also helped strengthen the external engagements of the grantees.

What are the main constraints in progress towards outcome that require additional soft assistance?

Based on the above, the three main constraints in progress towards outcome requiring soft assistance were the inadequacy of written communication skills of the grantees, project management skills, and intra-community disputes.

Certainly, the proponents/grantees have a good appreciation of the environmental problems they face, know what they want to do (innovative solutions) and how to implement these solutions, at least in a general sense. The problem, however, is their inadequacy in communicating these ideas in a manner that can be the basis of agreements or understanding between stakeholders. Thus, several soft interventions along this line had to be initiated by the CPMU. As stated above, these interventions spanned from project development until the terminal reporting.

Relative to that would be the inadequacy in some crucial project management skills. Clear from the above are the reporting skills, especially financial reporting.

Third is the presence of intra-community conflicts in some communities that actually affected the commencement or the continuation of some projects. In most of these cases, the CPMU intervened through investigations, however, in the case of DALUHAY's project in the Egongot ICC in Aurora, CPMU's intervention was in the form of a training in conflict management.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

The landscape approach has several advantages. The approach has allowed SGP to work on large geographic areas forming mosaics of land and water bodies with different uses, thus enabling it to demonstrate varied but complementary natural resource management approaches. Realizing the need for **complementation** happened naturally among SGP-5 grantees situated in a certain landscape. The grantees started working in **synergy** – talking to each other, working together, learning together and identifying common causes together. This was clearly exhibited in Northern Samar, where the grantees who worked from the ridges of the Samar Island Natural Park down to the reefs of the Biri LaRoSa Protected Landscape and Seascape saw the important connectivity of their work. These grantees swear that while they had known each other for so long, they never actually saw the need to work together. Today, they have formed a consortium that has made them stronger in engaging government, the academe and other stakeholders. By themselves, these grantees have decided to profile their landscape and formulate a strategic and an action plan that they have committed to pursue beyond SGP. Similarly, in the Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park, the grantees and their beneficiary community groups have come to appreciate that their small projects have actually established a social fence for the world-famous park, an effective buffer zone that the PPSRMNP is still dreaming of putting on paper. These groups have already formed their People's Council that is giving them a strong voice in the management of the Park, enticing other community organizations to join them. In the Calamianes Group of Islands in northern Palawan, the grantees have exhibited various protected area management models (ICCA, LCA, MPAs) that dot the large production landscape, which is the ancestral domain of the Tagbanuas. Working together, the Tagbanua's claim has given the ICC the strength to stand up to development aggression (e.g., the threat of putting up an underwater adventure park, the planned landfill) and assert their right to their ancestral domain in view of the land use planning being done by the DENR in the sequestered ranch as well as the intrusion of migrants from other provinces. These communities have expanded their work **beyond their small projects** and are therefore pursuing causes beyond the scope of their projects.

Building partnerships with local governments, national agencies, people's organizations, private entities and other stakeholders a diverse range of stakeholders is an important part of **achieving synergistic and institutionalized results**. In Nueva Vizcaya, the trust built by the Friends of the Environment for

Development and Sustainability (FREENDS) among the different groups and offices in the province played a big part in declaring the Palali-Mamparang Mountain Range Conservation Area and its corresponding multi-stakeholder management council and budgetary allocation. Not only has FREENDS and its partner NGOs and community organizations achieved the declaration, it has also enticed the Provincial Government, through an ordinance, now ensures an annual budget for the management of the PMMR. In Quezon Province, the network of SGP-5 grantees and other NGOs and POs has convinced the Municipal Government to establish, conserve and support a 15,000+ hectares in Gen. Nakar. In the case of the Culion Foundation, Inc., its partnership with the private sector has convinced the Municipal Government of Coron, Palawan to commit to the promotion of seaweed farming in the town's coastal areas. The Nortehanon Access Center (NAC) in Northern Samar, through its partnership with the University of Eastern Philippines, has lowered the cost of the incubators, which it uses in its project. The university has also been regularly monitoring the soil quality in NAC's project site as part of the former's extension work, thus for free.

But the most fruitful partnerships that were formed were those **partnerships among the grantees themselves and their immediate partners**. It will be noted that many grants given by SGP5 pursued **mother-child relationships** wherein NGOs used part of their grants to organize and/or strengthen POs, enabling many of these POs to come to their own. NSEP, for instance, organized WAIID and guided it through putting up a mangrove nursery and a savings and credit system among its women members. With only PHP20 weekly savings form each member, the organization has lent capital to several women to jumpstart homebased livelihood projects. These women are also sending their children, mostly girls, to high schools in the mainland through the support of WAIID. This was something they could not afford to do in the past. PCART partnered with the Unified Farmers and Fishers Organization, and strengthened the participation of women in their organization, producing more women leaders in the community. EVPRD's partnership with CEFA has made the latter a stronger PO, which has built its capacity for pursuing a thriving abaca business and thereby increasing its physical, financial and social capitals.

This mother-child relationships were however best shown through projects supported by **Strategic Grants**. Strategic Grants refer to projects that received more than the usual small grants of USD50,000 and up to USD150,000. Giving these grants was the best way to include other small NGOs and POs that would have otherwise not qualified to receive funding from SGP5, considering that they were required to show track record in project implementation and financial management to be considered for grantmaking. DALUHAY, for instance, was given a Strategic Grant to enable seven other POs in Aurora Province to receive support from SGP5. In PPSRNP, only one NGO and two POs would have qualified to receive grants from SGP5. Thus, the Strategic Grants given to SSFMPC and SMPBGTAI made it possible for several other POs to participate in SGP5. Because of this, the vision of expanding the reach of the City Government's Community-Based Sustainable Tourism Program in the PPSRNP and its environs was realized. In the Calamianes Group of Islands in northern Palawan, SARAGPUNTA, with its Strategic Grant, was able to bring in 14 POs that worked together to perfect their application for four CADTs and formulate an ADSDPP for each of those for ancestral domains.

The **site hubs strategy** proved to bolster grantee-to-grantee relationships. The site hubs served as communication centers for grantees in each priority site. It rolled out the cross-cutting capability-building interventions of the CPMU and served as the primary channel for quick response to problems encountered by many grantees. It also conducted annual site-based conferences, which served as platforms for peer-to-peer learning and partnership-building. However, site hubs were grantees as well whose projects had a shorter lifetime than the operational phase. Thus, at some point, they had to stop performing the important roles they played in the priority sites. Also, being grantees themselves, their SGP5 funds could not go beyond the maximum USD150,000 Strategic Grant. In the end, the CPMU had to shell out more funds to support the site-wide activities being rolled out by the site hubs. The next operational phase may well continue and improve on this innovative strategy. For one, it will be cost-efficient to not require the

hubs to do a project similar to that of their grantees. Instead, the leadership role of hubs should be expanded to make M&E and progress reporting more efficient and effective.

Conservation initiatives need **to recognize the dependence of communities on biodiversity and ecosystem services** provided by landscapes and seascapes. People are dependent on natural resources. This means that conservation strategies, especially in developing countries like the Philippines, have to consider that natural resources are to a large extent viewed through a utilization perspective. The stories of the grantees involved in developing biodiversity-friendly enterprises show the gains that can be seen from embracing and working with this perspective. The NAC showed how farmers were turned into conservation advocates through the new farming practices they learned and the new enterprise (salted eggs production) spawned by their rice duck/system of rice intensification project. Better ways of planting and marketing abaca turned the people's organization Centralized Farmers Association into savvy entrepreneurs — able to turn a profit in spite of typhoons damaging their crops, and able to serve as buyers/consolidators of abaca harvests for the whole Northern Samar province. Communities in Puerto Princesa City became equipped to welcome increasing numbers of tourists with open arms, earning increased incomes without sacrificing the integrity of the World Heritage Site that is the Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park. Utilization of water became an important rallying point for promoting forest conservation in Nueva Vizcaya, with some barangays even taking the initiative to declare their own "barangay source water protected areas." Tagbanuas in the Calamianes Group of Islands became more motivated to participate in programs as they recognized the role played by mangrove forests in shielding them from typhoons. The women in particular grew more empowered in skills and decision-making regarding natural resources management, knowing that this is closely linked to their role in sourcing food from the environment in order to feed their families. In turn, the **local governments are enticed to support the projects** because of their livelihood components. The Provincial Government of Northern Samar has started planning with SGP grantees about mainstreaming their plans into the local government's programs. Seeing the potential of its ecotourism project, the Municipal Government of Roxas, Palawan gave PCART PHP1M for the construction of a boardwalk to enhance the viability of its project. It is necessary that future operational phases of SGP focus on the economic and human security benefits of biodiversity conservation.

A note though on BDFEs. The livelihood initiatives of SGP5, at least most of them, are admittedly not yet characteristic of BDFEs based on the criteria set by the Biodiversity Partnerships Project, which were adopted by BMB by way of Technical Bulletin 2018-11. Attaining BDFE status is, as noted in the BEAT, a long and rigorous journey. Certainly, the lifetime of SGP5-supported projects is not sufficient for them to reach BDFE status. The capitalization needed - financial, physical, ecological and social - is just too demanding for them to attain the triple bottomlines of economic, ecology and equity in so short a time. It is thus necessary that these BDFEs be continually assisted financially and technically. As such, this area of work offers a rich avenue for policy work so that a continuous stream of financial capital goes down to the ground to provide sustained support for BDFEs. Down the line, too, is the need to invest resources for a guarantee system that will add market value to BDFE products.

The most important role of SGP5 is investing in communities and institutions. Such investments came in the form on capacity building, both in terms of technical aspects (community-based monitoring and evaluation system, environmental law enforcement, reforestation, entrepreneurship.) as well as important soft skills (negotiation, conflict management, lobbying). Taking the time to conduct outreach activities also led to **recruiting additional local champions**, as shown by the work of the Palawan Conservation Corps in promoting **youth involvement**. Ensuring the **involvement of women** also proved to be important, as women time and again went on to exhibit skills and dedication that would have otherwise gone untapped. Indeed, there were more women-led POs among the SGP5 grantees and beneficiaries, and they were able to lead their groups towards achieving the kind of successes featured in this book. Beyond the individual, **investing in community building** or organizing was also an important

part of cementing the success of the conservation initiatives. Establishing PO alliances, such as those done in Nueva Vizcaya (Federation of Palali-Mamparang Conservationists, Inc.) and Puerto Princesa (People's Council) served to facilitate stronger cooperation among these POs, giving them the means to encourage each other continue their work and also giving them a seat at the table along with other decision-makers.

The NIM as an execution modality has made **national government, through BMB, and small civil society groups more accessible to each other**. While it is true that BMB is known for its partnership with various NGOs, those NGOs were mostly the big and widely known organizations, e.g., WWF, Conservation International, Haribon Foundation. SGP has given smaller NGOs and even smaller POs to **access the services** of the DENR and other national government agencies by virtue of their partnership with the BMB. For instance, the DENR local offices of Quezon Province and Northern Samar were the ones who measured the project sites of TCD and PAKIBA, respectively. SGP grantees and their partners were able to **dialogue** with BMB on various policy matters, such as, the policies on BDFE, ICCA and NIPAS. Meanwhile, government has become more aware of the **contributions of these small organizations in the fulfillment of the latter's biodiversity conservation mandate**. For instance, the results of the projects of the grantees have been counted in the 6th National Report on Biodiversity Conservation (6NR). These results were also reported to the FASPS of the DENR. In clarifying the issues on the proposed underwater park in Coron, Palawan, and with regard to the forest land use planning for the sequestered Yulo King Ranch in Busuanga, SARAGPUNTA's data, which was generated through its SGP project, became a **rich source of information** for BMB. Similarly, their "SGP connection" provided an **inroad** for the grantees in southern Palawan to bring their advocacy to government with regard the proposed coal-fired power plant in Narra, Palawan. With NIM no longer an execution modality option in the next Operation Phase of SGP, there is need to maintain this relationship by putting up and institutionalizing a mechanism for continuous dialogue and information sharing between BMB and small civil society organizations.

7. PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIES

At the national level (CPMU), partnerships were formed and maintained with organizations and agencies that were represented in the NSC. Other agencies were also engaged to help further the reach of the grantees. These included the Department of Trade and Industry, which made it possible for some BDFE products to be introduced to a wider audience through trade fairs; the Climate Change Commission, which provided technical advice to interested grantees on how they can figure into the possible application of their local government units in the People's Survival Fund, the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Management Program (CMEMP) of the Biodiversity Management Bureau, for the adoption of some of the BDFE projects of SGP5 grantees. In addition, the CPMU assisted its grantees in solidifying its partnerships at the local level. These included the partnership forged between FRIENDS, PRRM, local academic institutions and the Provincial Government of Nueva Vizcaya; the partnership between the CERD, EVPRD, SPPI and NAC with the Municipal Government of Mondragon and the Provincial Government of Northern Samar; the partnership between CFI and the municipal governments of Coron, Busuanga and Culion; the partnership between the SGP5 grantees in and around the Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park with the Protected Area Superintendent's Office; and, the partnership formed by SGP5 grantees with the Municipal Government of Gen. Nakar, Quezon Province. Several other partnerships were formed by the grantees with local stakeholders, such as the one between PAKIBA and PENRO-Northern Samar, CFA and the Municipal Government of Can-avi, Eastern Samar, PCART and the Municipal Government of Roxas, Palawan.

8. GENDER AND DEVELOPMENT MAINSTREAMING

The Project document states that concerns of women, along with IPsm, shall be given importance in grant making and project implementation. Thus, although SGP-5 was not a gender programme by design, its implementation was characterized by conscious efforts to make it both gender sensitive and gender responsive.

It was gender sensitive because it endeavored to change behavior by raising awareness about gender equality concerns through the inclusion of gender dimensions in project implementation. At the start of the implementation, the CPMU and the RP created a committee of gender experts from among the PTRC members to identify markers for the inclusion of gender concerns in projects. At the technical evaluation stage, the PTRC identified opportunities to integrate gender concerns in appropriate proposals. Some projects did gender analyses, others included gender sensitivity in their capability-building activities. The CPMU also required gender disaggregated documentation of project activities, including beneficiaries.

It was gender responsive in the sense that its projects substantially helped overcome gender biases in order for women to truly engage and benefit from the projects. For example, the monitoring station of PCART in Barbacan River in Roxas, Palawan was designed and the construction thereof was managed by women members of its partner PO. PAKIBA's MPA was managed by women. But foremost of these projects would be that of the Samdhana Institute, which emphasized the leadership role of the Tagbanua women in biodiversity conservation despite the patriarchal set up of the Tagbanua society.

Gender issues identified	How the project is addressing identified gender issues	Gender equality and/or women's empowerment results
Marginalization of women in community-managed projects	Participation of women and men in beneficiary groups in project identification	Almost equal men and women beneficiaries Women-centered projects
Male domination in different phases of project management	Presence of women and men in the project implementation and management team	Women leaders in the management team
	Sex disaggregated data on the grantees' reports particularly in the participation of capacity building i.e. trainings, project activities and in decision making	.Almost all projects have sex disaggregated data in training and capacity building activities, showing almost equal participation
Marginalization of IP men and women	IP women and men were encouraged to be engaged in various aspects of the project and have equal access to opportunities, e.g. capacity building, livelihood support activities.	IP-driven and centered projects particularly involving ICCAs, CADT applications, ADSDPP formulation, and livelihoods

9. REPORTING ON OTHER CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Promotion of IP rights through projects that advance their rights to their ancestral domains and open up opportunities for mainstreaming their products in the market.

Sustainable and equitable access to biodiversity resources by supporting biodiversity friendly enterprises. Aside from community-based projects big corporations have also adhered to BDFE principles.

Capacity development through varied training and mentoring interventions to address capability gaps from project development to various skills set requirement in implementing, monitoring, and reporting their projects.

Gender mainstreaming through projects that support women's initiatives, reproductive roles, and promote the leadership functions of women

10. KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS AND DISSEMINATION PLAN:

List of Knowledge Products	Recipients
Survey of the SGP4 projects, which was published at the inception of SGP5	SGP partners
SGP 5 brochure	Project proponents, NSC, PTRC, stakeholders in national and local governments, general public
Video material on the best practices of SGP4 (5-minuter)	Project proponents, NSC, PTRC, stakeholders in national and local governments, general public
Video documentary on the best practices of SGP4 (20-minuter)	Project proponents, NSC, PTRC, stakeholders in national and local governments, general public
Handbook on Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)	280 participants to the 2018 SGP-5 National Conference
Handbook on Biodiversity Friendly Enterprises (BDFE)	FASPO Mid-Year Assessment Participants (20 copies each of manuals)
Handbook on Community-Based Monitoring & Evaluation System (CBMES)	SGP grantees and partners, LGUs, DENR
Handbook on Ecosystem Resource Valuation	280 participants to the 2018 SGP-5 National Conference, FASPO-DENR
Manual on Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme (SGP-GEF)	280 participants to the 2018 SGP-5 National Conference, FASPO-DENR
Video documentary on the best practices of SGP5	General public, CSOs, LGUs, NGAs and funding institutions; posted in SGP website and shown during SGP activities
Short video production on the impacts of SGP5 on women	General public, CSOs, LGUs, NGAs and funding institutions; posted in SGP website and shown during SGP activities
Short video production on the impacts of SGP5 on Indigenous Peoples	General public, CSOs, LGUs, NGAs and funding institutions; posted in SGP website and shown during SGP activities
Short video production on the impacts of SGP5 on farmers	General public, CSOs, LGUs, NGAs and funding institutions; posted in SGP website and shown during SGP activities
Short video production on the impacts of SGP5 on fishers	General public, CSOs, LGUs, NGAs and funding institutions; posted in SGP website and shown during SGP activities
Infographic on the impacts of SGP5 on women	120 copies distributed to FASPs and to participants to SGP7 Inception Workshop
Infographic on the impacts of SGP5 on Indigenous Peoples	120 copies distributed to FASPs and to participants to SGP7 Inception Workshop
Infographic on the impacts of SGP5 on farmers	120 copies distributed to FASPs and to

List of Knowledge Products	Recipients
	participants to SGP7 Inception Workshop
Infographic on the impacts of SGP5 on fishers	120 copies distributed to FASPs and to participants to SGP7 Inception Workshop
Proceedings of the 1 st Biodiversity Congress	SGP grantees and partners; local and national policymakers; UNDP, BMB, DENR; other grantmakers
Proceedings of the 2018 SGP-5 National Conference	SGP grantees and partners; local and national policymakers; UNDP, BMB, DENR; other grantmakers
<i>For printing are three other publications, which shall use other sources of funds:</i>	
Coffee table book on the model landscapes of SGP5	
Resource book on Scaling Up BDFEs	
Proceedings of the 2018 SGP5 National Conference	

11. SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS AND EXIT STRATEGY:

The UNDP and DENR-BMB recognized the gains, positive results and community benefits the SGP5 projects have achieved and set up for continued implementation and sustainability. However, since GEF-SGP is following a funding cycle and designed for a two-year project implementation, the CPMU organized a Sustainability Planning Workshop in preparation for the end of the project. The workshop was held on February 26–27, 2018 in Clark Pampanga, and was participated by the site hubs, CPMU, DENR (BMB, FASPS, BioFin), UNDP, and FPE. The objectives of the workshop were for participants to gain knowledge and appreciation of the preliminary consolidated results of SGP5 Programme; understand the various program sustainability domains and come up with sustainability plans that address the identified priority sustainability domains. Outputs of the workshop from the hubs and program levels were presented.

Although the draft sustainability framework has yet to be finalized, both the government and UNDP have expressed their interest in further supporting SGP under GEF7. the project demonstrated the results to sensitise and instil the sustainability thinking with the grantees and the relevant partners. Each hub had articulated sustainability actions so as to maintain their projects' outcome in the future.

Despite positive gains and results of SGP5 project implementation, CSO partners still expressed reservations and uncertainties on the continuity and sustainability of project implementation after the end of SGP5 funding support. Financial support remained a primary concern. The two-year period of project implementation, especially for groups that have just started generating internal resources to augment and support the intervention they started though SGP5 funding, was too short to be able to put in place mechanisms to continuously generate resources (internal and external).

In the final reports of grantees, they claimed that despite the capability and capacity building they have undertaken, application and institutionalization of learnings in their daily operations were still lacking. Upgrading of skills, knowledge, and values would still be needed to deepen their commitment to biodiversity conservation and community development and strengthen their capability to pursue the achievement of their visions and missions. Nevertheless, the partners

expressed their commitment to continue with the biodiversity conservation initiatives they have started. They also drew up their sustainability roadmaps as indicated below at hub levels:

Samar

- Creation of the Samar Biodiversity Network and Formulation of the Samar Biodiversity Agenda to be lobbied for adoption by the provincial and municipal governments, with corresponding budget and staff complement
- Technical Assistance to local government units in coastal resource and watershed management planning such as the Local Climate Change Adaptation Plan (LCCAP) and Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan (ICZMP) to ensure integration, operationalization, and institutionalization of biodiversity conservation actions and BDFEs in local development plans and programs
- Partnership with local government units (provincial, municipal, and barangay levels) on environmental projects and research
- BDFE scaling up of CEFA's (EVPRD partner) abaca production with additional funding from SGP5 through the New Zealand fund and technical assistance through the ISEA
- Resource mobilization for continuity of the projects, including proposal development, submission of proposals, and network building with other CSOs, funding organizations, businesses, and government agencies

Palawan

- Resource mobilization for continuity or expansion of projects.
- Continuous implementation of CBST in partnership with the Puerto Princesa Tourism Office
- Strengthening of the People's Council in PPUR PAMB
- Secured conservation areas thru continuous lobbying for the LGUs issuance of municipal and barangay level ordinances
- Secured ICCAs thru formulation of ADSDPP and application for CADT with the NCIP

Sierra Madre

- Secure conservation areas through issuance of municipal and barangay level ordinances
- Secure ICCAs through formulation of ADSDPP
- Resource mobilization for continuity or expansion of projects (FFP: SERD, CFFQI; Tanim: FPE, TK, etc.)
- Secure funding from the provincial and municipal governments and ensure functionality of the Technical Working Committee created to lead and oversee the LCA ordinance and management plan implementation

Much of the projects supported under SGP5 were new endeavors. Thus, continuity was more the order of the day for many of them, before they can embrace the concept of sustainability. In this regard, it was important for the CPMU to help the grantees ensure that their initiatives would have a chance at continuity. Thus, the interventions were to help them ensure that their projects would continue and be scaled up.

Not all the priority sites of SGP5 are included in SGP7. This was made clear in the middle of 2018. Thus, CPMU endeavored to help them develop new proposals and identified other financing

institutions that can help them continue their projects. The Forest Foundation Philippines came in handy, with some of the grantee's initiatives getting assurance of funding support from it. For those that are in Northern Samar, Calamianes and Aurora Province it is recommended that SGP7 continue supporting the projects that were started in SGP5 or in the earlier OPs of SGP.



Prepared by: RODOLFO FERDINAND N. QUICHO, JR., Project Advisor

Cleared/Approved by: _____ (National Programme/Project Director)

[Note: Since reporting should as much as possible be electronic for efficiency, signature is not required. The Report can be submitted by the Project Manager or the designated representative of the NPD via email]