



Terminal Evaluation Report of the Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF- Small Grants Programme in the Philippines (GEF Project ID 66837; PIMS-4517)

Table of Contents

I Opening Page.....	3
ii. Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	5
iii. Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction.....	14
1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation	14
1.2 Scope and Methodology.....	14
1.3 Limitation.....	16
1.4 Structure of this Report.....	16
2. Project Description and Development Context.....	16
2.1 Project Start and Duration.....	16
2.2 Problems that the Project Sought to Address.....	16
2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project.....	17
2.4 Main Stakeholders.....	18
2.5 Expected Results.....	18
3. Findings.....	22
3.1 Project Design / Formulation	22
3.2 Project Implementation	28
3.3 Project Results	34
4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons	48
4.1 Conclusions.....	48
4.2 Recommendations.....	49
4.3. Lessons Learned	52
Annexes:	53
Annex 1 Terms of Reference	53
Annex 2 Evaluation Matrix	53
Annex 3 List of Documents Reviewed	53
Annex 4 List of Person Interviewed /Met.....	53
Annex 5 Schedule Itinerary	53
Annex 6 Photo Documentation	53
Annex 7 Rating scales	53
Annex 8 TOR PTRC.....	53
Annex 9 NSC Members.....	53
Annex 10 CPMU Organizational Structure	53
Annex 11 TOR SGP5 Hubs.....	53

Annex 12 SGP5 Grant Guidelines	53
Annex 13 Expenditures Summary	53
Annex 14 Co-Financing & Grants Release	53
Annex 15. Summary of Project Accomplishments	53
Annex 16 Capability Building Activities	53
Annex 17 Dagatan Lake Management Plan	53
Annex 18 ADMP Kaplano.....	53
Annex 19 N. Samar Draft Report models	53
Annex 20 Mt. Palali - Mamparang Mountain Range Management Plan	53
Annex 21 Palawan Draft Report models	53

I Opening Page

Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project	5 th Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in the Philippines
UNDP and GEF project ID No.	0082868 4517
Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report	April 9, 2018 – June 30, 2018 June 2018
Region and countries included in the project	Asia Pacific Region Philippines
GEF Operational Program/ Strategic Program	Biodiversity
Implementing Partner and other project partners	United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Department of Environment and Natural Resources – Biodiversity Management Bureau (formerly PAWB)
Evaluation team members	Rafael E. Camat Jr. National Consultant Email: r.e.camat@gmail.com Mobile: +639178033216 Hari Ramalu Ragavan International Consultant

Acknowledgements

The Terminal Evaluation Team expresses its gratitude and recognition to the following organizations and individuals who took time to share information that was central to the terminal evaluation process.

- Country Programme Management Unit: Atty. Rodolfo Ferdinand N. Quicho Jr., Ms. Ester Batangan and Ms. Myrna Caguioa
- Members of the National Steering Committee: Atty. Jose Canivel, Ms. Belinda De la Paz, Ms. Carygine Isaac and Ms. Luz Baskinas
- UNDP Country Office, Ms. Grace Tena
- Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Biodiversity Management Bureau: Ms. Angelita P. Meniado, Ms. Norma M. Molinyawe, Ms. Nancy R. Corpus and Ms. Marlyn M. Mendoza
- The Foundation for the Philippine Environment: Mr. Oliver Agoncillo and Ms. Salve Narvadez
- Palawan NGO Network Inc.: Atty. Robert Chan
- Culion Foundation Inc.: Ms. Flora Ninfa S. Leocadio
- Palawan State University : Center for Strategic Policy and Governance Inc.: Prof. Marjorie Española and Prof. Hermenegildo Dela Peña
- Institute for the Development of Educational and Ecological Alternatives: Mr. Roger Garinga
- Kalipunan ng Pundasyon ng Mga Tagbanua Inc. (SARAGPUNTA): Mr. Alfredo Carpiano
- C3 Philippines: Ms. Shalom Joy Pareja
- Palawan Conservation Corps, Inc. Ms. Cherry De Dios, Mr. Ronald Amada and Ms. Dixy Portuguesa
- Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation Inc.: Mr. Ian Mabitasan
- Candis 3 Multi-Purpose Cooperative: Mr. Ronilo Camacho, Mr. Jun Saligumba and Mr. Francis Piamonte
- Sabang Mangrove Paddle Boat Tour Guide Association, Inc.: Mr. Celestino Santander
- Sabang Sea Ferry Multi-Purpose Cooperative: Ms. Teresita Austria
- Katala Foundation, Inc. Ms. Mary Chris Nierves
- Palawan Katutubo Mission: Mr. Willie Tingod

- The Samdhana Institute Ms. Shane Naguit
- Guian Development Foundation Inc.: Prof Margarita dela Cruz and Ms. Racelle R. Rescordado
- Eastern Visayas Partnership Rural Development, Inc: Mr. Greg Sarmiento
- Center for Empowerment and Resource Development Inc. Ms. Aileen Diaz
- Nortehanon Access Center Inc. : Ms. Maybelle M. Camps
- Northern Samar Environmental Protector: Prof. Myrna Nicol Ogoc
- Sentro Pagpauswag Ha Paginabuhi Inc. Mr. Marjoe Florander
- Pasay Kinis and Bangus: Ms. Edith Villocero
- Samar Center for Rural Education and Development Inc. Ms. Josephine De Leon
- Lakas at Pagkakaisa ng Asosasyon ng San Pedro: Members and Officers of the Board
- The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement Inc.: Ms. Merlinda Calobaquib and Mr. Pablo Paet Jr.
- Friends of Environment for Development and Sustainability Inc.: Ms. Teresita Acosta
- Community Forestry Foundation Quirino Inc. Ms. Grace Vicente
- Kalahan Educational Foundation Inc.: Mr. Sammy Balinhawang, Mr. David Marcelo
- Sustainable Environment for Rural Development Association, Inc. Mr. Joel Carig
- Gabriela Masipag Farmers Producers Cooperative: Mr. Antonio Agnapan
- Tangol Kalikasan Inc.: Atty. Maria Generosa Mislant
- Daloy ng Buhay Ms. Marivic Pajaro
- Tribal Center for Development Foundation Inc.: Mr. Dino Buefano
- Save Sierra Madre Network Alliance Inc. Father Pete Montalla
- Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park Protected Area Superintendent Elizabeth Maclang
- Biri Laroza Protected Landscape and Seascape Protected Area Superintendent Nestor Culamar and Forester Angelito Villanueva

ii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADMP	Ancestral Domain Management Plan
ADP	Ancestral Domain Plan
ADSDPP	Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan
BD	Biodiversity
BDFE	Biodiversity Friendly Enterprise
BMB	Biodiversity Management Bureau
C3MPC	Candis 3 Multi-Purpose Cooperative
C3P	C3 Philippines
CBFMA	Community Based Forest Management Agreement
CBO	Community Based Organization
CERDI	Center for Empowerment and Resource Development Inc
CFFQI	Community Forestry Foundation Quirino Inc
CO	Country Office
COA	Commission on Audit
CPMU	Country Programme Management Unit
CFI	Culion Foundation Inc
DA	Department of Agriculture
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DILG	Department of Interior and Local Government
EVPRDI	Eastern Visayas Partnership for Rural Development, Inc
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FPIC	Free and Prior Informed Consent
FRENDS	Friends of Environment for Development and Sustainability Inc
GDFI	Guiuan Development Foundation Inc
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GMFPC	Gabriela Masipag Farmers Producers Cooperative
IDEAS	Institute for the Development of Educational and Ecological Alternatives
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IPRA	Indigenous Peoples Rights Act
KII	Key Informant Interview
KBA	Key Biodiversity Area
KEF	Kalahan Educational Foundation Inc
KFI	Katala Foundation Inc
LAPAS	Lakas at Pagkakaisa ng Asosasyon ng San Pedro
LGU	Local Government Unit
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NAC	Nortehanon Access Center Inc
NCIP	National Commission on Indigenous People
NEDA	National Economic Development Authority
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NIPAS	National Integrated Protected Areas System
NPD	National Project Director
NSC	National Steering Committee
NSEP	Northern Samar Environmental Protector
PAMB	Protected Areas Management Board
PAKIBA	Pasay Kinis and Bangus

PBCFI	Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation Inc
PCCI	Palawan Conservation Corps, Inc
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PKM	Palawan Katutubo Mission
PLS	Protected Landscape and Seascape
PNNI	Palawan NGO Network Inc
PRRM	Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement Inc
PSUCSPGI	Palawan State University: Center for Strategic Policy and Governance Inc.
PO	Peoples Organization
RP	Responsible Party
SACRED	Samar Center for Rural Education and Development Inc
SARAGPUNTA	Kalipunan ng Pundasyon ng Mga Tagbanua Inc.
SERD	Sustainable Environment for Rural Development Association, Inc
SMPBTGAI	Sabang Mangrove Paddle Boat Tour Guide Association, Inc
SSMNAI	Save Sierra Madre Network Alliance Inc
SPPI	Sentro Pagpauswag Ha Paginabuhi Inc
SSFMPCC	Sabang Sea Ferry Multi-Purpose Cooperative
TCDFI	Tribal Center for Development Foundation Inc
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TEE	Terminal Evaluation Experts
TET	Terminal Evaluation Team
TEV	Total Economic Value
TK	Tangol Kalikasan Inc
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSI	The Samdhana Institute Incorporated
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
WB	World Bank

iii. Executive Summary

This Terminal Evaluation (TE) is for The Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF – Small Grants Programme in the Philippines (GEF-SGP OP5) (PIMS #4517). As stated in the Terms of Reference, the objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of the benefits from this project to Philippines and for UNDP’s future programmes especially in SGP GEF initiatives. In accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, this TE is also intended to “promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives; including the global environmental benefits”.

The Project Document was signed on June 2013 and would end on July 30, 2017, however due to delayed project start up a no cost extension was approved, extending the project up to December 2018.

Project Summary Table

Project Title	The Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in the Philippines		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS)	4517	PIF Approval date	
GEF Project ID	00066837		
Atlas Project ID	0008 2868	Project Document Signature date	June 13, 2013
Country	Republic of the Philippines		
Region	Asia and Pacific	Inception Workshop date	August 2014
GEF Focal Area	Biodiversity	Terminal Evaluation completion date	June 2018
Executing Agency/Implementing Partner’s	Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Biodiversity Management Bureau	Planned Project Termination date	June 30, 2017
Responsible Party	Foundation for the Philippine Environment	Revised Project Closing date	December 2018
Project Finance	At CEO endorsement		At Terminal Evaluation
1. GEF Financing	US\$ 4,583,333		US \$ 4,583,333.00
2. UNDP Contribution	US\$ 1,000,000		US\$ 1,000,000.00
3. Government of the Philippines	US\$ 3,002,907		US\$ 3,002,907.00
4. Other In-kind	US\$ 1,100,000		US\$ 2,874,608.00
5. Total co-financing (2+3+4)	US\$ 5,102,907		US\$ 9,752,123.00
Project Total Cost (1+5)	US\$ 9,686,240		US\$ 14,335,456.00

Project Description:

The objective of the project is to secure global environmental benefits through community based biodiversity conservation initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines. The project pursued three components: (1) Community-based actions to improve the sustainability of protected areas (PAs); (2) Mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascape and sectors (PLS); (3) Cross-cutting capacity development and knowledge management. To achieve these components and their expected results GEF-SGP Philippines supported local organizations, NGOs and CBOs in designing and implementing projects to contribute to global biodiversity conservation using the landscape approach and modeling and implementation of best practices.

The project’s long-term solution is to enable communities to ensure a mosaic of land uses and resource management practices across the rural landscape comprised of PA within larger PLS that generate sustainable livelihoods while helping the Philippines meet its commitments under the global environmental conventions by generating global benefits for biodiversity.

The GEF, SGP4, NSC, have identified the Sierra Mountain Ranges in Luzon and the Islands of Samar and Palawan as the priority sites for this project. The basis of their choice was global biodiversity significance including a number of key biodiversity areas, protected areas and protected landscapes and seascapes and the presence of strong networks of NGOs and CBOs active in conservation issues. In line with the SGP Operational Guidelines, grants have been made directly to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs). The project was to be implemented from June 2013 to July 2017 but due to delays in the project start up activities, the project was given a no cost extension up to December 2018. Results of the project implementation are as follows:

Project Result

Intended Outcome PRODOC 2013	Actual Outcomes as of June 2018
<p>Project Objective: Global environmental benefits secured through community-based biodiversity conservation initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines</p> <p>1. Increase in area under protection in community-managed or community-supported protected areas (100,000 has)</p> <p>2. Increase in area under certified or verified sustainable use by communities (400,000 has)</p>	<p>Actual Achievement of Project Objective:</p> <p>1. 134,863has. Exceeded the target by 35% PA protected using various instruments.</p> <p>2. 684,495 has. Exceeded the target by 71% production landscape/seascape under improved management compared to previous practice of open access to natural resources.</p>
<p>Outcome 1: Effective Models for community – based governance of protected areas are demonstrated.</p> <p>1. Number of community managed or co-managed PA models operational in project areas (10 community PA)</p> <p>2. Number of hectares protected through community-PA (100,000 has.)</p> <p>3. 40% increase on average in relevant dimensions of</p>	<p>1. Seven models/best practices implemented by 39 grantees and their community partners.</p> <p>2. 134, 863 has of community managed protected areas, exceeding the 100,000 ha. target by 35%.</p> <p>3. Two MPAs completed two cycles of METT assessment but fell short of the 40% management improvement target.</p>

Intended Outcome PRODOC 2013	Actual Outcomes as of June 2018
<p>management effectiveness of target PAs.</p> <p>4. 1,000 ha of mangroves and seagrass beds rehabilitated or protected within one or more PAs</p>	<p>4. 8,111 ha. mangrove and seagrass beds were rehabilitated or protected, exceeding the 1,000 ha. target by 711%.</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives.</p> <p>1. 400,000 ha improved community “mainstreamed” management within PLS reducing threats to BD from slash and burn farming; over-harvesting of timber, and destructive fishing</p> <p>2. At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.</p> <p>3. Number of communities adopting TEV reports or similar ecosystems valuation approaches in development of ADPs or other community land-use plans.</p>	<p>1. 684,495 ha. production landscape/seascape under improved management, exceeding the 400,000 ha. target by 284%.</p> <p>2. 38 community land use plans produced, exceeding the target by 26%.</p> <p>3. Resource assessments were made on what were found within the LCA, MPA or CADT areas and included in the management plan. The use of Total Economic Valuation was too complicated for the community preparers to do.</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products produced and marketed by 30 communities</p> <p>1. 30 communities produce and market biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products.</p>	<p>1. 43 Grantees with 159 PO partners are producing various biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products.</p>
<p>Outcome 4: Increased capacity of GEF-SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions.</p> <p>1. 4000 community-level resource users and managers who are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.</p> <p>2. 30 of new grants that replicate approaches</p> <p>3. 50% increase in amount of co-funding for Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3</p> <p>4. Community-based partnership initiatives for GEF-SGP launched by at least 4 LGUs by end of Year 4</p>	<p>1. 9,555 local resource users and managers trained in various aspects of biodiversity management and organization work. In addition, the CPMU produced 88 trainers in Ecosystem Valuation, CBMEs & BDFE and M&E.</p> <p>2. Several project grantees submitted project proposals to other grant makers for replication some of them already obtaining approval. The CPMU is assisting the grantees.</p> <p>3. Co-funding from grantees exceeded the total grant amount by 7%.</p> <p>4. Four community based partnerships were launched by LGUs.</p>
<p>Outcome 5: Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends</p> <p>1. At least 80 community groups grantees participate in training; Improvements of 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E</p>	<p>1. M&E framework has completed, 2. TOT has been done for 30 participants, 3. All grantees trained on M&E, 4. Improvements in reporting were observed in many grantees,</p>

Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons learned

Conclusions:

1. SGP remains relevant:
 - a. National targets and international commitments
The conservation through community and landscape-based approach implemented by SGP5 is very relevant to the initiatives and plans of the Philippines government especially in relations to Section 3 A on Cross Cutting Concerns specifically on the protection of Key Biodiversity Areas of the PBSAP 2015-2028 and Chapter 10; Goal 1. Improved Conservation, Protection and rehabilitation of Natural Resources of the Philippines Development Plan 2016-2022. SGP5 project also contributed to increasing the established terrestrial and marine protected areas of the country as indicated in the Aichi Target 11 Strategic Goal C which requires that “ By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water and 10% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrate into the wider landscape and seascapes.”
 - b. Civil Society can greatly contribute to meeting targets and SGP provides avenue for it.
 - c. In the Philippine context where the accountability of NGOs is in question, SGP provides an opportunity for CSOs, the genuine ones at least, to disprove accusations of corruption.
 - d. SGP provides opportunities for CSOs to assert “participatory development”.
2. SGP5 in the Philippines proved strong in social inclusion, showing that biodiversity conservation is everybody’s work and for everyone’s benefit:
 - a. Women, youth and children
 - b. Indigenous People
 - c. It has potential to include more, e.g., elders, PWDs, urban poor
 - d. It can also include other professions that are not normally included: accountants, medical workers, engineers, food servers, etc.
3. There are a number of good things about the design:
 - a. As stated, how it contributes to national targets and global benefits is clear
 - b. It scales up the work of SGP from scattered and independent small projects to landscape-based synergistic community of projects
 - c. It adopts the Grant Maker Plus strategy that gives emphasis to KM and capability-building
4. However, there are aspects of the design that could have been better:
 - a. Some targets are too ambitious
 - i. Target landscapes are too large (400,000 ha). While the projects exceeded the target, it is submitted that this is so only because of the legal instruments that covered such expanse. However, there are no actual interventions that took place in all of them.
 - ii. Targeting replication projects is not apt. Replication should only happen when a past project already shows at least a color of sustainability – something that cannot be determined after only 1-2 years of implementation.
 - b. The management is too complicated
 - c. Uncertainties in the design caused delays
 - i. RP was not identified – the procurement process took too long
 - ii. Landscapes were not identified, the priority sites are too large
 - d. The M&E was not well-designed

5. SGP5 was able to fulfill and even exceeded much of its targets

Recommendations

1. In the production landscape, biodiversity mainstreaming has focused primarily on improving and changing production practices to be more biodiversity friendly with a focus on sectors that have significant biodiversity impacts (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, and extractives). In the future, mainstreaming must go beyond that by; a). Developing policy and regulatory framework that provides incentives for biodiversity-friendly land and resource use, b). Spatial and land-use planning should ensure that land and resource use is appropriately situated to maximize production without undermining or degrading biodiversity, and c) Pilot an array of financial mechanisms (certification, payment for environmental services, access and benefit sharing agreements, etc.) to provide financial incentives to actors to change current practices that may be degrading biodiversity.
2. DENR should take action to ensure that all co- management plans developed under SGP5 have complete signed agreements in some form and to monitor its progress in a timely manner. The ownership of the initiatives by the community will be greatly enhanced and sustainability is more likely to happen. The co-management must be institutionalized within NIPAS to ensure real implementation of such options of management of protected areas.
3. The co-funding requirement could be made more specific or included so that the grantees and implementing agencies can plan early on and monitor this closely. This could be in the form of more investment on the part of other line agencies/departments in environment related outcome or large private sector investment on a landscapes production or other donor funding. At the moment the co-funding requirement is at the grantee level and the obligation is on the grantees to obtain this. The implementing agencies should be doing this under the cross cutting activities.
4. Enforcement activities are part of management of PAs. Stakeholders are increasingly concerned with the slow response by the authorities for reported violation committed within the PAs/ LCAs. There is a need to focus or increase the enforcement activities by grantees as part of their objectives and targets within the project, a mechanism which would provide quick response to reported violations between authorities and the stakeholders should be set up and more stakeholders should be deputized and properly equipped and funded for patrolling and enforcement activities by LGUs and local police and perhaps, SGP7 should consider this in the scope of project proposals. This should encourage innovative and effective enforcement of PAs management.
5. The separation of funds for grants and cross cutting activities should be decided at the design stage so that the grant giving out process and timing can be managed earlier and progress can be monitored sooner. This should also provide better planning for cross cutting activities and work plans.
6. Multiyear work plan must be created at the design stage so that the project management team and NSC have a basis for activities planning early on. It should serve as guide for budget management, progress reporting and risk management.

7. The National Steering Committee should not be chaired by NPD. It should be chaired by the DENR's undersecretary or persons delegated who preferably is of higher position than the NPD in the implementing agency. This is important for separation of powers and accountability. NPD should be responsible in reporting the progress of the project to NSC with the support of the CPM. NPD is the single responsible person on behalf of the implementing agency for the project and should not be chairing the NSC meeting.
8. Project Management Unit should have monthly meetings with properly accomplished minutes of meeting and should be chaired by the National Project Director. This meeting should be attended by project staff, NPD and the relevant officers from the implementing agency and UNDP. This meeting is important to identify issues, monitoring project risk and progress and to follow up matter arising at the NSC meetings. It is also suggested that the CPM should be invited to attend BMB management meetings so that sharing of information will be to all operating units of BMB and not just limited to focal persons assigned to SGP.
9. The project must have a communication plan at the design stage as part of the cross cutting activities. This is crucial so that the PMU can develop the work plan for delivering the communication plans output in timely manner.
10. SGP7 should seriously consider promoting the strategic grants to capable NGO/CSOs who would access SGP7. There were many grantees who expressed that the \$50 thousand maximum amount per grantee may not be sufficient for effective implementation of project goals and targets for landscape projects.
11. As part of the project's monitoring and evaluation system, assessment on knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) among targeted communities and relevant NGOs and agencies should be done before and after the implementation of activities on awareness and capacity building. This is to determine the project's impact on awareness and capacity building on the values of biological resources among the project stakeholder.
12. GEF Focal Point Philippines should continue with the next phase of SGP7. SGP-5 has built a solid case for community participation in biodiversity conservation by providing concrete examples of the various roles that communities play in biodiversity protection and management, and sustainable use. National GEF Steering Committee should conduct active and inclusive participation of all stakeholders to decide the scope and approach to be taken. The relevant objectives and targets in 2015-2028 Philippine Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (PBSAP) that relates to communities should be the starting point for discussion.
13. The landscape approach should be continued because it provides focus and monitoring on specific environmental problems, clear goals and partnerships and indicators and targets. This is relevant either way for single or multi-focal areas for SGP7 implementation. It is also recommended that some of SGP5 activities that have shown good results should be continued in SGP7. Two years of implementation is not enough to address all the problems and threats to biodiversity.
14. The standard UNDP M&E approach is not adequate to capture what is really being accomplished at the project level. SGP7 must apply theory of change to identify the problems to be addressed and the corresponding objectives, outcome, output and activities

to be framed for implementation and monitoring. The SGP5 developed M&E manual has introduced the use of the Theory of Change (ToC) in combination with Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) at the project and program level. This can be used in developing the M&E for SGP 7. A ToC if done right captures the logical and plausible causal link between inputs to activities to outputs to outcomes. In RBME one monitors for efficiency-the delivery of inputs and conduct of activities to generate outputs, and evaluates for effectiveness- the concomitant generation of outputs, the use of these outputs to produce outcomes and emerging impacts.

15. As one of the upgraded countries under SGP, Philippines should consider NIM implementation with UNDP support. However, since there are only two options provided in the SGP guidelines and NIM is not one of them the current RP of SGP5 should be considered as possible implementation partner. It has the tract record and experience in implementing small grants project even prior to their engagement in SGP5 as RP and the institutional memory of what has been done and accomplished in SGP5 which would help facilitate implementation of SGP7.
16. Delayed signing of agreements, approval of tenure instruments and other management concerns has caused delays in the smooth implementation of SGP5 and has also been experienced in previous SGP4. This risk should be addressed early on in the implementation of SGP7.
17. It is also recommended that mechanism for assisting potential grantees in writing project proposals should be put in place when the call for proposals shall be given for SGP7. Poor quality of project proposals has been one of the major cause of delay in grant approvals.

Lessons Learned

1. It is a must that a data base be developed and put in place to monitor project accomplishments. Design of the database should respond to a well-developed Monitoring and Evaluation tool which should be based on the Theory of Change and Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation. The usual use of the Microsoft Excel program is not adequate to help project management to track the progress of accomplishments for multi small grants as evidenced in the constant changes the accomplishment figures of the project,
2. Total Economic Valuation for Ecosystems Services as tool, is too complicated for community users to understand and use in their management planning. TEV at community level should be orientation level the aim of which is for them to appreciate use of it as a guide for planning.
3. Grantees are very poor in writing project proposals and project reports. This is evidenced by the fact that despite the simplified template for the Terminal Report, more than 50% of the grantees still had to be handheld in preparing their reports. More than anything, this is a question of capability/skills on the part of the grantees.

- **Evaluation Rating Table**

1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. IA& EA Execution	Rating
M&E Design at Project Start	MS	Implementing Agency Execution	S

M&E Plan Implementation	S	Executing Agency Execution	S
Overall Quality of M&E	S	Overall Quality of Project Implementation / Execution	S
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Relevance	R	Financial Resources	L
Effectiveness	S	Socio-economic/political	L
Efficiency	S	Institutional Framework and Governance	L
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	S	Environmental	ML
		Overall Likelihood of Risks to Sustainability	ML
5. Impact	Rating		
Environmental Status Improvement	S		
Environmental Stress Reduction	S		
Progress towards Stress/Status Change	S		
Overall Project Results	S		

HS = Highly Satisfactory; S = Satisfactory; MS = Moderately Satisfactory; MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory; U= Unsatisfactory; HU = Highly Unsatisfactory; L= Likely; ML = Moderately Likely; MU = Moderately Unlikely; U = Unlikely; R = Relevant; NR = Not Relevant

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

1. In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. This Terminal Evaluation (TE) is for The Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF – Small Grants Programme in the Philippines (GEF-SGP OP5) (PIMS #4517).

2. As stated in the Terms of Reference, (**Annex 1**) the objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of the benefits from this project to the Philippines and for UNDP’s future programmes especially in SGP GEF initiatives. In accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, this TE is also intended to “promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives; including the global environmental benefits”.

1.2 Scope and Methodology

3. The evaluation was conducted by one International Consultant and one National Consultant between April 9th and June 30th 2018 over a 27 day work period. Fifteen days were used for the in-country project site visits between 23rd April and 10 May 2018. This TE was carried out almost 6 months prior to the closure of the project (after extension) and one year after the Mid-Term evaluation. The principal responsibility for managing the evaluation was the UNDP CO in the Philippines. The CPMU was responsible for liaising with the Terminal Evaluation Team (TET) to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

4. As per the TOR, the TE was conducted in accordance with the “UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-financed Projects (2012)”; and the “*GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*”, and in line with GEF principles including independence, impartiality, transparency, and participation. The (TET) reviewed and agreed to adhere to the UNEG “Ethical

Guidelines for Evaluations”. As per The “Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form” signed by the TET, all information gathered by the TET is considered confidential.

5. The TE seeks to provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. In this regard, the TET followed a participatory and consultative approach, and used a variety of evaluation instruments to triangulate information gathered from projects reports including:

5.1. Evaluation Matrix: An evaluation matrix was developed based on the set of questions covering the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact which were included in the TOR for the TE. The matrix **Annex 2** served as a general guide for the interviews conducted by the TEE.

5.2. Document Review: The TEE reviewed documents including the project document, project progress reports including (PIR, APR, QPR), Audit Reports, Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) Report, minutes of NSC meeting, project files, policy and national strategy documents, and other relevant documents. **Annex 3** list the documents reviewed. The information on the different project reports were further validated as discussed below.

5.3. Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions: In-person individual and group interviews were conducted with more than 100 stakeholders. Many of these meetings took place with small groups at all levels – national, regional, local stakeholders and grantees. Interviews were conducted in both English and Filipino. FGDs and KII were done in Puerto Princesa City, Palawan; Lawaan, Eastern Samar; Catarman, Northern Samar; Bayombong, Nueva Viscaya and at the BMB in Quezon City. The list of respondents is attached as **Annex 4**.

5.4. Follow-up Email & Skype Communications: As time did not allow for all the necessary information to be gathered during the in-country mission, a significant amount of data was requested by email from the CPMU, other project stakeholders and project consultants. Skype conference was made with Ms. Diana Salvemini, CPMT New York.

5.5. Project Site Visits: Site visits were extremely useful in validating project implementation, results and impacts. Arrangements for travel, venues of meetings and specific sites to be visited were done by the CPMU staff in consultation with the TET. Due to time constraints of the evaluation and the distances to be covered, the TET was able to visit only some of the project sites. Visits were made to – areas representing; coastal and marine, lowland, montane and island landscapes where the TET met several grantees and stakeholders. Specifically the TET visited the following project sites located: Palawan, Barangays Sabang, Binduyan and Candis III in Puerto Princesa City; In Samar Island, Municipalities of Lawaan, Mondragon, Biri and Lavizares. Due to insufficient time and difficulty of access, project sites in Sierra Madre were not visited but representatives from each project site were invited for FGDs in Bayombong, Nueva Viscaya. Eight of them were able to attend the sessions in addition; four grantees attended the FGD for Southern Sierra Madre held at the BMB in Quezon City. **Annexes 5 and 6** contain the itinerary of site visits, and the photo documentation of the site visits, FGDs and KIIs, respectively.

6. Ratings: In accordance with GEF guidelines for project evaluations, the TET rated project achievements and outcomes according to the GEF project review criteria (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results and Sustainability), using the obligatory GEF ratings of: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). A full description of these ratings and other GEF rating scales is provided in **Annex 7**. The TET also rated various dimensions of sustainability of project outcomes using the GEF obligatory rating scale: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), and; Unlikely (U).

1.3 Limitation

7. Some of the interviews were limited due to time constraints. There were also occasions where interviewees could not be met due to conflict in schedule. The project site visits were limited due to short field mission of 15 days. The documentations for M&E from the CPMU and RP and grantees were not organised and information and evidence were not given earlier, hence it took some time to synthesise and make conclusions. The TET did not have a chance to attend on-going workshops or seminars or NSC meetings to observe and learn the stakeholders' dynamics.

1.4 Structure of this Report

8. This terminal evaluation report documents the achievements and successes as well as the shortcomings and constraints encountered by the project and include five sections organized as per the Table of Contents included in the TOR for terminal evaluations. Section 1 briefly describes the purpose, scope and methodology of the evaluation; Section 2 presents an overview of the project; and Section 3 presents the findings of the evaluation. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons are presented in Section 4. Section 5 contains the accompanying annexes.

2. Project Description and Development Context

2.1 Project Start and Duration

9. GEF-SGP started in the Philippines in 1992 with five phases implemented so far: Phase 1 (1992-1995), Phase 2 (1996-2000), Phase 3 (2001-2005), Phase 4 (2006-2010) and the current SGP5. The Project Document for SGP 5 was signed in June 2013 and supposed to end on 30 July 2017 with a 4-year project period. However, due to the delay in the implementation, a no-cost extension was recommended by the NSC and was approved by the UNDP-GEF on August 18, 2017, extending the project to December 2018. The setback was primarily caused by the delays in organizing the CPMU and hiring of personnel. The bidding and contracting of the Responsible Party (RP). At the start the (RP) faced challenges in kicking off the work of the Project Technical Review Committee (PTRC) (**Annex 8** contains the TOR of the PTRC). The first batch of grants proposal was received by the CPMU in December 2014, but the PTRC was only able to do the technical review in May 2015. The first NSC evaluation was done in June 2015. In addition, implementation of grantees of projects located in ancestral domains suffered significant delays because the processing of the Free and Prior Informed Consent by target ICCs took time. The process took three months at best, and 1.5 years at worst.

2.2 Problems that the Project Sought to Address

10. The Philippines is host to over 52,000 species of flora and fauna, with 13,500 plant species comprising 5% of the world's total flora. 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.

11. Three of the most important regions where biodiversity resources are inextricably linked to the livelihoods and well-being of local and indigenous communities are the Sierra Madre Mountains, Samar Island and Palawan. These have been selected by the SGP 4 National Steering Committee as priority sites the fifth operational phase on the basis of their global biodiversity significance (including the number of Key Biodiversity Areas, protected areas and protected landscapes therein), the presence of a strong network of community-based organizations active in conservation issues, and opportunities to catalyze convergence with complementary initiatives and partners.

12. Given the general recognition of the importance of biodiversity, however, threats to biodiversity continue to exist. The Philippine Medium-Term Development Plan 2004 – 2010 profiles the destruction of forest, freshwater and marine ecosystems and the resulting biodiversity crisis. With

the loss of biodiversity comes a reduction in the natural capital (total economic value of ecosystem services) that local communities depend upon. The latest environmental indicators show that the various aspects of environmental sustainability are rated poor or low. Overall, the ability of the major ecosystems to provide and maintain a regular stream of economic goods and ecological services has been significantly affected due to declining stocks and reduced coverage and quality of forest. The ongoing threats are *habitat destruction/ land use change, overexploitation of biodiversity, and pollution*.

13. The project's long term solution is to enable communities to ensure a mosaic of land uses and resource management practices across the rural landscape that generate sustainable livelihoods while helping the Philippines meet its commitments under international agreements by generating global benefits for biodiversity.

2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

14. The project objective is to secure global environmental benefits through community-based biodiversity conservation initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines. The project aims to achieve this objective through five (5) outcome areas which are grouped into three (3) components:

14.1 Component 1: Community-based actions improve the sustainability of protected areas. Outputs and activities under this Component are structured to achieve one Outcome which is Outcome 1: Effective models for community-based governance of protected areas demonstrated. Under this component the project will strengthen community-based actions to improve the management and sustainability of protected areas (PAs) by way of exploring new ways of PA management and strengthen governance systems that can support landscape-wide coordination including rehabilitate and restore degraded habitats.

14.2 Component 2: Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors. Outputs and activities under this component are to achieve two outcomes, namely Outcome 2: Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives and Outcome 3: Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products produced and marketed by 30 communities. Work under this component will enable communities to create protected land and seascapes (PLS)/community-based land and resource use plans such as the Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP) for indigenous communities, the Local Government Unit Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs), the Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) system or other community-based natural resource management systems within which the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation objectives into sustainable community-based production activities will take place.

14.3 Component 3: Cross cutting capacity development and knowledge management. Outputs and activities are to achieve two outcomes, namely Outcome 4: Increased capacity of GEF-SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions and Outcome 5: Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends. This component supports capacity building initiatives that will equip project community partners such as CBOs with the skills, knowledge and competencies necessary to strengthen conservation and sustainability at the local level. It will also create a knowledge management platform that will facilitate linkages and cross-fertilization among grantees, promote information sharing, and provide access to knowledge resources that are relevant to their individual projects.

2.4 Main Stakeholders

15. The following project stakeholders have been identified in the ProDoc as the main stakeholders of the project. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, National Economic Development Authority, Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) Local Government Units (LGUs), private sector, IP groups within the selected sites, Local NGOs and CBOs, Academic and Research Institutions, and Women and Youth. Their specific roles and contribution in the project are discussed in section 3.2 of the report.

2.5 Expected Results

16. The expected results as described in the project's logical framework (log frame) are shown in Table 1. Some changes were made to the indicators, baseline and target during the inception workshop and reflected in the Inception Report. The original and revised indicator, baseline level and target are shown below.

Table 1 Expected Results (log frame)

Objective/ Outcome/ Output	Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project
Project Objective Global environmental benefits secured through community-based biodiversity conservation initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines	1. Increase in area under protection in community-managed or community-supported protected areas	1. None supported by the project	1. At least 100,000ha of protected areas under community management/ co-management by recipients of grants under this project.
	2. Increase in area under certified or verified sustainable use by communities	2. None supported by the project.	2. At least 400,000ha of community agricultural, fishing or forestry area under certified or verified sustainable use by communities that are recipients of grants under this project.
Outcome 1 Effective models for community-based governance of protected areas demonstrated	Number of community managed or co-managed PA models operational in project areas	No specific community co-management models identified in target areas.	Original Target: At least 10 community management or co-management models established and operational. Revised Target: At least 10 communities exhibit management or co-management models of protected areas
	Number of hectares protected through community-PA	Individual small community protection initiatives in existence in	Original Target: At least 20 communities community-managed protected or conservation areas established or enhanced encompassing at least 100,000 hectares

Objective/ Outcome/ Output	Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project
		some local communities, but no comprehensive data available	Revised Target: At least 10 community-managed protected or conservation areas established or enhanced encompassing at least 100,000 hectares
	% increase in METT	Relevant METT indicators and baseline scores to be decided prior to each relevant grant inception.	40% increase on average in relevant dimensions of management effectiveness of target PAs.
	Original Indicator: Number of ha of mangroves rehabilitated or protected. Revised Indicator: Number of ha of mangroves and/or seagrass areas rehabilitated or protected.	None identified	Original Target: 1,000 ha of mangroves rehabilitated or protected within one or more PAs. Revised Target: 1,000 hectares of mangrove and/or seagrass areas within the 100,000 ha community-managed protected or conserved areas are rehabilitated or protected
Outcome 2 Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives	Number of ha under improved community "mainstreamed" management within PLS, reducing threats to BD from slash and burn farming; over-harvesting of timber, and destructive fishing.	Zero – no hectareage is under improved community-mainstreamed management.	Original Target: 400,000 ha improved community "mainstreamed" management within PLS reducing threats to BD from slash and burn farming; over-harvesting of timber, and destructive fishing. Revised Target: 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

Objective/ Outcome/ Output	Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project
			biodiversity.
	Revised Indicator: Number of community-based land use plans or Ancestral Domain plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.	None	Original Target: At least 40 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations. Revised Target: At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.
	Number of communities adopting TEV reports or similar ecosystems valuation approaches in development of ADSPs or other community land-use plans.	No community level TEV reports	TEV or similar ecosystem valuation reports being used by at least 20 communities in the development of ADSPs or other community land-use plans.
Outcome 3 Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products produced and marketed by 30 communities	Original Indicator: Number of community level regulations or enactments for biodiversity-friendly production in key sectors Revised Indicator: Number of biodiversity-friendly products produced and marketed by communities.	Original Baseline: There are none so far enacted or promulgated. Revised Baseline: There are no records bearing out the biodiversity-friendly products of local communities.	Original Target: 30 community-level regulations or enactments for biodiversity-friendly production in key sectors. Revised Target: 30 communities produce and market biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products.
Outcome 4 Increased capacity	# Of community-level resource	None amongst grantees to be	At least 4,000 community-level resource users and managers are trained to use

Objective/ Outcome/ Output	Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project
of GEF-SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions	users and managers who are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.	selected (grants are generally awarded to grantees who have not previously benefitted from GEF-SGP capacity support)	the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.
	# of new grants that replicate approaches	None	Original Target: Conservation and sustainable use approaches of the projects are replicated in at least 30 new grants by year 4 Revised Target: Conservation and sustainable use approaches of the projects are replicated in at least 20 new grants by year 4
	% increase in amount of co-funding for the Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3	Minimum of 1:1 co-funding for grants	50% increase in amount of co-funding for Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3
	Number of governors who launch community-based partnerships by year 4	Zero	Community-based partnership initiatives for GEF-SGP launched by at least 4 LGUs by end of Year 4

Objective/ Outcome/ Output	Indicator	Baseline Level	Target level at end of project
Outcome 5 Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends	# of GEF-SGP grantees participating in monitoring and evaluation training; % increase in knowledge before/after training	Grantees not yet trained	Original Target: At least 80 community groups grantees participate in training; Improvements of 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E. Revised Target: (1) SGP Philippines M&E framework is established (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 (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

3. Findings

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

3.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

17. The objective and outcome and the corresponding indicators and targets are relevant to the development goals and conservation goals of Philippines and its international commitments, as presented in Section 3 A on Cross Cutting Concerns specifically on the protection of Key Biodiversity Areas of the Philippine Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan 2015-2028; Chapter 10, Goal 1. Improved Conservation, Protection and rehabilitation of Natural Resources of the Philippines Development Plan 2016-2022; and SGP5 project also contributed to increasing the established terrestrial and marine protected areas of the country as indicated in the Aichi Target 11 Strategic Goal C which requires that “ By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water and 10% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrate into the wider landscape and seascapes.”

Some of the projects objectives and components were not clearly stated such that they needed further clarification as evidenced in the proceedings of the SGP5 Inception Report. Some of the indicators, baseline and targets were revised after the Inception workshop; the original and revised indicators, baseline and targets are presented in Table 1 Expected Results.

3.1.2 Risks

18. Table 2 lists the risks identified for the project as indicated in the ProDoc. The last column indicates our findings. Perhaps risks 1 and 2 should have been identified as of higher risk category so that the NSC could have followed up on a quarterly basis. This could have prevented some of the delays in implementations due to poor capability of CSOs in proposal writing and inability to get FPIC and NGO certifications. This has been identified as lessons learned from SGP 4 which noted project management issues and delays in the signing of agreements, and implementation of the projects. Same high risks should be noted in the design of SGP7.

Table 2 Risks

Description	Date Identified	Type	Impact and Probability	Findings
1. Grantees have varying levels of technical and management capacity and may fail to complete a project or to take advantage of opportunities for community in conservation initiatives.	03/ 2011	Strategic	Low	<p>Despite the orientation write-shops and very good grant making guidelines prepared and provided to potential grantees, there had been difficulties in encouraging submission of project proposals from CSO/POs due to their poor ability to write project proposals. Some of those who submitted had to do several revisions before their proposals were endorsed by the PTRC to the NSC. Despite the endorsement some proposals were still returned by the NSC to the proponents for further revision before they were finally approved. Per guideline, under ideal situation it would take 42 days for a project proposal to be approved. Preparation and signing/approval of grant agreements and mobilization funds also took time.</p> <p>To remedy the situation the CPMU hired proposal writers to help project proponents in writing proposals. The NSC recognized this as a wise intervention acknowledging that while many NGOs and POs are good at what they do on the ground, they often have challenges in writing proposals. Out of the 55 approved only one failed to complete their</p>

Description	Date Identified	Type	Impact and Probability	Findings
				project. (Bono Bono Gintong Butil Multi-Purpose Cooperative)
2. Government regulatory processes can outlast the typical lifespan of a grant (2years)	05/2011	Strategic	Medium	Despite the willingness of IP communities to participate in the project, it took sometime before the NCIP was able to issue the Certification Precondition for areas to be included in the project. The process took three (3) months at best, and 1.5 years at worst. This was in fact one of the justifications for the 18-month extension of SGP-5.
3. Climate unpredictability may affect the level of success of the projects biodiversity conservation work such as habitat restoration and thereby constrain project achievements or affect their impact.	05/2011	Environmental	Medium	Reforestation and agricultural activities were affected by typhoons and drought, but due to the persistence of the beneficiaries they were able to recover and finish their respective projects.
4. Baseline government funding for community based initiatives may continue to be limited.	05/2011	Financial	Low	The DENR National Greening Program provided funds for community based initiatives for reforestation and rehabilitation of upland and mangrove areas. Some of the grantees were able to avail NGP projects.
5. Grantees may not, in the end, meet their co-funding obligations under each small grant proposal.	05/2011	Financial	Low-Med	Based on the submitted report of the RP, as of June 2018 total co-financing amounted to Php. 143, 730, 411.00, which 7% is higher than the total grant amount.

18. We were also informed that there were risks not identified during project conceptualization but occurred during project implementation and were monitored and addressed by the project. Example of this is organizational conflict between grantees/beneficiaries due to allegations of lack of transparency on the use of funds and mis-use of SGP grant funds.

3.1.3. Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

20. The SGP5 design did take into account other on-going relevant initiatives in the country including the UNDP projects, such as the New Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project (NewCAPP) and the Biodiversity Partnership Project (BPP). Those two projects were identified as supporting and complement higher level policy, institutional and technical capacity that relates to community- based initiatives.

21. Linkages were made between SGP5 beneficiaries with the National Greening Program of the DENR. Some of the POs were awarded contracts for upland and mangrove reforestation and protection (LAPAS, PAKIBA, EVPRD, Sitio Maguli, and Candis III). The Biodiversity Partnership Project's initiatives on BDFE provided inputs and Technical Bulletins that provided basic reference for BDFE activities of SGP5. The establishments of local conservation areas and the documentation of ICCAs, which actually trace their beginning from the earlier operational phases of SGP, was further enhanced through the NewCAPP, and thus gained more momentum under SGP5.

3.1.4. Planned stakeholder participation

22. The identification of stakeholders and their respective roles and responsibilities were noted in the design. However, the identification of specific stakeholders was not done due to absence of specific identified landscapes in the priority sites. This resulted in missed opportunity to do stakeholder analysis at the design stage that could have provided the link between the stakeholders and the targeted outcomes and indicators as well as the risk factors involved.

23. The process of stakeholder participation at the design stage was not recorded to indicate the extent of consultation done. The Inception Report provides a better picture of the participation of stakeholders in the discussion of objectives, outcomes, targets and indicators.

24. There was also lack of identification of private sector stakeholders that could support the achievements of some of the target outcomes.

3.1.5 Replication approach

25. The project has strong elements for replication. The projects intention to build capacity of communities on PA management and biodiversity conservation can be replicated through the assistance of the government agencies represented in the NSC. The broader adoption of this governance modality with policy support from the government will translate to more rapid establishment of new conservation areas that can be managed by the communities; example of this policy is the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board Resolution No 908, series 2013 approving the Enhanced Comprehensive Land Use Plan guidebook for local government. The guide book has adopted the ridge-to-reef or integrate watershed ecosystems management framework to emphasize the interrelationship between the upland, lowland and coastal ecosystems. The guidebook has also integrated special areas and thematic concerns such as ancestral domain, biodiversity, heritage and green growth in the land use planning process to ensure the conservation and sustainable management of these critical elements.

3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

26. UNDP is the administrator of the SGP and as such has a great comparative advantage as the Implementing Agency for SGP5. Moreover, the UNDP CO has a great deal of experience with biodiversity conservation projects and with GEF projects. It is well informed of all UNDP/GEF projects in the country and periodically convenes all of the project directors of those projects to share information and experience with each other and with UNDP.

27. UNDP has extensive experience working with both Government and civil society. UNDP's mission involves enhancing the well-being of people while protecting the environment and as such it is perfectly suited to be the Implementing Agency for this project.

28. UNDP's working relationship with the BMB as the Implementing Partner is excellent and this synergy provides UNDP huge comparative advantage.

3.1.7 Management arrangements

30. The Managements arrangement and organizational structure described in the ProDoc is complicated and creates overlapping functions. SGP5 is implemented using the National Implementation Modality (NIM), with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources as the Implementing Partner and UNDP as the GEF Executing Agency. As such the DENR through its staff bureau BMB, will be responsible and accountable for implementing and managing the project, including monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outputs, and for the efficient use of resources as such it is expected that BMB will assign regular staff on full time basis to implement SGP5. However, the Prodoc also provides that an NGO will be contracted and will be designated as Responsible Party, that will be made "responsible for the day to day operation of the program and facilitate the grant-making process including human resources management, budgeting, accounting, grant disbursement, auditing and procurement, as well as providing technical advisory services for grant monitoring and supervision, capacity building, knowledge management, communication and advocacy". This is a duplication of the responsibilities of BMB as implementing party. Furthermore, a CPMU with a corresponding staff will be created and housed within the RP office. The CPMU was given the responsibility to work closely with the NGO partner in "1) ensuring compliance with the overall GEF-SGP Results Framework and national environmental priorities; 2) preparing the GEF-SGP annual work programme and reports to UNDP and other donors, and 3) ensuring achievements of the national GEF-SGP targets." This is another layer of management directly reporting to UNDP.

3.1.7.1 The National Steering Committee (NSC)

31. The NSC's TOR was appropriate and captures the necessary work that need to be carried out by NSC. The NSC has met for 10 times until August 2017. The issues and suggestions discussed seemed to get full engagement and commitment from the NSC members. The NSC membership is equally distributed between government representatives (7) and NGOs (7) and UNDP (1)). **Annex 9** contains the list of members and their contact numbers. It is noted that both government and NGO involvement and participation in the NSC discussion was very constructive and engaging. However regular member's attendance to meetings was not consistent and they are represented by their designated alternates. The NGO members were also aware of the restriction on grant availment by NSC members and did not participate as grantees.

32. The NSC chaired by a DENR Under-Secretary who is also the GEF Country Operational Focal Point. However, in practice, most of the meetings were chaired by the designated National Project Director for SGP5 who is also the Director of the BMB. This is not appropriate considering that the National Project Director is to report on the progress of the project to the NSC Chair and the rest of the Committee. Technically the CPM is to assist the NPD to present the progress to the NSC. The NPD should never chair the NSC meetings. As of April 2018, there have been 10 NSC meetings. Majority of the discussions has been mostly on approving the project proposals which is understandable due to the need to award grant projects in order to catch up with project implementation. It was only when substantial accomplishments have been made by the grantees and after validation by the RP that progress on projects was presented.

33. The expertise required based on the objectives and outcomes of SGP5; is adequate between the members of the NSC. They were able to provide solutions to issues discussed. However, involvement of private sector is completely lacking, though the Philippines Business for Environment is a member representing the private sector but hardly attended the meetings. This is especially so given the Biodiversity Friendly Enterprise (BDFE) target of the project. Similarly not all agencies were able to sort out issues with ease to help the CPMU to move on some of the bottle necks. A case in point is the NCIP's tedious Free and Prior Informed Consent process despite the fact that the IP beneficiaries had expressed their interest and given written consent.

3.1.7.2 Country Programme Management Unit

34. The design document provided for three positions for the CPMU (Country Programme Manager, Program Associate and Admin and Finance Associate) this failed to take into account that SGP5 is bigger and more complex to implement and that the standard staffing prescribed in the earlier phases of SGP will be in-adequate to cope with the work demand for a landscape approach implementation. Given the bigger amounts to disburse an Admin and Finance Associate will not be able to meet the accounting, bookkeeping, disbursements and reporting requirements of a multi-million dollar programme. One person doing accounting and disbursements violates the principle of check and balance. Likewise a Programme Associate will be challenged to perform all the M&E requirements for tracking and validating project progress due to the number of projects and difficulty of accessing project sites.

35. The ProDoc states that the NGO RP shall house the CPMU. However, this did not materialize and instead the CPMU was provided with an office space at the BMB building to facilitate reporting and coordination between the NPD and the CPMU. In view of these higher levels of coordination effort has to be done by CPMU with the RP staff holding office in another location.

3.1.7.3 Responsible Party

36. The RP has clear TOR and contract. It had staff capacity to be able to execute the tasks assigned. The selection of RP took some time, first because there was dearth of applicants; and, second, the contract amount required the approval of the UNDP Regional Office in Bangkok. Ultimately, the Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) was selected. FPE is a domestic small grant making institution that supports the environmental initiatives of NGOs and POs, much like GEF-SGP. It has been in existence for more than 25 years now.

37. It is noted that the RP arrangement is a new experience compared to the earlier phase of SGP implementation. The RP set up the PTRC to assess proposals before they are brought to NSC for approval. They commenced work August 28, 2014 which is one year after the start of the project. As mentioned in paragraph 35 RP and CPMU offices are physically separate which creates some bureaucratic delays in the operation of SGP5 such as the difficulty in convening the members of the PTRC and the conduct of M&E for grant projects. It should also be noted that RP is tasked to develop the SGP5 database, but this was not done they used Microsoft Excel program for presentation of project progress.

3.1.7.4 Project Technical Review Committee

38. The PTRC is composed of 11 members with multi sectoral expertise six from NGOs and five from mandatory agencies and UNDP. The PTRC TOR and composition is attached as **Annex 8**. They were, convened and supported administratively by the RP. The selection obtained the approval from the NSC. The composition of the PTRC members is appropriate given the scope and nature of the project's outcome and targets. The invitation to submit project proposals by the CPMU generated 62

proposals which were reviewed by the PTRC. Out of this the NSC approved 56 projects, two of which did not pursue their project due to their failure to secure FPIC approval from NCIP. The others were returned for revisions but the proponents did not resubmit.

39. To avoid the cost of face to face meetings to review proposals; the RP originally conceived that the review of project proposals be done via internet with each expert sending their comments by email and the RP consolidating the comments. This however did not work which caused further delays in the review and endorsement of the projects. CPMU had to ask the RP that face to face meetings of the PTRC be done to be able to make progress in the review of project proposals.

40. The PTRC members serve on voluntary basis and are not paid for their services. However, face to face project reviews are difficult, repetitive and time consuming for the PTRC experts, the experts will also incur expenses attending the meetings perhaps in the future, consideration should be made to compensate them for the use of their time and expertise.

3.1.8 Monitoring and Evaluation: design at entry

41. This section is an assessment of the design of the M&E plan. The M&E design should take into account the scope, approach and objectives of the project as well as the need for capacity building for M&E understanding and implementation. The M&E plan for the project was established using the standard UNDP GEF requirements and was very process oriented regarding the timely monitoring and evaluation activities like audit, midterm and final evaluation, site visits, budgets and reporting of progress. Responsible parties for each M&E activity were properly identified however there were no specific discussion on what will be the role of each actor in the conduct of the M&E. The allotted budget for M&E in the amount of \$250,000 is adequate to fund the identified activities.

42. The setting up of indicators, baseline and targets also form a big part of the M&E at design phase for the project. The indicators, baseline and targets for objectives and outcome were determined arbitrarily without any reference or basis. Most of the baselines level was based on assumption without prior knowledge from any data base or records. The M&E capacity building targets and indicators were also missing at the design stage.

RATING: M&E DESIGN AT ENTRY: MARGINALLY SATISFACTORY

3.2 Project Implementation

3.2.1 Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

43. To facilitate implementation and coordination with BMB the CPMU was provided an office space within the BMB building. Some modifications were made on the staffing to be able to cope with the work demand of SGP5 as shown in **Annex 10**. Three of the staff was appointed by UNDP, while the rest were appointed by BMB. The expertise required is appropriate to execute the tasks of the CPMU. It is noted that there are no records of inter-office meetings between NPD and CPMU. This country team meeting are important for the NPD to set direction and get updates regularly from CPMU, RP and UNDP representatives. It is also noted that CPMU's updates and response to queries are good and seemed fully in control of the situation and perhaps is stretched in terms of task – managing the CPMU as well as implementing cross cutting activities. Constant contact with the Hubs, RP, LGUs and the grantees was maintained by CPMU. The staff that helped the TET coordinates the mission schedule and site visit were rather new hire. It took sometime before information can be generated for previous year's accomplishments, but nevertheless they were able to adequately cope with the demands of their jobs. None of the original staff who started with the project have

remained; they either transferred to other UNDP projects or were pirated by other institutions. This will make the project closing activities very challenging for the CPM and the new hires.

44. The BMB assigned regular staff on part-time basis to provide technical assistance to the PTRC, and help facilitate the processing of administrative and financial requirements of the project. Signing and approval of grant agreements is deemed faster compared to previous UNOPS approval scheme. This strengthened the development of CSO and BMB partnership in addressing environmental challenges.

45. Guidelines for grantees developed are good. It is written in both English and Filipino to help CSOs and POs prepare viable project proposals. It explains what SGP5 is all about and clearly states what projects are eligible and the allowable expenses. It explains the project requirements, project costs, proponent eligibility, grant limits, co-financing, project duration and the evaluation criteria. It provided a template/proposal format for Small Grants, Planning Grants and Strategic Projects, which is easy to follow for those who have experience in writing project proposals. The complete set of guidelines is attached as **Annex 12**. In addition to the grant making guidelines, CPM conducted project development workshop per priority site and hired proposal writers to help CSOs/POs in preparing their project proposals.

3.2.2 Site Hubs

46. The idea to set up the Hubs for SGP is rather new but a good one given the landscape approach for implementation. The Hubs received Strategic Grants. Aside from doing on-site projects (similar to other small grant recipients), they also acted as communication centers in their respective sites. They conducted annual site-based conferences as platform for knowledge sharing, networking for policy advocacy, and for ensuring synergistic actions within landscapes. They also facilitated capacity building activities for SGP grantees and other stakeholders. In addition, they helped the CPMU and the RP in monitoring, the progress of projects within the landscapes and the priority sites. As an innovation, the NSC required the CPMU to prepare a TOR for the Hubs (please see **Annex 11**) The Hubs were offered to submit grant proposals as such because of their leadership and wide CSO network in the site.

47. Four hubs were selected, represented by three CSOs (Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement Inc. for Northern Sierra Madre, Center for Empowerment and Resource Development for Samar Island, Tangol Kalikasan Inc., for Southern Sierra Madre) and one existing network organisation with membership (Palawan NGO Network Inc. for Palawan). It is noted here that the Sierra Madre Mountain Range was divided into two (Southern or Lower Sierra Madre, and Northern or Upper Sierra Madre) because of the sheer size of this priority site, which traverses 10 provinces.

48. The site Hub strategy has enhanced cooperation and synergy among the CSOs and other local players in each priority site. It has also democratized to a certain extent the management of GEF-SGP projects, thus the governance of SGP5.

3.2.3 Indicators

49. There were some changes done on project indicators and targets during implementation. It is noted that these changes are warranted given the practicality of achieving the original targets. These included the indicator for Outcome 3, which originally required a number of community level regulations or enactments for biodiversity friendly production in key sectors; which has already been done by the BPP project, and was pointed out during the inception workshop thus the suggestion to change this to a number of biodiversity-friendly products produced and marketed by communities. The target for Outcome 5 was also changed and made to be more specific. On the other hand the 40

community land use plan target for Outcome 2 was reduced to 30 community land use plans. The changes are shown in Table 1 and the effectiveness of project section of this report.

3.2.4 Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

50. The following project stakeholders have been active in providing guidance in their roles as NSC members or as project partner/ beneficiary in project implementation. National government agencies facilitated provision of technical assistance to the grantees through their respective field offices.

50.1 Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)

The DENR is the designated GEF Operational Focal Point for the Philippines and Chair of the National Steering Committee (NSC). The DENR's mandate is to protect, conserve and manage the environment and natural resources of the country. The DENR and its concerned bureau, the BMB (PAWB) were involved in the formulation of appropriate policies, guidelines and tools to improve the implementation of SGP plans and programs including policies on biodiversity. Their active participation in the NSC meetings helped facilitate approval of grant projects.

50.2. In the course of project implementation local offices of the DENR provided direct technical and policy support to grantees. Examples include the following:

1. The Community Environment and Natural Resources Office (CENRO)-Cabagan, Isabela assisted the MLFPC in Malasi Lake develop their project proposal and provided technical guidance in the implementation of the project as well as in the preparation of their progress reports.
2. The CENRO-Infanta, Quezon measured the ICCA of the TCD
3. The CENRO-Catarman, Northern Samar facilitated the expansion of the abaca plantation for the EVPRD project
4. The Provincial ENRO/ Protected Area Superintendent's Office (PENRO/PASu) of Biri LaRoSa Protected Landscape and Seascape facilitated the signing of the MOA between the PAMB and LAPAS as well as the measurement of their project site
5. The PASu Office of the Tumauini Protected Landscape and Seascape in Isabela guided the implementation of the project of SMFPC, especially the measurement of their project site and the establishment of their tree nursery.

50.3. National Economic Development Authority (NEDA)

NEDA is the planning agency of the government and oversees the planning and monitoring of the UNDP Country Programme. It monitors and evaluates the implementation of the Project, as part of its inherent role in the management of the ODA portfolio. They participated actively in the NSC meetings and discussions and sometimes chaired the NSC meetings.

50.4. Department of Agriculture (DA)

The DA provided policy support to the development of alternative biodiversity products from agriculture and fisheries. Through their respective field-offices they provided financial resources and farm and fishing implements to some of the grantees and beneficiaries, such as the additional funds to NAC to build additional egg incubators for the rice duck project, pump boats for patrolling established MPA and paddle boats for seaweeds culture of grantees. BFAR provided technical assistance to PAKIBA for their mud crab fattening livelihood.

50.5. Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG)

This agency provided administrative supervision over all LGUs. As member of the NSC the DILG guided the CPMU on how to facilitate the enactment and adoption of local ordinances, resolutions and plans.

50.6 National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP)

NCIP acted as primary partner that looked after the interests of the IPs in project sites within ancestral domains. They are responsible for securing the Free and Prior Informed Consent of ICCs. They are also responsible for the review of the Ancestral Domain Plan for CADC/CADT areas and the processing of application for CADT.

50.7 Local Government Units (LGUs)

The LGUs have political/administrative jurisdiction in areas where SGP projects are located. They are mandated by law to spearhead the passing of local ordinances for the establishment of local conservation areas, develop and enforce regulations in their political jurisdictions. The LGUs also provide support to the projects in terms of funding, technical expertise, logistics and facilities. Many of the SGP grantees worked closely with their respective LGUs for the incorporation of biodiversity concerns in their comprehensive land use plan and in the formulation and implementation of local development plans. They also provided technical and financial support for the operation of Bantay Dagat for established marine protected areas as those established in the Municipality of Lawaan and Barangay Binduyan in Puerto Princesa City. Technical and financial support for ecotourism projects such as the one organized in Puerto Princesa City. The establishment of the Mt. Palali –Mamparang Local Conservation Area for Biodiversity, thru Nueva Viscaya Provincial Ordinance and allocation of annual operating funds as facilitated by FRENDS are just some of the LGU support to SGP grantees. Mutual support and understanding between the LGUs and the local communities increased the projects' chances of sustaining and succeeding in protecting biodiversity corridors, and promoting sustainable management within and around PAs/KBAs.

50.8. IP groups within the selected sites

The IPs have taken an active role in the implementation of local actions to support integrated local development plans, in partnership with LGUs, local communities, DENR field offices, and other local stakeholders. They were responsible for issuing the Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) for the Project in selected areas which has to be approved by NCIP. They are also grantees and beneficiaries of SGP grants.

50.9 Local NGOs and CBOs

Local NGOs and CBOs are primary project beneficiaries. GEF – SGP worked with them in the preparation and implementation of 62 project proposals.

50.10 Academic and Research Institutions

The academic and research institutions helped provide scientific foundations for project initiatives through their research and other academic work in the regions/provinces where the Project sites are located. They were involved in the conduct of research and other studies, and in sharing of scientific-information on the sites especially so if the communities have contributed to the researches made. They provided their expertise such as advisory support to selected Project activities. Specifically the following universities provided technical inputs to the SGP grantees:

2. The Western Philippines University (PWU) in Aborlan, Palawan provided important biodiversity information through their published work in establishing the importance of the Victoria-Anepahan Mountain Range in identifying the latter as a landscape that KFI, PKM, IDEAS and NTFP-EP worked on together.

3. The University of Eastern Philippines (UEP) in Northern Samar assisted the grantees there in many ways through extension work. Some of their interventions were the fabrication of an incubator for hatching duck eggs and did regular soil analysis of the rice farms for the project of NAC. The EVPRD also benefited from the services of the technical experts of UEP in agroforestry. Similarly, PAKIBA, LAPAS and NSEP benefited a lot from the extension work of community development teachers and students of UEP. UEP professors also participated in landscape-wide discussions in Northern Samar.
4. The University of the Philippines in Tacloban City provided technical assistance in the planning process done by GDFI in Eastern Samar.
5. The Marine Science Institute of the University of the Philippines at Diliman (main campus) provided a platform (through its Professional Masters in Tropical Marine Ecosystems Management (PM-TMEM) Program for the project of MERF.
6. Agriculture experts at the University of the Philippines in Los Baños provided support to the project of UPLBFI in Rizal province.
7. The Center for Cagayan Valley Programme on Environment and Development (CCVPED) of the Isabela State University (ISU) at the Cabagan Campus helped develop the proposal of some of the proponents in Upper Sierra Madre, e.g., Sitio Maguli Producers and Farmers' Cooperative.
8. The Palawan State University (main campus and Cuyo campus) made the project of PSU-CSPG a platform for extension work for their biology, community development and business management teachers and students.
9. The following colleges and universities are hosting the Institute of Environmental Governance project of Tanggol Kalikasan, providing physical school and faculty for professional training of LGU and NGO workers: Bulacan State University (Baliwag Campus), Quirino State University, Aurora State College of Technology, Southern Luzon State University (Lucban Campus), and Central Luzon State University.

50.11. Women and Youth,

Women and youth were active partners in project implementation, their potential were harnessed to contribute in improving sustainable management in the protected areas and in the production landscapes. Of the 52 grantees for onsite projects, 31 have women project coordinator/manager or led by women's groups (e.g., FRIENDS, PRRM, LAPAS, PAKIBA, DALUHAY, and PCCI). Similarly, several beneficiary organizations are headed by women (e.g., WAIID, SABWELL, and SURSHA).

50.12. Other Government Agencies,

In addition to the stakeholders pre-identified in the project document, it should be noted that partnerships were also developed with other government agencies that provided technical assistance in the implementation of the grant projects to the communities. Some of these agencies are:

1. The Philippine Fiber Authority (PFA) provided technical advice to the abaca (Manila hemp) production and processing for the project of EVPRD in Northern Samar.
2. The Maritime Industry Authority (MARINA) provided technical advice to ensure the technical soundness of the prototype fiberglass boat built by the SSFMPC in Puerto Princesa.
3. The Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice provided technical and logistical support to the monitoring activities done by KFI in the forests of the Iwahig Penal Farm in Puerto Princesa City.

4. The local offices of the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) helped some grantees in product development, e.g., the cashew processing supported by the Culion Foundation, Inc. in Coron, Palawan.

3.2.4 Project Finance

51. Financial disbursements were very low for the first two years of operation due to the delays in the start-up of project activities, the delays were primarily caused by delays in organizing the CPMU, the bidding and contracting for the RP, the organization of the PTRC, and the low turnout of project proposals from CSO's. A catch up plan prepared by the CPMU and approved by the NSC that was put in operation beginning of the third year helped the project to catch –up with their disbursements in their 3rd year of operation. Financial management of the project was generally good with satisfactory audit. As of June 30, 2018 the project has incurred total expenditure of US\$ 3,928,603.05 out of the \$4,583,333.00 grant fund, the remaining balance of \$ 654,729.95 is expected to be fully expended by December closing of the project. **Annex 13** contains the detailed breakdown of expenditures per component.

3.2.5 Co-Financing

52. Reported co-financing of grantees as of June 2018 is PHP 143,730,441.23 which is 7% in excess of the target. Efforts made by the grantees are commendable especially to get the financing at the local level. **Annex 14** contains the breakdown of co-financing per grantee. The additional funding provided by LGU partners of the project assured the continuity of the management and protection of local conservation areas established under SGP5. Targets were exceeded due to additional resources contributed by the grantees and beneficiaries, more time and manpower were deployed to help in the implementation of project activities.

53. At the moment the in-kind co-financing and cash contribution from UNDP are not accounted for. Nevertheless, UNDP CO contribution could be under-represented as it contributed significantly in terms of personnel participation in workshops, meetings, and in terms of provision of goods and services.

3.2.6 External Audit

54. The audit conducted by COA in 2017 for 2016 expenses. The audit showed an “unqualified” result. Initially the COA had given "qualified" result due the 2% of the total expenditures audited more than the original budget. However, UNDP justified that while the NSC-approved tolerance level is absent; the case is acceptable to UNDP as long as the revision is less than 10%. The opinion was then changed from “qualified” to “unqualified”. Some minor recommendations were made by COA for the efficient implementation of the project. Similarly the project was also subject to spot check by an independent private auditor appointed by UNDP in November 2017 that showed no major issues with finance management.

3.2.7 Monitoring and Evaluation: Implementation (*)

55. During the implementation, almost all M&E process based on the project document M&E plan were carried out correctly. The site visits and progress reporting and audit were conducted timely and appropriately. Although the M&E knowledge product and training were conducted very late, the adaptive management to add this is commendable. It is noted that the outcome of the Mid Term Review is not very relevant to the project at the half way of its implementation duration. Similarly, it is acknowledged that PMU had prepared the management response and provided comments to the

MTR report. The 2017 PIR rated the overall project development objective accomplishment as moderately satisfactory with a reported 96.8% accomplishment for Indicator 1 and 77% accomplishment for Indicator 2. The overall Implementation Plan rating is also moderately satisfactory. At that time accomplishments of the targets has not yet been reached. However as of the TE the project has exceeded their targets and thus warrants a satisfactory rating.

56. Although, the Terminal Reports from the grantees are coming in late, it is commendable that efforts are being made to present better quality reports. The guidelines for these reports were also provided to the grantees.

RATING: M&E PLAN IMPLEMENTATION: SATISFACTORY

3.2.8 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

UNDP as GEF Executing Agency*

57. In its role as Executing Agency for the project, UNDP managed the SGP finances, did some procurement, issued some of the contracts and grant payments, and reported according to standard procedures on finances and administration. The UNDP provided helpful and important support to the Project especially at the initial/planning stage. The UNDP CO attended the NSC meetings and meeting with the PMU periodically to monitor, providing solutions to arising matters and contribute to information sharing from other relevant on-going initiatives. UNDP Co works very closely with the GEF Focal Point and the Implementing Partner, BMB.

58. UNDP, through its participation in the NSC and through its review of the project annual PIRs, helped ensure a focus on results and provided adequate supervision of inputs and processes. UNDP is also responsible to monitor the risks which required UNDP intervention in order to facilitate project implementation. Risk management intervention by UNDP and DENR/BMB were timely and appropriate as discussed in Section 3.1.2 and Table 2.

59. DENR/BMB as Implementing Partner provided adequate office space and facilities for use of the CPMU. They also provided technical staff to the PTRC for the review of project proposals, finance and administrative support for the CPMU. The close coordination and open access between CPM and the NPD facilitated the signing and approval of grant agreements and other transactions. The active participation of the NPD in SGP activities and NSC meetings facilitated the discussions and decision making process needed for the timely implementation of the project. It also facilitated the development of cooperation of DENR field offices and personnel in SGP project sites.

RATING: Satisfactory

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1 Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)

60. The objective of the project as stated in the Project Document was “Global environmental benefits secured through community-based biodiversity conservation initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines”. Two indicators (as described by the project), and targets to be achieved by the end of the project associated with each of the indicators, were described for use in evaluating whether or not the objective was achieved. The targets for each objective indicator are presented in Table 3 followed by the actual achievement of each. **Annex 15** contains the detailed breakdown of the achievements contributed by each grantee for Outcomes 1, 2, and 3.

Project Objective

Global environmental benefits secured through community-based biodiversity conservation initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines

Table 3 Project Results

Indicator	Target level at end of project	Achievements at the time of TE
1. Increase in area under protection in community-managed or community-supported protected areas	1. At least 100,000ha of protected areas under community management/ co-management by recipients of grants under this project.	1. 134,863 ha. under protection, exceeded the target by 35%. PA protected using the following instruments; 1. Provincial Ordinance, 2. Municipal or City Ordinance, 3. Barangay Ordinance, 4. CBFMA, 5. CADT/CADC, 5. Co-Management, 6. MOA
2. Increase in area under certified or verified sustainable use by communities	2. At least 400,000ha of community agricultural, fishing or forestry area under certified or verified sustainable use by communities that are recipients of grants under this project.	2. 684,495 ha. of production landscape/seascape under improved management compared to previous practice of open access to natural resources. Tenure instruments and approved agreements provided the holders and those mandated in the agreements to manage and protect the area in a sustainable way. Target area was exceeded by 71%

61. The achievements of the overall objective, based on the indicators and targets established and the information provided by the monitoring system regarding actual achievements, indicate that both objectives targets were exceedingly achieved. Examples of the achievements for Indicator one is the passage Provincial Ordinance No. 2017-138 by the Province of Nueva Vizcaya declaring 24, 917 ha. of the Sierra Madre's Palali-Mamparang Mountain Range as Local Conservation Area for Biodiversity, for which a multi stakeholder management council has been created to manage the LCA, with the Provincial Governor no less as Chairman. Notable, too, is that members of the Council includes SGP grantees (FRENDs and PRRM) and project beneficiaries. **Annex 15** contains the summary of project accomplishments of the grant projects. Another example of a community managed LCA is the 1,050 hectares of protection forest under the management of the Centralized Farmers Association Inc. in the Municipality of Mondragon in Northern Samar. The issuance of City Ordinance declaring Isla Filomena and the Twin Sandbar as marine protected areas by the City of Puerto Princesa, the marine protected area for Barangay. San Pedro in Biri, Northern Samar, is just some of the examples of the efforts of SGP5 beneficiaries to protect and manage their natural resources and biodiversity. Examples of accomplishment for Indicator 2 which is on production landscapes/seascape are the areas covered by the 1). SGP Grantee Community Forestry Foundation Quirino Inc. located in Barangay Landingan, Nagtipunan, Quirino Province, the management of the 25, 531 hectares production landscape is shared between the Agta CADT holders, Bugkalot CADT holders CBFM holders and Stewardship contract holders, beneficiaries are engaged in sustainable agroforestry and rattan craft. 2). The 13,710 ha of Biri Larosa PLS multiple use zone which is used for seaweeds production of 12 PO beneficiaries organized by Sentro Ha Pagpauswag Ha Paginabuhi, Inc. Overall rating: Satisfactory

Relevance

62. The project is directly relevant to, and consistent with Philippine’s national priorities and policies related to global environmental issues and development priorities. It specifically contributed to the Philippine Development Plan 2011-2016, in strengthening and enhancing the protection of vulnerable and ecologically fragile areas, especially watersheds and areas where biodiversity is highly threatened. These areas are home to many indigenous peoples, highland communities and other beneficiaries of the GEF-SGP mechanism. It is also clear that the project support the Philippine Development Plan 2016-2022, as reflected in Chapter 10, Goal 1. Improved Conservation, Protection and rehabilitation of Natural Resources; Section 3 A on Cross Cutting Concerns specifically on the protection of Key Biodiversity Areas of the PBSAP 2015-2028; and SGP5 project also contributed to increasing the established terrestrial and marine protected areas of the country as indicated in the Aichi Target 11 Strategic Goal C which requires that “ By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water and 10% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrate into the wider landscape and seascapes.”

63. The project also responds to the Philippine Agenda 21 (PA21), which is the Philippines’ road map to achieving sustainable development. PA21 serves as both guidelines for pursuing development and standards against which all development programs and policies are evaluated for their consistency to bring about sustainable development for the country.

64. The project also supported the implementation of previous Philippine National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, Particularly Strategy 4 “Strengthening Capacities for Integrating and Institutionalizing Biodiversity Conservation and Management.” The project helped to strengthen the capacities of Peoples’ Organizations, including Indigenous Peoples’ groups and other local-level stakeholders to manage and conserve their local biodiversity resources, and to better coordinate their conservation efforts with broader district, regional and national conservation programmes and strategies. Specifically the IPs were assisted in the preparation of their Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plans, and for CBFM holders the preparation of their Community Resources Management Plan where production areas and protection areas are identified and delineated.

RATING: R

Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)

65. This section provides an assessment of how well project Outcomes were achieved using the GEF rating scale of HS = Highly Satisfactory (6); S = Satisfactory (5); MS = Marginally Satisfactory (4); MU= Marginally Unsatisfactory (3); U = Unsatisfactory (2); HU = Highly Unsatisfactory (1). The rating is based not merely on whether the target numbers set in the log frame were achieved, but also an assessment of the quality of those achievements.

Effectiveness

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

Table 4 Effective models for community-based governance of PA demonstrated

Indicator	Target level at end of project	Achievements at the time of TE
-----------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

<p>Number of community managed or co-managed PA models operational in project areas</p>	<p>At least 10 communities exhibit management or co-management models of protected areas</p>	<p>Listed below are some of the grantees/beneficiaries exhibiting best practices In community PA management.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FRIENDS- Mt. Palali Mamparang 2. MLPC - Malasi Lake Wildlife Sanctuary 3. SERD -Ridge to River 4. KFI – Protection of Cockatoo habitat 5. PNNI- Crocodile Sanctuary 6. PBCFI- Dugong Sanctuary 7. Daluhay - Dagatan Lake 8. KEF- ICCA 9. CERD- Monbon Beach forest and marine sanctuary 10. LAPAS - Matambakahan Marine Sanctuary 11. GDFI –(6 MPA) Taguitian Marine Sanctuary
<p>Number of hectares protected through community-PA</p>	<p>At least 10 community-managed protected or conservation areas established or enhanced encompassing at least 100,000 hectares</p>	<p>1. 134, 863 has of community managed protected areas have been accomplished by the project. This is 37% higher than the 100,000 has target of the project.</p>
<p>% increase in METT</p>	<p>40% increase on average in relevant dimensions of management effectiveness of target PAs.</p>	<p>3. Two MPA assisted by Daluhay were able to do complete the two cycle of METT assessment and scoring and they fall short of the 40% management improvement target, these are the</p> <p>3.1. San Luis MPAN has 2017 baseline of 59.6% and in 2018 it scored 94% with an increased METT score of 33%</p> <p>3.2. Baler MPAN has 2017 baseline of 45% and 75.75% in 2018, garnering an increased METT score of 30.25%</p> <p>On the other hand seven (7) of the MMCPCC assisted MPA was able to do baseline assessments while PBCFI and C3P completed 2 baseline assessments only</p> <p>MMCPCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caramay MPA 59% • Johnson MPA 57% • Malcampo MPA 50% • Rizal MPA 51% • San Miguel MPA 63% • Tinitian MPA 50% • Tumarbong MPA 35% <p>PBCFI/C3P</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cheey watershed 43% Bogtong watershed 52.5%
Number of ha of mangroves and/or seagrass areas rehabilitated or protected.	1,000 hectares of mangrove and/or seagrass areas within the 100,000 ha community-managed protected or conserved areas are rehabilitated or protected	<p>8,111 ha. (800. %) mangrove and seagrass areas. These accomplishments are distributed among grantees located in Samar 1, 888 ha. Palawan 6,873 ha., and Lower Sierra Madre 50 ha.</p> <p>Targets have been exceeded however there should be a distinction between areas rehabilitated and areas protected since this will call for different inputs for mangrove management. The project report also does not make the distinction between rehabilitation and protection for mangrove areas/seagrass areas.</p>

Outcome 2

Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives.

Table 5 Community Managed Landscapes and seascapes

Indicator	Target level at end of project	Achievements at the time of TE
Number of 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	<p>1. 684,495 ha. Production landscape/seascape under improved management distributed as follows.</p> <p>1.1 Samar: 420,805 ha.</p> <p>1.2 Palawan: 201,948 ha.</p> <p>1.3 Sierra Madre: 57,891 ha.</p> <p>The tenorial instruments provided the PO beneficiaries gave them the right to manage and protect areas covered by the tenorial instrument. This gives them the authority to prevent other people who are not members of the PO from exploiting or accessing the resources of the areas. This is better than the open access that usually prevails if there are no PO's looking after the PA/LCA.</p>
Number of community-based land use plans or Ancestral Domain plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.	At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.	<p>4-ADSDPP– covering 16 communities/clusters</p> <p>5-CRMF (CBFMA) plan</p> <p>9-LCA/Co-Management Plan</p> <p>11-MPA/MPAN Mgt. Plan</p> <p>3- Wildlife Habitat/Sanctuary Mgt. Plans</p> <p>6- PA/Management Plans</p> <p>TOTAL: 38 Management Plans</p>
		Resource assessments were made on

		what are found within the LCA, MPA or CADT areas and included in the management plan. The use of Total Economic Valuation was too complicated for the community preparers to do.
--	--	--

Samples of Management plans are attached as **Annex 20** Management Plan Mt. Palali Mamparang, **Annex 18** ADSDPP of Marcilla, and **Annex 17** Dagatan Lake Management Plan.

Outcome 3

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

Table 6 Biodiversity Friendly Enterprises

Indicator	Target level at end of project	Achievements at the time of TE
Number of biodiversity-friendly products produced and marketed by communities.	30 communities produce and market biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products.	43 Grantees with 159 PO partners are implementing BDFE/Livelihoods such as: Agroforestry, handicraft/ rattan, seaweeds farming, cashew, abaca farming and abaca fiber, growing of organic rice and vegetables, rice-duck/eggs, crab fattening, coffee, cacao, roselle, ecotourism, commercial nursery of indigenous tree and mangroves, honey, almaciga resin, coco-sugar.

Outcome 4

Increased capacity of GEF-SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions

Table 7: Increased Capacity of SGP GEF Stakeholders

Indicator	Target level at end of project	Achievements at the time of TE
# Of community-level resource users and managers who are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.	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.	CPMU sponsored training of Trainor's for Ecosystem Valuation, CBMEs & BDFE and M&E. 88 participants completed the training. They in-turn trained 9,555. Beneficiaries in the training roll out.
# of new grants that replicate approaches	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
% increase in amount of co-funding for the Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3	50% increase in amount of co-funding for Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3	Target co-funding of one is to one has been exceeded by 7%. Please refer to Annex 14 for details.
Number of governors who launch community-based partnerships by year 4	Community-based partnership initiatives for GEF-SGP launched by at least 4 LGUs by end of Year 4	Four community based partnerships has been launched by LGUs; these are the 1). Sierra Madre Mt. Palali Mamparang Mountain Range biodiversity conservation between the Provincial government of Nueva Viscaya and FRIENDS and community partners. 2) Partnership between PNNI and the LGU of the Municipality of Rizal in Palawan for the establishment and management of the crocodile sanctuary, 3) PBCFI and C3 partnership with the LGU of Busuanga for the Dugong Sanctuary establishment and management, 4) The PSU in Cuyo had strong collaboration with the MLGU with Municipal resolutions numbers 01, 20, 33, 49 & 50 declaring protection and production sites for cashew, lato, salt production. TEV conducted by PSU faculty was used as a tool for planning highlighting among other things the sustainable use of natural resource viz biodiversity protection; case studies done by PSU was used in crafting a policy paper entitled "Important Ecosystems in Magsaysay, Palawan: Basis for Conservation and Ecotourism Development".

66. 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. Grantees that have been able to secure new funding to continue activities of the project are the following; (NAC got Php 1million for the duck rice project from the World Bank, D.A., funded Philippine Rural Development Program, SERD expansion of the Ridge to River project funded by PTFCE/FFP; FRIENDS's partnership with the PLGU of Nueva Vizcaya for the Mt. Palali Mamparang Range LCA where the PLGU allocated an annual operation budget of Php. 6 million; CFFQI expansion of their reforestation/agroforestry activities funded by FFP, among others).

67. The replication approach of SGP5 is intended to build the capacity of communities on PA management and in biodiversity conservation and hoped that the government agencies represented in the National Steering Committee institutionalize this governance modality with policy support and translate it to more rapid establishment of new conservation areas that can be managed by the communities. For this purpose the project also intended to document best practices on the ground.

68, Training for Trainor’s was conducted for Ecosystems Valuation, CBME, BDFE and M&E a total of 88 beneficiaries were trained. The total number of participants that were trained during the training roll out was 9,555. **Annex 16** contains the list of all trainings that were done for project beneficiaries and the number of participants per training.

Outcome 5

Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends.

Table 8 Enhanced Capacities of grantees to do M&E

Indicator	Target level at end of project	Achievements at the time of TE
# of GEF-SGP grantees participating in monitoring and evaluation training; % increase in knowledge before/after training	(1) SGP Philippines M&E framework is established (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 (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.	M&E framework has been completed. It is based on theory change combined with Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation. RP could have used the framework for their monitoring work but did not do so. TOT has been done for representatives of 30 grantees. Sept. 8, 2016. Grantees were trained on M&E but it came too late for them to actually use in their projects. Most of their projects have been approved by July 2016. Major effort should have been done by the RP and CPMU to have the different projects revise their M&E to comply with the newly developed one as specified in the M&E manual. However, this was not done.

RATING: Satisfactory

Efficiency

69. Efficiency relates to cost of the partnership and management arrangements that was carried out during the implementation of the project and the results achieved. The use of local/national capacity in implementing SGP5 by NGOs at national and landscape level to provide project monitoring, technical support and capacity building is commendable.

70. Project support provided by BMB as Executing Agency and that provided by UNDP as GEF Implementing Agency were both efficient. Despite the delay in kicking off the project, the project was able to stay within the budget. Their active participation in the NSC deliberations and field

activities facilitated decision making and implementation of appropriate actions for issues that are brought before the NSC. As of June 30, 2018 the project has incurred a total expenditure of \$3,928,603.05 out of the total project budget of \$ 4,584,333.00 with a remaining balance of \$ 654,729.95. The summary of expenditures as of June 30, 2018 (**Annex 13**) shows that allocation and expenditure for each outcome are all within the budget. Given the complexity of the SGP5 project in terms of approach, scope and objectives, the project can be considered efficient in delivering the results.

RATINGS: Satisfactory

Country ownership and Mainstreaming

71. The STAR allocation of OP5 to the SGP5 for USD4.833 million is very significant and shows the commitment and country ownership of the SGP project. The co-financing contribution made by the grantees and stakeholders which exceeded target is another important indicator to assess the country's ownership of a project. The allocation of annual regular operational funds by LGUs for the operation of established LCAs like the Mt. Palali Mamparang in Nueva Viscaya and the various Barangay established protected watershed and marine protected areas in Samar and Palawan are additional indicators of ownership. The objective and outcome and the corresponding indicators and targets are contributing to the accomplishment of the development goals and conservation goals of Philippines and its international commitments, as presented in Section 3 A on Cross Cutting Concerns specifically on the protection of Key Biodiversity Areas of the Philippine Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan 2015-2028; Chapter 10, Goal 1. Improved Conservation, Protection and rehabilitation of Natural Resources of the Philippines Development Plan 2016-2022; and the project also contributed to increasing the established terrestrial and marine protected areas of the country as indicated in the Aichi Target 11 Strategic Goal C which requires that " By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water and 10% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrate into the wider landscape and seascapes."

72. The project also supports the on-going UNDP Country Programme in the areas of Empowerment of the Poor and Ensuring Environmental Sustainability. In addition it furthers the work of NewCAPP, through grants given to pursue establishments of LCAs and ICCAs and BDFEs which was started by the Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes/Biodiversity Partnerships Project. It also contributed to the objective of the BIOFIN project to increase funding expenditures for biodiversity conservation and management.

Sustainability (*)

73. The overall likelihood of sustainability is "Likely" (L)

This is evidenced by at least four community based partnerships that has been launched by LGUs; these are the 1). Sierra Madre Mt. Palali Mamparang Mountain Range biodiversity conservation between the Provincial government of Nueva Viscaya and FRENDS and community partners. 2) Partnership between PNNI and the LGU of the Municipality of Rizal in Palawan for the establishment and management of the crocodile sanctuary, 3) PBCFI and C3 partnership with the LGU of Busuanga for the Dugong Sanctuary establishment and management, 4) The PSU in Cuyo had strong collaboration with the MLGU with Municipal resolutions numbers 01, 20, 33, 49 & 50 declaring protection and production sites for cashew, lato, salt production. TEV conducted by PSU faculty was used as a tool for planning highlighting among other things the sustainable use of natural resource viz biodiversity protection and the case studies done by PSU was used in crafting a policy paper

entitled “Important Ecosystems in Magsaysay, Palawan: Basis for Conservation and Ecotourism Development”.

74. Although the draft sustainability or exit plan is not yet finalized, the government has 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 grantee is required to highlight their sustainability actions so as to maintain their projects’ outcome in the future.

75. According to GEF guidelines, sustainability is based on several dimensions including financial resources, socio-political considerations, institutional framework and governance factors, and environmental factors. A rating of “Likely” means there are negligible risks to sustainability, “Moderately Likely” means there are moderate risks, “Moderately unlikely” means there are significant risks to sustainability, and a rating of “Unlikely” means there are severe risks to sustainability.

The analysis of risks that affect sustainability of project outcomes

Financial Resources Risks (Likely – L)

76. The likelihood that financial resources will be available to continue the objective of supporting communities to continue conservation and environmental management is likely as there is already an effort to move on with SGP7 agenda. The OFP of GEF in Philippines is committed to continue the allocation of OP7 funds to SGP. As mentioned above, local governments, other projects and funding institutions have taken interest in the initiatives started by SGP5 grantees, especially with the Forest Foundation of the Philippines already committing bigger funding support to a number of them.

Socio-political Risks (Likely – L)

77. The stakeholders at large will continue to support SGP projects since the awareness of the approach and impacts are relatively high. The ownership and buy-in of the project beneficiaries are very good and can contribute to sustainability. It was observed during the KII and FGD consultations that even if the POs do not have outside support they have persisted in continuing what they have set their minds to do, external assistance helped speed up and improve accomplishment of their organizational objectives. The recent announcement of the government to resume acceptance of applications for special use agreement for protected areas (SAPA) will further help facilitate the sharing of benefits to communities from biodiversity friendly livelihood activities.

Institutional Framework and Governance Risks (Likely – L)

78. The strong lesson learned from the SGP5’s institutional; governance and community’s technical know-how capacity building provide strong sustainability of the SGP’s presence. The project have not designed or achieved any institutional or policy framework but to some extent achieved some form set up by establishing local ordinance and agreements (including tenure) for resource management and agriculture practices. Examples of this are the Provincial Ordinance of Nueva Viscaya, the ordinances of Puerto Princesa, Mondragon, other municipalities and their various Barangay ordinances, establishing MPAs and LCAs. These, coupled with the required systems for accountability and transparency in the management of funds by LGUs, and project beneficiaries will enhance sustainability. The SGP5’s approach of landscape conservation, communities’ participation and strong networking and replication are well accepted and can build further ecosystems conservation. This is also reinforced by the HLURB 2013 Guidelines in the preparation off LGU Comprehensive Land Use Plan which adopted the principles of Integrated Ecosystems Management.

Environmental Risks (Moderately Likely – ML)

79. Environmental risks for the Philippines in the form of climate change and natural disaster may certainly affect project outcome in some areas. On the other hand environmental risks related to human activity like development policy frameworks such as the Provincial Development Plans and Regional Development Plans which proposes road and other form of infrastructure projects within PA for which may result in disruption of environmental habitats and ecosystems are still there.

Overall Rating of Sustainability: Likely (L)

Impact

80. The SGP5 project's impact achievements should be measured by its ability to demonstrate the progress towards improving environmental status and reducing the environmental stress. In this aspects it the contribution to a bigger goal of conservation vision in Philippines rather than attributing superficially its impacts on certain achievements that is important. This is more so because there are many either ongoing or past projects in the same area as SGP-supported projects in the past, many with similar or complementary objectives. Sometimes, SGP-supported projects work closely together with other initiatives, each providing inputs which complement and help ensure the success of the other's output.

81. Although verifiable improvements in ecological status and reduction in stress on ecological systems will be difficult to show due to the way the baseline, indicators and targets were set, it can be certainly argued that the project has demonstrated the progress towards these impact achievements. The contribution of the project in removing the barriers and threats identified in the project document within the context of local and indigenous communities livelihood and resource management is very clear and evident. Examples of these are the SARAGPUNTA projects on the documentation for their CADT and preparation of the ADSDPP of the Tagbanuas; the Ikalahan ICCA project of KEF, the Egongot project of DALUHAY among others. As shown in the problems that the project is addressing i.e. habitat destruction and land use change and overexploitation of biodiversity, it is evident and verifiable that the project has contributed to remove barriers of lack of ability to form and manage community based PA, lack of knowledge and market barriers for adoption of biodiversity friendly methods of production and lack of partnership platform for peer to peer capacity building and training for sustainable resource management.

82. In accordance with the goal of the global SGP to support communities, the project impacts on environmental stress and improvements of the quantity and quality of the environment has been by enhancing the necessary enabling tools for the willingness and capacity of the communities to contribute to global environmental benefits by finding solution to local environmental problem. The improvements in the METT score, the establishment of various management plans and the community conservation areas are prove of these.

83. The project has contributed to the Key Biodiversity Areas of Philippines as shown in Table 9 below. Based on the study done by Ambal, et. al. published in January 2012 in the JOTT Communication; a total of 228 KBAs resulted from the integration of the terrestrial, freshwater and marine KBAs. These KBAs represent the known habitat of 855 globally important species of plants, corals, mollusks, elasmobranchs, fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals in the country. Some of these KBA's are partly included in existing protected areas while others are not.

84. Some of the efforts of SGP5 grantees are contributing to the conservation and management of biodiversity in twelve (12) KBA's listed below. Some of the projects that directly support protection and conservation efforts are the Kalahan Educational Foundations 3,586 hectares of ICCA inside their ancestral domain located in the Municipality of Santa Fe, Nueva Viscaya, The Katala Foundation conservation effort for the Philippine Cockatoo and other wildlife in Victoria Anepahan KBA82 , the Malasi Lake project of Malasi Lake Producers Cooperative for KBA 14 which is a breeding ground for *Anas luzonica* or Philippine duck and other 5 bird species, and the Dugong project of C3 Philippines in Busuanga Palawan KBA 68, among other projects.

Table 9 SGP 5 contribution to Philippine Key Biodiversity Areas Management

SGP 5 contribution to Philippine Key Biodiversity Areas management			
KBA No.	Name	Location	Trigger species
17	Casecnan Protected Landscape	Provinces of Nueva Viscaya, Quirino, Nueva Ecija and Aurora	12 trigger species of mammals, birds and amphibians
16	Quirino Protected Landscape	Provinces of Isabela, Quirino & Nueva Viscaya, Municipalities of Nagtipunan and Cabarroquis	16 trigger species of amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals
14	Malasi Lake (unprotected)	Province of Isabela, Municipality of Sto. Tomas	6 species of Birds
15	North Central Sierra Madre (partially protected)	Provinces of Isabela, Quirino and Aurora, Municipalities of, Nagtipunan, Cabarroquis, San Luis, Maria Aurora, Baler, Dingalan, Casiguran	8 species of amphibians, birds and mammals
33	Mts. Irid –Angilo and Binuang (unprotected)	Provinces of Rizal, Bulacan, Aurora and Quezon; specifically municipalities of Tayabas, Gen. Nakar, Tanay, Dingalan, Norzagaray, Caranglan, and San Guillermo	20 trigger species of amphibians, birds and mammals
67	Calamianes Group of Islands	Province of Palawan, Municipality of Busuanga	97, trigger species of mollusks, mammals, birds, amphibians and corals
68	Busuanga Is.	Palawan Municipality of Busuanga and Coron	43, trigger species of amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals
79	Puerto Princesa Subterranean River Natural Park	Palawan, Puerto Princesa City and San Vicente	31 trigger species of mammals, birds and amphibians

SGP 5 contribution to Philippine Key Biodiversity Areas management			
KBA No.	Name	Location	Trigger species
84	Mt. Mantalingahan Protected Landscape	Palawan, Municipalities of Quezon, Brookes Point, Bataraza, and Rizal	37, trigger species of amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals
82	Victoria and Anepahan Range	Palawan, Puerto Princesa City, Aborlan, Quezon and Narra	45, trigger species of amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals
130	Samar Island Natural Park	Northern, Eastern and Western Samar provinces specifically in the Municipalities of Lawaan, Lope De Vega, Catarman, Mondragon, Bobon, San Jose, Basey,	57 Trigger species has been identified as of 2012
129	Biri – Larosa Protected Landscape and Seascape	Northern Samar, Municipalities of Biri, Lavezares, Rosario and San Jose	Two trigger species Both are corals, PA has very good stand of mangrove forest

Environmental Status Improvement

Rating: SATISFACTORY

Environmental Stress Reduction

Rating: SATISFACTORY

Progress towards Stress/Status Change

Rating: SATISFACTORY

Overall Project Results

Rating: SATISFACTORY

Institutional, Policy and Regulatory frameworks

85. Impacts in the form of developing/strengthening the institutional, policy and regulatory frameworks are important to overall impact and sustainability of the project. The project has not designed or achieved any institutional or policy framework but to some extent achieved some form set up by establishing local ordinance and agreements (including tenure) for resource management and agriculture practices.

Landscape approach

86. The landscape approach that the project took in designing the implementation plan has lasting impact. SGP-5 has been able to establish production landscapes and seascapes where biodiversity conservation is complementing the livelihood/economic activities of the communities. It is noted that this contribute to achieving the target of the medium-term Philippine Development Plan, and the country's commitments under the Aichi Targets which is to increase terrestrial areas under

protection by 17%, and coastal marine areas by 10% by 2020. These land/seascapes are to be treated as models by the DENR in its work on large conservation areas. Although the NIPAS Act allows for the participatory management of PAs through a multi-sectoral PAMB, it is noted that most PAs that mere membership of the communities in the PAMB does not capture the spirit of the co-management idea of the law. The SGP projects have established an informed and active participation of community members and civil society in management and conservation actions in the site, especially with some type of formal/signed agreement between the PAMB and the community group. This has defined the roles of the parties, delineate the parameters of the work to be done in an identified area based on agreed set of objectives and goals, and ensure compliance with biodiversity conservation and accountability, and create ownership. In particular, the agreement is necessary in areas where there is overlap of tenure, as in the case of ancestral domains within NIPAS sites. Example is the Biri Larosa Protected Landscape in Northern Samar where the communities residing with in the Park have entered into a MOA with the PAMB to specifically protect and manage mangrove, seagrass and fishery resources that has been declared by LGU ordinance as MPA.

Biodiversity Friendly Enterprises

87. The BDFEs started by SGP-5 should also be considered a main impact area because of its many examples of biodiversity-based livelihoods. Although, the BDFEs are not exclusive efforts of SGP, as other earlier projects Biodiversity Partnerships Project (BPP) and ECOFISH have started this enterprise project, the SGP5 has certainly contributed to understanding various models of BDFEs within the specific nature of the landscape areas and its ecosystems. A total of 43 Grantees with 159 PO partners have implemented these BDFEs/Livelihoods in agroforestry, fisheries, forestry, ecotourism, and sustainable agriculture. Specifically some of the BDFE supported by SGP5 is the Community Based Sustainability Tourism Program of Puerto Princesa which is part of the City's bid to promote local development; the following CBST were funded by SGP5: (1).Sabang Jungle Trail trekking tour managed by IP Tagbanua members of the Community Park Warden Association. This provides alternative access to the Underground River when sea travel is not possible. (2). Sabang Falls managed by the Tinig ng mga Katutubo sa Cabayugan (TICKA-CADC), (3). Isla Filomena Dive and Snorkel Site by the Nagkakaisang Samahan ng Isla Filomena Dive Site ng New Panggangan, (4). Barangays Babuyan and Binduyan, Puerto Princesa City by the Palawan Conservation Corp. established as tourist destination the Babuyan Twin Sandbar and Olangoan Waterfalls and Local Conservation Area thru City Ordinance. (5).Buenavista View Deck/Ulugan Bay Eco tour in Brgy Buenavista. (6). Sabang Sea ferry Multipurpose Cooperative where they manufactured fiberglass boat to replace wooden hull boats used to go to PPRSRNP, (7). Sabang Underground River Souvenir Handicraft Association (SURSHA) they manufacture souvenir items for tourists, (8).Samahang Magsasaka ng Marufinas, the farmers are into organic farming using vermicast. There are other examples of BDFEs that has been supported by SGP5 details of which are in the RP draft report attached as **Annex 21**. The lesson learned and analysis of the outcome should provide DENR reason to support the adoption of BDFE Framework to guide biodiversity-friendly livelihood and programs in its official departmental capacity, applicable to both protected areas and Key Biodiversity Areas.

Bottom-up approach for global environmental benefits.

88. Conserving biodiversity in landscape/seascape in both protected and production areas require bottom-up approach to create ownership which can provide sustainability of global environmental benefits. The project managed to demonstrate the bottom-up approach with clear community ownership, capacity and removing the barriers at the local level. An example of this is the WAIID experience where the women of the community decided to form an organization by themselves to

help raise funds for the education of their children. They started a savings fund thru a weekly contribution of 20 pesos for each member and with this amount asked the assistance of NSEP to help them to formally organize and to get projects LGUs and other agencies and with SGP5. They are now engaged in mangrove reforestation and protection and BDFE livelihood. Another example is the LAPAS experience where the woman President negotiated with the LGU to formally establish the marine protected area in their barangay and for them to be part of the management council of the MPA. **Annex 19** RP draft documentation report of grantees in Northern Samar contains the details of the WAID and LAPAS experience.

Partnership

89. Partnership and collaboration is the best way to achieve impacts on the ground. The grantees proposal guidelines require that all grantees show collaboration plans and results as observed in the implementation of the strategic grants for Sabang Mangroves, Sabang Sea ferry, FRIENDS, DALUHAY and CFI. The partnership established between stakeholders, which was in a way a direct result of project design, leads to greater impact of projects as it facilitates and encourages sharing and learning from experiences and lessons, cooperative marketing and cooperative agreements, which would not otherwise exist, but will pave for replication and scaling-up. Working in landscapes to achieve mutual environmental goals between interested parties created opportunities to establish the community based conservation area and mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscape activities.

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

4.1 Conclusions

90. These conclusions are derived from the findings of the project design, implementation and reporting of the results. It also forms the basis for the recommendations for future SGP project in the Philippines.

1. SGP remains relevant:
 - a. National targets and international commitments
The conservation through community and landscape-based approach implemented by SGP5 is very relevant to the initiatives and plans of the Philippines government especially in relations to Section 3 A on Cross Cutting Concerns specifically on the protection of Key Biodiversity Areas of the PBSAP 2015-2028 and Chapter 10, Goal 1. Improved Conservation, Protection and rehabilitation of Natural Resources of the Philippines Development Plan 2016-2022. SGP5 project also contributed to increasing the established terrestrial and marine protected areas of the country as indicated in the Aichi Target 11 Strategic Goal C which requires that “ By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water and 10% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrate into the wider landscape and seascapes.”
 - b. Civil Society can greatly contribute to meeting targets and SGP provides avenue for it.
 - c. In the Philippine context where the accountability of NGOs is in question, SGP provides an opportunity for CSOs, the genuine ones at least, to disprove accusations of corruption.
 - d. SGP provides opportunities for CSOs to assert “participatory development”.

2. SGP5 in the Philippines proved strong in social inclusion, showing that biodiversity conservation is everybody's work and for everyone's benefit:
 - a. Women, youth and children
 - b. Indigenous People
 - c. It has potential to include more, e.g., elders, PWDs, urban poor
 - d. It can also include other professions that are not normally included: accountants, medical workers, engineers, food servers, etc.

3. There are a number of good things about the design:
 - a. As stated, how it contributes to national targets and global benefits is clear
 - b. It scales up the work of SGP from scattered and independent small projects to landscape-based synergistic community of projects
 - c. It adopts the Grant Maker Plus strategy that gives emphasis to KM and capability-building

4. However, there are aspects of the design that could have been better:
 - a. Some targets are too ambitious
 - i. Target landscapes are too large (400,000 ha). While the projects exceeded the target, it is submitted that this is so only because of the legal instruments that covered such expanse. However, there are no actual interventions that took place in all of them.
 - ii. Targeting replication projects is not apt. Replication should only happen when a past project already shows at least a color of sustainability – something that cannot be determined after only 1-2 years of implementation.
 - b. The management is too complicated
 - c. Uncertainties in the design caused delays
 - i. RP was not identified – the procurement process took too long
 - ii. Landscapes were not identified, the priority sites are too large
 - d. The M&E was not well-designed

5. SGP5 was able to fulfil and even exceeded much of its targets

4.2 Recommendations

1. In the production landscape, biodiversity mainstreaming has focused primarily on improving and changing production practices to be more biodiversity friendly with a focus on sectors that have significant biodiversity impacts (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, and extractives). In the future, mainstreaming must go beyond that by; a). Developing policy and regulatory frameworks that provides incentives for biodiversity-friendly land and resource use, b). Spatial and land-use planning should ensure that land and resource use is appropriately situated to maximize production without undermining or degrading biodiversity, and c) Pilot an array of financial mechanisms (certification, payment for environmental services, access and benefit sharing agreements, etc.) to provide financial incentives to actors to change current practices that may be degrading biodiversity.

2. DENR should take action to ensure that all co- management plans developed under SGP5 have complete signed agreements in some form and to monitor its progress in a timely manner. This will ensure the ownership of the initiatives by the community will be greatly enhanced and sustainability is more likely to happen. The co-management must be institutionalized within NIPAS to ensure real implementation of such options of management of protected areas.

3. The co-funding requirement could be made more specific or included so that the grantees and implementing agencies can plan early on and monitor this closely. This could be in the form of more investment on the part of other line agencies/departments in environment related outcome or large private sector investment on a landscapes production or other donor funding. At the moment the co-funding requirement is at the grantee level and the obligation is on the grantees to obtain this. The implementing agencies should be doing this under the cross cutting activities.
4. Enforcement activities are part of management of PAs. Stakeholders are increasingly concerned with the slow response by the authorities for reported violation committed within the PAs/ LCAs. There is a need to focus or increase the enforcement activities by grantees as part of their objectives and targets within the project, a mechanism which would provide quick response to reported violations between authorities and the stakeholders should be set up and more stakeholders should be deputized and properly equipped and funded for patrolling and enforcement activities by LGUs and local police and perhaps, SGP7 should consider this in the scope of project proposals. This should encourage innovative and effective enforcement of PAs management.
5. The separation of funds for grants and cross cutting activities should be decided at the design stage so that the grant giving out process and timing can be managed earlier and progress can be monitored sooner. This should also provide better planning for cross cutting activities and work plans.
6. Multiyear work plan must be created at the design stage so that the project management team and NSC have a basis for activities planning early on. It should serve as guide for budget management, progress reporting and risk management.
7. The National Steering Committee should not be chaired by NPD. It should be chaired by the DENR's undersecretary or persons delegated who preferably is of higher position than the NPD in the implementing agency. This is important for separation of powers and accountability. NPD should be responsible in reporting the progress of the project to NSC with the support of the CPM. NPD is the single responsible person on behalf of the implementing agency for the project and should not be chairing the NSC meeting.
8. Project Management Unit should have monthly meetings with properly accomplished minutes of meeting and should be chaired by the National Project Director. This meeting should be attended by project staff, NPD and the relevant officers from the implementing agency and UNDP. This meeting is important to identify issues, monitoring project risk and progress and to follow up matter arising at the NSC meetings. It is also suggested that the CPM should be invited to attend BMB management meetings so that sharing of information will be to all operating units of BMB and not just limited to focal persons assigned to SGP.
9. The project must have a communication plan at the design stage as part of the cross cutting activities. This is crucial so that the PMU can develop the work plan for delivering the communication plans output in timely manner.

10. SGP7 should seriously consider promoting the strategic grants to capable NGO/CSOs who would access SGP7. There were many grantees who expressed that the \$50 thousand maximum amount per grantee may not be sufficient for effective implementation of project goals and targets for landscape projects.
11. As part of the project's monitoring and evaluation system, assessment on knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) among targeted communities and relevant NGOs and agencies should be done before and after the implementation of activities on awareness and capacity building. This is to determine the project's impact on awareness and capacity building on the values of biological resources among the project stakeholder.
12. GEF Focal Point Philippines should continue with the next phase of SGP7. SGP-5 has built a solid case for community participation in biodiversity conservation by providing concrete examples of the various roles that communities play in biodiversity protection and management, and sustainable use. National GEF Steering Committee should conduct active and inclusive participation of all stakeholders to decide the scope and approach to be taken. The relevant objectives and targets in 2015-2028 Philippine Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (PBSAP) that relates to communities should be the starting point for discussion.
13. The landscape approach should be continued because it provides focus and monitoring on specific environmental problems, clear goals and partnerships and indicators and targets. This is relevant either way for single or multi-focal areas for SGP7 implementation. It is also recommended that some of SGP5 activities that have shown good results should be continued in SGP7. Two years of implementation is not enough to address all the problems and threats to biodiversity.
14. The standard UNDP M&E approach is not adequate to capture what is really being accomplished at the project level. SGP7 must apply theory of change to identify the problems to be addressed and the corresponding objectives, outcome, output and activities to be framed for implementation and monitoring. The SGP5 developed M&E manual has introduced the use of the Theory of Change (ToC) in combination with Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) at the project and program level. This can be used in developing the M&E for SGP 7. A ToC if done right captures the logical and plausible causal link between inputs to activities to outputs to outcomes. In RBME one monitors for efficiency-the delivery of inputs and conduct of activities to generate outputs, and evaluates for effectiveness- the concomitant generation of outputs, the use of these outputs to produce outcomes and emerging impacts.
15. As one of the upgraded countries under SGP, Philippines should consider NIM implementation with UNDP support. However, since there are only two options provided in the SGP guidelines and NIM is not one of them the current RP of SGP5 should be considered as possible implementation partner. It has the tract record and experience in implementing small grants project even prior to their engagement in SGP5 as RP and the institutional

memory of what has been done and accomplished in SGP5 which would help facilitate implementation of SGP7.

16. Delayed signing of agreements, approval of tenure instruments and other management concerns has caused delays in the smooth implementation of SGP5 and has also been experienced in previous SGP4. This risk should be addressed early on in the implementation of SGP7.

17. It is also recommended that mechanism for assisting potential grantees in writing project proposals should be put in place when the call for proposals shall be given for SGP7. Poor quality of project proposals has been one of the major cause of delay in grant approvals.

4.3. Lessons Learned

1. It is a must that a data base be developed and put in place to monitor project accomplishments. Design of the database should respond to a well-developed Monitoring and Evaluation tool which should be based on the Theory of Change and Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation. The usual use of the Microsoft Excel program is not adequate to help project management to track the progress of accomplishments for multi small grants as evidenced in the constant changes in the accomplishment figures of the project,

2. Total Economic Valuation for Ecosystems Services as tool, is too complicated for community users to understand and use in their management planning. TEV at community level should be orientation level the aim of which is for them to appreciate use of it as a guide for planning.

3. Grantees are very poor in writing project proposals and project reports. This is evidenced by the fact that despite the simplified template for the Terminal Report, more than 50% of the grantees still had to be handheld in preparing their reports. More than anything, this is a question of capability/skills on the part of the grantees.

Annexes:

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

Annex 2 Evaluation Matrix

Annex 3 List of Documents Reviewed

Annex 4 List of Person Interviewed /Met

Annex 5 Schedule Itinerary

Annex 6 Photo Documentation

Annex 7 Rating scales

Annex 8 TOR PTRC

Annex 9 NSC Members

Annex 10 CPMU Organizational Structure

Annex 11 TOR SGP5 Hubs

Annex 12 SGP5 Grant Guidelines

Annex 13 Expenditures Summary

Annex 14 Co-Financing & Grants Release

Annex 15. Summary of Project Accomplishments

Annex 16 Capability Building Activities

Annex 17 Dagatan Lake Management Plan

Annex 18 ADMP Kaplano

Annex 19 N. Samar Draft Report models

Annex 20 Mt. Palali - Mamparang Mountain Range Management Plan

Annex 21 Palawan Draft Report models