



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | BASIC PROJECT DATA | 2 |
| 2. | PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) | 5 |
| 2. | IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)..... | 27 |
| 4. | SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS | 32 |
| 5. | ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) | 35 |
| 6. | RISKS | 38 |
| 7. | FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR) | 46 |
| 8. | MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS | 47 |
| 9. | STAKEHOLDERS’ ENGAGEMENT..... | 48 |
| 10. | GENDER MAINSTREAMING | 50 |
| 11. | KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES | 51 |
| 12. | INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT | 52 |
| 13. | CO-FINANCING TABLE | 53 |

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Region: | EAP |
| Country (ies): | Philippines |
| Project Title: | Dynamic conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity in traditional agro-ecosystems of the Philippines |
| FAO Project Symbol: | GCP/PHI/062/GFF |
| GEF ID: | 5549 |
| GEF Focal Area(s): | Biodiversity |
| Project Executing Partners: | Department of Agriculture-Bureau of Agricultural Research |
| Project Duration (years): | 6.9 years (01 May 2016 – 31 March 2023) |
| Project coordinates: | YES (provided separately) |

Project Dates

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| GEF CEO Endorsement Date: | 27 October 2015 |
| Project Implementation Start Date/EOD : | 01 May 2016 |
| Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹: | 30 June 2022 |
| Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ² | 31 March 2023 |

Funding

| | |
|---|--------------|
| GEF Grant Amount (USD): | 2,182,631 |
| Total Co-financing amount (USD)³: | 11,519,324 |
| Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD): | 2,097,100 |
| Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴: | 2,086,038 |
| Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵ | 5,556,865.46 |

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting: | 30 May 2022 |
| Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ : | September 2018 |
| Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed): | March – May 2019 |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ : | October– March 2022 |
| Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex) | Yes |

Overall ratings

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative): | Satisfactory |
| Overall implementation progress rating: | Satisfactory |
| Overall risk rating: | Moderate |

ESS risk classification

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| Current ESS Risk classification: | Moderate |
|----------------------------------|----------|

Status

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR): | Final PIR |
|--|-----------|

Project Contacts

| Contact | Name, Title, Division/Institution | E-mail |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Project Coordinator (PC) | Lionel Dabbadie FAO Representative | Lionel.Dabbadie@fao.org |
| Budget Holder (BH) | Lionel Dabbadie FAO Representative | Lionel.Dabbadie@fao.org |

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)</p> | <p>Ms. Analiza Rebueta – Teh Undersecretary Department of Environment and Natural Resources</p> | <p>annateh@denr.gov.ph</p> |
| <p>Lead Technical Officer (LTO)</p> | <p>Sridhar Dharmapuri, Senior Food Safety and Nutrition Officer, FAORAP (main) Bo Zhou, Agricultural Officer, FAORAP</p> | <p>Sridhar.Dharmapuri@fao.org Bo.Zhou@fao.org</p> |
| <p>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</p> | <p>Sameer Karki, Technical Officer, CBC Chris Dirkmaat, Executive Officer, CBC</p> | <p>Sameer.Karki@fao.org Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org</p> |

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

| Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation. | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Project or Development Objective | Outcomes | Outcome indicators ⁸ | Baseline | Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹ | End-of-project Target | Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023 | Progress rating ¹¹ |
| Enhance, expand and sustain the dynamic conservation practices that sustain globally significant agrobiodiversity in traditional eco systems of the Philippines | Outcome 1 | | | | | | |
| | Outcome 1.1: Strengthened policy and legal framework defining a national approach to ABD and guiding the design and implementation of corresponding activities at national and local level | Number of target policy instruments ¹² embedded in programmes with corresponding budget assignment. | Target policies exist but are not implemented due to lack of corresponding instruments. | <i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i> | Policy instruments (e.g. administrative orders, joint memorandum circulars) developed for: - 1 key agriculture sector policy - 1 key environment sector policy - 1 key culture-related policy - 1 key indigenous people related policy 1. | Two key agriculture sector policies: 1) Amendments to the Philippine RA7308 – National Seed Industry Development Act (SIDA) 2) Signing of the DA Circular on the Registration of Traditional Varieties for Conservation and Sustainable Use Two policies developed cross-cutting agriculture, environment, IPs and culture: 1) Joint DA- Department of Environment and Natural | |

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.

¹² Refers to Output 1.1.1 – Key policy instruments favouring ABD conservation developed at national and local level; and numbers and nature of recommendations generated to guide policy development

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Resources (DENR)- National Commission for Culture and the Arts (NCCA)-National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) Memorandum Circular on the Rules and Regulations Governing the Joint Confirmation Declaration and Recognition of Nationally Important Agricultural Heritage System (NIAHS) and Providing Appropriate Mechanisms for their Dynamic Conservation and Sustainable Use wherein the three agencies (DA, DENR and NCCA) have already provided the comments. At the moment, awaiting comments from the NCIP ; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint DA-Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)- DENR-Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) Memorandum Order on the Dynamic Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Agrobiodiversity within the National Convergence Initiative Framework which has been signed already in May 2022. | |
| | <p>Outcome 1.2: Enhanced institutional coordination and capacity to effectively address cross-sectoral issues of agro-biodiversity.</p> | <p>Number and type of instruments into which inter-disciplinary ABD considerations are integrated</p> | <p>Recognition of the value of ABD is limited only to certain special research programs of government; DA recognizes importance of ABD and is proposing to consolidate programmes on the issue</p> | <p><i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i></p> | <p>Interdisciplinary integration and coordination regarding ABD reflected in: Plans of local multi-sectoral councils of 3 MLGUs and 2 PLGUs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 1 Protected Area (PA) Area Plan per target region (DENR) | <p>To address the first target: Lake Sebu is within the Protected Area and has a Protected Area Management Plan. Aligned here, it has passed a municipal resolution supporting the project implementation and has allocated funds amounting to P3 M or USD 62 500 for 2020-2022</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>for the ABD Development/ Implementation Plan.</p> <p>An Orientation on E- National Integrated Protected Areas System Act was also conducted on 20 October 2021 by the DENR Protected Area Management Board (PAMB) since the municipality of Lake Sebu is part of the Allah Valley Protected Landscape, a proclaimed watershed forest reserve and one of the key biodiversity areas of the country. The PAMB also aligns and validates the contents and implementation of the contextualized learning modules facilitated by the project to integrate ABD and IKSPs.</p> <p>To address the second target, and through the mainstreaming of Provincial Coordinating Committees PCCs, 10 PCC meetings have been already conducted for the two provinces, while 10 Municipal Coordinating Committees (MCC) meetings have already been conducted for the three municipalities. The following were facilitated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ABD consideration included in the Ancestral Domains Sustainable Development & Protection Plans (ADSDPP) of the <i>T'boli</i> and <i>Ubo</i> Tribes in Lake Sebu and of the <i>Tuwali</i> in Hungduan, while Hingyon's ADSDPP is still to be developed. Nonetheless, target has been overreached. | |
| | | | | <p>2. At least 1 Ancestral Domain Area Development Plan (NCIP)</p> | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>3. Specific support programme of DA to Indigenous Peoples (IP)</p> | <p>To address the 3rd target: At the national level, the Agriculture Training Institute (DA-ATI) in collaboration with the project has allocated and almost utilized Php 4 M or USD 83 333 has been spent for the activities until May 2022 such as the delivery of Personal Protective Equipment (PPEs), farm tools and agricultural inputs (seedling trays, vegetable seeds) during Farmer Field Schools (FFS) regular and specialized training sessions. FFS in Lake Sebu culminated in August to September 2021 through various activities such as graduation, field day, harvest festival and rituals.</p> <p>The topic on integrated rice farming system, has been integrated to the FFS design , and farmers were provided with vegetable seeds, through the <i>Plant Plant Plant</i> Program of the DA, and complementary farm tools and animal, particularly ducks in Ifugao and goats in Lake Sebu (both co-financed by DA-ATI), on top of the vermicast provided by the project, towards mainstreaming of the ABD in the FFS. In May 2022, additional 1284 chickens including starter feeds were distributed to 107 farmers in Ifugao (12 chickens for each farmer), to add to the ducks initially given as part of the FFS. The supposed to be supplemental ducks were replaced by chickens due to the threat of avian flu as advised by the department.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>DA's 4K (<i>Kabuhayan at Kaunlaran ng Kababayang Katutuba</i>) or in English: <i>Livelihoods and Development of Indigenous Peoples Compatriots</i> Program for IPs is also on-going since 2020 until 2022 towards the development of the Ancestral Domain to improve productivity and develop sustainable agricultural enterprises. Initial coordination has been made to link the project to 4K program.</p> <p>Coordination meeting was conducted on 15 November 2021 with the 4Ks Program Coordinator of Region-12, followed by 4Ks orientation and farmers' profiling on 18 November in Brgy Klubi (ABD project pilot barangay in Lake Sebu). This was attended by Lake Sebu Indigenous Women and Farmers Association (LASIWFA) and Climate Resilient Farm Business School (CRFBS) graduates.</p> <p>Through the 4Ks Program, 450 coffee and 850 cacao seedlings were distributed to the LASIWFA Klubi Cluster which amounts to Php 36 750.00 as indicator of project mainstreaming in the 4Ks Programme of the DA. There were 22 farmer recipients of the seedlings.</p> <p>In addition, in 13 April, 50 small farm tools, 50 solar radio transistors, 50 bags of 40 kilos each of white corn seeds and 50 gallons of organic foliar fertilizer were given to 50 farmers in LASIWFA Klubi cluster, still funded by the 4Ks program of</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | the DA. Further, in 17 June 2022, one unit each of rice thresher, grass cutter, corn miller and abaca stripping machine amounting to Php 885 000 (USD 16 918) were turned-over to Klubi cluster which would benefit its 78 members. All these machineries were funded by the DA 4K program. | |
| | Outcome 2 | | | | | | |
| | Outcome 2.1: Conservation and sustainable use of ABD is supported by planning and governance mechanisms | Numbers of types of plans and programmes into which ABD concerns are embedded | Planning frameworks are currently inadequate for supporting ABD conservation | <i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i> | ABD concerns embedded in Comprehensive Development Plans (CDPs), Executive Legislative Agendas (ELAs) and thematic programmes for agricultural, natural resource management and tourism in 3 MLGUs and 2 PLGUs | <p>ABD concerns are embedded into the agenda/instruments issued by the pilot areas as reported in the Executive Legislative Agenda (ELA) and thematic programmes of South Cotabato with funding allocation of Php5M or USD 104 167 for Organic Program for 2020 and separate allocation for ABD related activities starting 2021 onwards. From the Php 5M allocation of the province, Php 175 000 or USD 3 646 has been utilized for Lake Sebu and distributed 1 000 packs of assorted vegetable seeds and planting materials (coconut seedlings) as part of the Plan Plant Program of the DA. Set of farm tools were also distributed initially to the 4 pilot areas with succeeding distribution to the 4 more areas, including the expansion areas.</p> <p>The Municipal Tourism Office of Lake Sebu committed to support the promotion and marketing of the ABD processed products through display in the local resorts and restaurants and establishment of municipal display/pasalubong center. Visibility materials such as signages and markers were also</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>in-place to promote the products. A municipal resolution has been drafted to institutionalize the accommodation, promotion and marketing of the LASIWFA processed ABD products (both developed and to be developed) in the resorts, restaurants, tourist destination areas and other commercial establishments in Lake Sebu. This is aligned with the Tourism Master Plan of the municipality which is yet to be finalized.</p> <p>While the groundbreaking of the municipal Pasalubong (Souvenir) Center in Lake Sebu was conducted on 11 November, the proposed construction was shifted to the repair of an existing facility since the MLGU allotment (co-financing counterpart) of Php 200 000 would not suffice. The proposed location is still within the compound of the supposedly proposed construction area.</p> <p>The draft comprehensive development plan of Lake Sebu already integrated ABD specifically in the agro-tourism sector under the landscaping program and with the component, establish agrobiodiversity programs and support mechanisms.</p> <p>While for Ifugao, the Provincial Agriculture Environment and Natural Resources Office (PAENRO) in particular allocated Php 2M or USD 41 667 for ABD support such as additional micromills, microtillers and</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>threshers through the Provincial Supplemental Budget. These farm tools (5 of each type) have been procured already and distributed in the municipality of Mayoyao, nearby municipality where production of traditional rice is abundant as well. The total amount of farm equipment distribute was Php 1 345 100.00. The farm equipment were not provided in the ABD project areas since the same (except for the threshers) types were already distributed by the project.</p> <p>Also, through the PAENRO, producer groups in Ifugao were provided with tools to process rice wine such as barrels for fermentation, jags, and bottles as well as other baking tools for the baked ABD products.</p> <p>The three pilot Municipal LGUs, have committed and are utilizing below co-financing for 2021 to 2022 to cover ABD project related activities such as the MMC meetings and facilitation of Locally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (LIAHS) -related activities and other trainings: Hingyon, Ifugao – Php 200 000 or USD 4 167 Hungduan, Ifugao – Php 100 000 or USD 2 083 Lake Sebu, South Cotabato – Php 2 000 000 or USD 41 667.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | <p>Numbers of MLGUs and communities in which formalized provisions for enforcement are in place</p> | <p>Governance frameworks are currently inadequate for supporting ABD conservation</p> | <p><i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i></p> | <p>Formalized provisions for enforcement in place in 3 MLGUs and 9 communities (as models for the 17 target barangays), specifically addressing threats affecting ABD</p> | <p>Municipal resolutions supporting the project have been issued, followed by the issuance of Executive Orders creating the Municipal Coordinating Councils and Technical Working Groups (TWGs) for LIAHS. While at the barangay level, the 17 barangay resolutions of support to the ABD project were completed.</p> <p>With the similarities of the composition of the existing provincial committees and PCCs in Ifugao and Lake Sebu, it was recommended to institutionalize the PCCs in the Ifugao GIAHS Sustainable Development Council (creation supported by the supported by the EO 09 series of 2014) while in the South Cotabato Committee on Agriculture and Food Security, respectively with only some amendments on the functions and roles to integrate the dynamic conservation and sustainable use of ABD. The PCC-Ifugao will meet in July 2022 and plan how the GIAHS Council and the PCC can be merged.</p> <p>The MCC in Lake Sebu will be absorbed by the Municipal Agriculture and Fishery Council (MAFC) as discussed during the</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | ABD mainstreaming consultation with the LGU in June 2022. | |
| | <p>Outcome 2.2: Traditional varieties are maintained in community gene banks</p> | <p>Numbers of ABD varieties/ farmer selections maintained in gene banks, supported by ex situ collections</p> | <p>Some individual initiatives (e.g. private museum in Lake Sebu municipality) hold a very limited number of varieties without adequate storage conditions. One seed bank exists in Hingyon. Some varieties are included in <i>ex situ</i> collections in universities.</p> | <p><i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i></p> | <p>All traditional ABD varieties/farmer selections present in the 3 target municipalities are maintained in gene banks, and supported by <i>ex situ</i> collections</p> | <p>The threat of losing the Traditional Rice Varieties (TRVs) has been addressed through the completion, turn-over and utilization of 17 CSBs for the storage of seeds and availability during planting, seed exchanges among farmers, and as genetic materials stored in small quantities both through <i>in-situ</i> and <i>ex-situ</i> conservation.</p> <p>Institutional coordination with the five government agencies for the dynamic conservation have been created: Philippine Rice Research Institute (PhilRice) for the <i>ex-situ</i> conservation of traditional rice through a black box agreement; Bureau of Plant Industry (BPI) on the status of the filed SIDA amendment, and the implementation of the DA circular on the registration of traditional varieties and capacity building and mentoring support for farmers; Philippine Fiber Industry Development Authority (PhilFiDA) for abaca propagation through macro propagation chambers and nurseries of traditional abaca including training on Integrated Pest Management; and the local academe, the Ifugao State University and the Mindanao State University for the inventory of other ABD crops and documentation of relevant Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) related to the traditional rice farming systems; and lastly, the</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>University of the Philippines Los Baños, for the farmers' characterization of TRVs, abaca and taro towards the development of descriptor list and valuation of ABD crops.</p> <p>Through the facilitation of the project, a multi-stakeholder training on provincial genebank management was conducted on 17 September 2021. The activity was conducted by PhilRice via zoom and was attended by the representatives of the Office of the Provincial Agriculturist (OPAg) of South Cotabato, and Municipal Agriculturists within the province. This was followed by PhilRice's visit to OPAG South Cotabato in May 2022. A learning visit of the farmers and provincial and municipal agriculturists to the PhilRice's Gene Bank facility, was conceptualized and being proposed to be held by July or August 2022.</p> <p>In February 2022, a blackbox agreement between the individual farmer-donors and the PhilRice was already drafted by the latter regarding the safety duplication of the collected heirloom/traditional rice varieties under blackbox conditions. The finalised agreement is commented by the Lead ABD Policy Consultant of the project to be endorsed to PhilRice for consideration. On the other hand, 7 offices within PhilRice were involved in the finalization of the draft document with planned on-site ceremonial signing in August</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>2022. In addition to the agreement, a briefer about the ex-situ conservation will be attached to the document for better understanding of the farmer donors. Both the agreement and the briefer will be translated in local dialect of <i>Tuwali</i> and <i>T'boli</i> tribal groups.</p> <p>In addition, a signed certification was issued by PhilRice stipulating that all the rice germplasm collections made through the ABD project are for safety duplication and <i>ex-situ</i> conservation.</p> <p>In May and June 2022, participatory consultations were conducted in Ifugao and Lake Sebu respectively and participated by total of 73 farmers to discuss, modify and agree on the contents of the black box agreement with target signing of both parties (farmer representatives and PhilRice) in July or August 2022.</p> <p>CSBs at the local level also serve as meeting, socialization, and commercial venue of farmers for information exchange, knowledge sharing and trade. It is also envisioned that CSBs will be part of the tourism site of the barangay or municipality which could also be a form of livelihood in the community, as part of promotion and information dissemination about TRVs/ ABD conservation. All these multiple uses of the CSBs besides seed storage, are ways to raise awareness, promotion, and appreciation of the importance</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>of agrobiodiversity conservation. All of these are elements that show the value of investing in the establishment of CSBs since there is only one cropping season of the TRVs.</p> <p>Relatedly, training on CSB Management were conducted in all sites; and enhanced guidelines on the management and utilization of the CSBs were developed. The guidelines on the use and management of CSBs were backed up by posters, logbook of seed borrowing, repayment and inventory of stored seeds, visible for the farmers and easily understood as presented in their local dialects.</p> <p>A total 13 TRV cultivars and 1 cultivar of abaca for <i>T'nalak</i> production, 1 cultivar of traditional corn, and 2 cultivars of banana, all selected by the farmers, were already endorsed by the PCC- South Cotabato for submission to the Bureau of Plant Industry for proper registration but put on hold to consider the terminal evaluation. However, during the participatory consultation in June 2022, the farmers opted to push with the registration even beyond the project duration.</p> <p>Similarly, the farmers from Ifugao decided to push through with the registration of traditional crops, particularly those that underwent farmers' characterization. This has been confirmed during the</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | participatory consultation held in May 2022. | |
| | <p>Outcome 2.3: Enhanced and expanded knowledge among local level decision makers and community members on the application of dynamic ABD conservation practices and their relation to cultural heritage</p> | <p>Numbers of LGU policy makers, planners and extension personnel in the core LGUs aware of the value of ABD and specific management options to ensure their conservation and sustainable use</p> | <p>LGU members especially, agricultural extension and NRM staff, are typically aware of general environmental issues but not of the full importance of, or management options for, biodiversity (including ABD). <i>Baseline values of knowledge will be detailed through KP studies in Year 1</i></p> | <p><i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i></p> | <p>21 LGU policy makers, planners and extension personnel in the core LGUs aware of the value of ABD and specific management options to ensure their conservation and sustainable use</p> | <p>The capacities of 209 LGU policy makers, planners and extension personnel on ABD management options were enhanced through the following info-sessions during meetings/on-site activities such as PSC, TWG, PCC and MCC meetings including meetings of the TWG for LIAHS and capacity building/mentoring on LIAHS documentation.</p> | |
| | | <p>Levels of knowledge among target farmers on how to adapt traditional management to changing circumstances</p> | <p>Farmers have retained traditional knowledge of traditional varieties and management practices, but lack knowledge of management options that would permit them to adapt to changing circumstances. <i>Baseline values of knowledge will be detailed through KP studies in Year 1.</i></p> | <p><i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i></p> | <p>Knowledge Products (KP) surveys show enhanced knowledge among 1,000 farmers in 17 target barangays of how to adapt traditional management systems to changing circumstances</p> | <p>A total of 2 513 indigenous famers have been trained in various ABD conservation and traditional farm management in 17 barangays. This is through the enhanced farmer field school including relevant and identified special topics. Virtual capacity building and field validation of the TRVs (in all pilot municipalities) and trainings on traditional varieties of taro (Hingduan and Hingyon) and abaca (Lake Sebu), were conducted as well.</p> <p>For the farmers' profiling, 298 farmers in Hungduan and 220 farmers in Hingyon were interviewed. Consolidation and analysis of data for the two municipalities are on-going.</p> | |
| | <p>Outcome 2.4: Improved opportunities for local communities to derive</p> | <p>Numbers of farmers applying producer labels based on ABD considerations, and quantity of rice labelled</p> | <p>- No farmers are currently third party certified. - A few ABD varieties in Ifugao were certified by a PLGU-initiated system</p> | <p><i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i></p> | <p>200 farmers in all 17 barangays, applying producer labels based on ABD considerations to a total of 35 tons of rice per year</p> | <p>A total of 667 IP women-farmers from the 17 pilot barangays have been involved in community-enterprises activities through capacity building activities and</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>economic, livelihood and food security benefits from agro-biodiversity conservation, resulting in increased sustainability of agro-biodiversity and ecosystem conservation practices</p> | | <p>but this was not sustained. First party producer labels are only applied by a limited number of farmers, only in Ifugao.</p> | | | <p>marketing, and have applied producer's labels with information on the sources of the raw materials such as various ABD crops being supported by the project (value addition). Initially market tested 100 kilos of <i>minaangan</i> and 100 kilos <i>tinawon</i> heirloom rice to one institutional buyer.</p> <p>Based on the market study conducted, most of the rice produced are for consumption.</p> <p>Another institutionalized buyer in Lake Sebu was established from September to November 2021- that is the DepEd's Feeding Program which availed 3 950 packs of <i>bongulan</i> banana chips and taro chips.</p> | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Productivity is gradually increasing with the turn over and usage of processing facilities, processing tools, and resumption of tourism particularly in Lake Sebu, and through the Municipal Tourism Office with monthly order Php 3 000 to Php 5 000 (USD 59 to USD 99) worth of ABD processed products (banana chips, taro chips, tomato candy) starting November.</p> <p>As of June 2022, total of Php 82 450 (USD 1 576) worth of tomato candy, <i>bongulan</i> banana chips, and taro chips were produced and sold by the three processor group beneficiaries in Lake Sebu, in the nearby municipality and to institutional buyers like the DepEd's Feeding program, resorts pasalubong (souvenir) stations, and tourism office.</p> <p>Farmers' consultation with the DTI Provincial office in Ifugao was held in May 2022 to discuss the labelling and packaging enhancement activities on their developed ABD products. On the same month, meeting among LASIWFA, Municipal Agriculture Office, Municipal Tourism and DTI Provincial Office of South Cotabato was conducted to conceptualize the training on enhanced packaging and labelling of the ABD products.</p> | |
| | | Levels of income from sale of traditional varieties | Average per farm annual production and sale of traditional rice varieties in the 17 target barangays (kg/farmer/year and US\$/farmer/year): | <i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i> | A total of 100 farmers from the 200 farmers applying producers' label in 17 barangays have increased their income from sale of traditional varieties by 5% | There were total of 327 women farmers who were capacitated in marketing and promotions through participation in trade fairs and exhibits and attended training on Market Assessment, | |

| | Produced | Sold | Net income | | | |
|-----------|----------|------|------------|--|--|---|
| Hungduan | 492 | 182 | 135 | | | |
| Hingyon | 450 | 99 | 93 | | | |
| Lake Sebu | 1381 | 732 | 243 | | | |
| | | | | | | <p>Planning and Management and Digitalization Training. This is in collaboration with United Nations Development Program’s (UNDP’s) initiative Women Organizations and Networks Delivering Assistance for COVID-19 Response Philippines (WONDER) initiative. This includes supervised processing of ABD products such as ginger candy, rice cookies and ginger tisane in Ifugao. Relative but minimal incomes have added due to limited production brought by the decline in the demand. From the meantime, there is continuous supervised processing in the pilot areas towards improved productivity in anticipation to the resumed markets. Further strengthening of the processor/producer groups were conducted to the municipal-wide and barangay-based or clustered organizations in Ifugao in April. Supervised production and marketing is on-going in all the pilot areas with anticipated turn-over of processing tools within June.</p> <p>Continuous engagement of the 14 producer groups (8 in Hungduan, 3 in Hingyon and 3 in Lake Sebu) have produced Php 180 502 or USD 3 451 worth of ABD products (taro chips, banana chips, ginger candy, turmeric tea, ginger tea, rice cookies, rice bar, rice brew, ginger herbal tea tisanes, traditional rice) distributed and sold within their communities such as in churches, hospitals,</p> |

| | | | | | | <p>variety stores, and barangay food terminal, among others.</p> <p>In Lake Sebu, South Cotabato, Php 14 200 or USD 296 worth of ABD products (banana chips, taro chips, tomato candy) was produced by the 2 producer groups distributed at the Lake Resorts, variety stores, DA's KADIWA (rolling/pop-up) store and PLGU and MLGU offices.</p> <p>Also, in Lake Sebu, trial marketing has started with an institutional buyer, the DepEd through their Feeding Program. Initial order of 1 300 packs of taro and <i>bongulan</i> banana chips in September, 1 400 packs of the same products in October, and 1 250 packs of <i>bongulan</i> banana chips in November, with total sales amount of P59 250.00 or USD 1 169.</p> <p>The baseline income data available at the moment is from Hungduan wherein from the profiled 298 respondents, 93.27% earns Php 1 000 to Php 10 000 pesos annually. On-going consolidation is being done for Hingyon and Lake Sebu data.</p> | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------|---|---|--------------|-------------------|--|-----|---------|-----|-----------|-----|---|---|--|--|
| | | Quantities of traditional rice varieties that farmers consume or use for social obligations, rather than selling, relative to baseline levels | <p>Quantities of farm-produced traditional rice varieties retained for home use (consumption or social obligations)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Municipality</th> <th>Kg/household/year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hungduan</td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hingyon</td> <td>351</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lake Sebu</td> <td>649</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Municipality | Kg/household/year | Hungduan | 310 | Hingyon | 351 | Lake Sebu | 649 | <i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i> | Farmers maintain the quantities of traditional rice varieties that they consume or use for social obligations, rather than selling, at least baseline levels. | <p>To achieve the first target: As per result of the market survey of the heirloom rice of Hungduan and Hingyon, 62% of the farmers interviewed cited that their product is mainly for consumption and only 38% of them sell their produce.</p> <p>On the other hand, market study and value chain analysis of the TRVs in Lake Sebu shows</p> | |
| Municipality | Kg/household/year | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hungduan | 310 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hingyon | 351 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lake Sebu | 649 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>that around 40 to 50 percent of the harvested <i>palay</i> were held in reserve for family consumption with average daily consumption of 0.44 kg per person</p> <p>To achieve this, a total of 3 to 5 additional rice varieties have been planted and grown and conserved in 17 barangays, such as: Hungduan – two (2) additional TRVs Hingyon – four (4) additional TRVs Lake Sebu – Twenty-two (22) additional TRVs</p> | |
| | Outcome 3 | | | | | | |
| | <p><u>Outcome 3.1:</u> Increased knowledge and awareness among policy-makers and practitioners about the full socio-economic value of agrobiodiversity.</p> | <p>Numbers of policy makers aware of ABD and practices that conserve them</p> | <p>Less than 15 policy makers and planners at national level and less than 20 local officials nationwide are aware of the value of ABD</p> | <p><i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i></p> | <p>Policy makers and planners aware of the value of ABD and practices that conserve them:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 50 from at least 15 national agencies 2) 50 local officials in 32 LGUs | <p>Policy makers and planners are aware of the value of ABD and practices that conserve them through the series of LIAHS activities.</p> <p>For the first target: 43 policy makers from 14 national agencies have been attained, and will continue to increase as the project progresses.</p> <p>For the second target: 190 local officials in 2 PLGUs and 3 MLGUs were informed of the full value of ABD through series of provincial and municipal-level workshops on LIAHS including mentoring sessions on LIAHS identification, documentation and declaration. To break it down, we have reached 29 LGUs (2 PLGUs, 3 MLGUs, and 17 BLGUs</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>in the pilot areas and 12 additional BLGUs (<i>Ned, Lamlahak, Halilan, O-ong, Umalbong, Namulditan, Ubuag, Piwong, Bangtinon, Abatan, Bangbang, Lubo-ong</i> in the upscaling areas. For both the pilot and expansion areas, the project is working with not only 32 LGUs but 34 across the 2 provinces, 3 municipalities and 29 barangays.</p> <p>In Lake Sebu, the project facilitates activities for the registration to the Department of Labor and Employment and CSO accreditation of the newly organized farmers' groups in the three expansion areas.</p> | |
| | <p>Outcome 3.2: Conditions created for further replication and scaling up of ABD promotion in other parts of core provinces and regions</p> | <p>Numbers of farmers covered by commitments and action plans developed by regional organizations, LGUs and other organizations</p> | <p>Commitments on outreach cannot be established until project start.</p> | <p><i>No identified mid-term targets at the design stage</i></p> | <p>1) Commitments and action plans materialized</p> | <p>To address the first target: Commitments of further collaboration and action plans were provided by the members of the PSC, PCCs, MCCs and TWGs for LIAHS to support sustainability and scaling-up.</p> <p>Co-financing reflected in various instruments such as South Cotabato Executive Legislative Agenda, Organic Agriculture Programme of Office of Provincial Agriculturist-South Cotabato, Tourism Master Plan of Lake Sebu, PAENRO-ifugao, Executive Orders from the MLGUs supporting the project, and the 17 Barangay Resolutions adopting the project, have been facilitated.</p> <p>As part of replication and scaling-up, the LIAHS identification, documentation and recognition are on-going, which covers additional 12 barangays (3 barangays in Lake</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>2) Focus on replication to twelve (12) nearby communities instead of other provinces and regions, in South Cotabato and Ifugao provinces. (following the MTR team's recommendations)</p> <p>3) target population of up to 4,000 farmers.</p> <p>This was reduced to 2 000 based on the recommendation of the MTR to focus on the nearby communities for replication instead of other provinces and regions</p> | <p>Sebu, 6 in Hingyon and 3 in Hungduan municipality).</p> <p>To address the third target: The number of farmers will also change considering the change from regions and provinces to PLGUs/MLGUs and BLGUs), as such, the target of 4,000 farmers was reduced to 2,000 farmers.</p> <p>Total of 4 090 have been achieved. In addition, 45 youth participated in the training workshop on enhancing the traditional skills of the <i>T'boli</i> on handicraft such as production of beads accessories, musical instruments, <i>t'nalak</i> weaving and home decors using bamboo, which was conducted on 23-24 February 2022. Skills training in expansion area in Hingyon was provided as well in April 2022. While in Lake Sebu, skills training on flour, bread and cake making was conducted by the Sultan Kudarat State University for the project pilot and expansion areas, held in May 2022. Prior to the training proper, series of consultation meetings were conducted with the farmer participants, LGUs, partner agencies, and LASIWFA towards timeliness of activity and cost-sharing/co-financing commitments.</p> <p>Identification of communities for scaling up is being discussed with the PLGUs and MLGUs. In Hungduan, the remaining 3 barangays and in Hingyon, the remaining 6 barangays not</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>covered by the project were identified as expansion areas. While in Lake Sebu, there will only be additional three barangays to be covered.</p> <p>The original target of 12 LGUs with commitment/action plans as revised shall be as follows: 2 PLGUs 3 MLGUs 17 BLGUs (pilot) 12 BLGUs (expansion)</p> <p>The target of 2000 farmers has been fully achieved as per MTR new target. In fact, it even overreached the original target of 4000 farmers with the abovementioned 4 090 reach.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

2. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

| Outcomes and Outputs ¹³ | Indicators (as per the Logical Framework) | Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan) | Main achievements ¹⁴ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR) | Describe any variance ¹⁵ in delivering outputs |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Outcome 1.1 | | | | |
| Output 1.1.1 Key policy instruments favouring ABD conservation developed at national and local level | Numbers of policy instruments developed favouring ABD conservation (4 policy instruments) | Finalization of the 2 policy instruments (the JMC and JMO) | 1 policy instrument (JMO) finalized and signed 1 policy instrument (JMC) circulated for final comment by the NCIP. 3 Agencies submitted comments already | DA, DENR and NCCA already provided comments and currently still awaiting from the feedback of the NCIP on the latest version; prior to signing the JMC. |

¹³ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹⁴ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

2023 Project Implementation Report

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>Output 1.1.2 Specific guidelines supporting the piloting of approaches to ABD management and conservation in the target areas</p> | <p>Coverage of special orders and MOAs to guide the piloting of approaches to ABD management in the target areas</p> | <p>Specific guidelines for the JMC and JMO developed</p> | <p>Specific guidelines to pilot approaches to ABD management in the target areas included in the developed JMC and JMO</p> | |
| <p>Output 1.2.1 Strengthened capacities and mechanisms for addressing interdisciplinary aspects of ABD conservation</p> | <p>Number of existing inter-institutional coordination mechanisms in the agendas of which ABD issues and good management practices and needs are taken up</p> | <p>3 of existing inter-institutional coordination mechanisms in the agendas of which ABD issues and good management practices and needs are taken up.</p> | <p>Inter-institutional coordination mechanism sustained with National Convergence Initiative through the Regional Convergence Team.</p> <p>Similarly sustained with the DA, DENR, NCCA and NCIP to finalize the JMC.</p> <p>Through the Bureau of Plant Industry, the department circular on the registration of traditional varieties has been signed.</p> | |
| <p>Outcome 2.1</p> | | | | |
| <p>Output 2.1.1 Local Government (LGU) plans and programmes in pilot municipalities providing for ABD conservation</p> | <p>Numbers of target MLGUs in which agriculture development plans, ordinances and programmes are included</p> | <p>3 MLGUs in which agriculture development plans, ordinances and programmes are included</p> | <p>Utilization of the 3 municipal and 2 provincial LGU funding allocations to the project through their socio-economic development plan, organic agriculture program or supplemental budgets as applicable providing additional farm equipment/tools, planting materials/inputs and training funds.</p> | |
| <p>Output 2.1.2 Community level planning and governance frameworks in pilot communities incorporating ABD considerations</p> | <p>Numbers of target barangays in which plans and customary norms are in place incorporating consideration of ABD.</p> | | | <p>Reported in previous PIR</p> |
| <p>Output 2.2.1 Community-based gene management systems and</p> | <p>Numbers of pilot municipalities in which community gene banks and seed stores have been established.</p> | | | <p>Reported in previous PIR</p> |

2023 Project Implementation Report

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| networks supported by <i>ex situ</i> collections | | | | |
| Output 2.3.1 ABD resources, agroecosystems and their management practices mapped, characterized and documented in the pilot areas | Numbers of barangays covered by participatory inventories and analyses of ABD resources, agroecosystems and their management practices | | Finalization of the reports of Ifugao State University (IFSU) and Mindanao State University (MSU) on the mapping, inventory and documentation of ABD resources, agroecosystems and management practices/IKSPs Capacity building (virtual training and field validation) on farmers' characterization and valuation of traditional rice, taro and abaca | Mapping, inventory and documentation completed Farmer's characterization conducted in August 2022 for all 3 pilot municipalities |
| Output 2.3.2 Knowledge sharing on ABD management and conservation practices for farmers in pilot and neighboring communities | Numbers of MLGUs where extension/ communication guides/modules have been developed Numbers of farmers involved in knowledge sharing on management and conservation practices for target ABD varieties | 3 MLGUs targeted where extension/ communication guides/modules to be developed Involve 122 farmers in knowledge sharing on management and conservation practices for target ABD varieties | 3 MLGUs where extension/modules have been developed 122 farmers involved in the knowledge sharing through FFS Documentation of the rolled-out FFS using enhanced module integrating ABD and IKSPs on rice farming system has been finalized | |
| Output 2.3.3 Inclusion of ABD issues in primary, secondary and tertiary education and IKSP programmes in the pilot provinces | Numbers of secondary and tertiary students receiving classes on ABD | 500 primary and secondary students received classes on ABD for Ifugao 700 primary and secondary students received classes on ABD for Lake Sebu | Grades 5 and 8 in 7 <i>Tuwali</i> speaking municipalities in Ifugao involving 500 pupils 700 Grade 7 <i>T'boli</i> speaking students and Secondary Tribal Education for Lake Sebu | |
| Output 2.4.1 Access to tools, equipment and facilities for improving productivity and sustainability, and reducing post-harvest losses | Numbers of target barangays with access to tools, equipment and facilities required for improving productivity and sustainability, and reducing post-harvest losses | . | | Reported in previous PIR |
| Output 2.4.2 Recognition of distinctive ABD and cultural importance of target sites and products | Numbers of target municipalities including NIAHS recognised sites | 1 target municipality for NIAHS recognition | Documentation of 1 municipality (Hungduan) for LIAHS and TWG for LIAHS endorsement to the Municipal Council Completed Farmers characterization in 6 barangays towards development of farmer | |

2023 Project Implementation Report

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | <p>Numbers of target barangays with community registries of traditional varieties under the Plant Variety Protection Act (PVPA)</p> <p>Numbers of traditional varieties in target barangays registered with National Seed Industry Council</p> | <p>6 target barangays have started the establishment of community registries of traditional varieties through the assistance of UPLB experts (under the Plant Variety Protection Act)</p> | <p>descriptor list and the establishment of community registry initially</p> | <p>Reported in previous PIR</p> |
| <p>Output 2.4.3 Detailed market analyses conducted to assess the specific marketability of indigenous varieties as a premium market product (building on general</p> | <p>Number of traditional varieties for which market studies carried out</p> | | | <p>Reported in previous PIR</p> |
| <p>Output 2.4.4 Capacity development for business planning, product development and marketing, to increase farmers' abilities to seize commercial opportunities from target ABD species/varieties</p> | <p>Number of producer groups with business and marketing plans to maximize opportunities for product development and revenue creation from target ABD varieties</p> <p>Numbers of people to who have received training on business development and management, and enterprise development support</p> <p>Numbers of new products developed from traditional varieties in target municipalities</p> | | | <p>Reported in previous PIR</p> |
| <p>Outcome 3.1</p> | | | | |
| <p>Output 3.1.1 Information on the full value of ABD and management options compiled and disseminated among policy-makers based on pilot results and existing national level information (including other initiatives)</p> | <p>Numbers of policy makers and planners who have received information on ABD and management options</p> | <p>Additional number of policy makers and local officials received information on ABD and management options</p> | <p>Policymakers and planners aware of the value of agrobiodiversity and practices that conserve them: - 50 from at least 15 national agencies, and - 50 local officials in 32 LGUs.</p> | |
| <p>Output 3.1.2 Modules on agrobiodiversity issues developed and included in primary, secondary and tertiary education and</p> | <p>Numbers of secondary and tertiary students receiving classes on agrobiodiversity.</p> | <p>Students in pilot schools participate in special training on heritage arts (song, dance, weaving etc.) but not on agrobiodiversity concerns.</p> | <p>Contextualized modules developed integrating agrobiodiversity and IKSPs for Tawali-speaking pupils in Grades 5 and 8 and T'boli-speaking pupils in Grade 7. Tertiary teaching module on Ifugao agricultural practices developed.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| IKSP programmes in the pilot provinces. | Numbers of ethno-linguistic groups having authored IKSP documents. | Sporadic documentation of agrobiodiversity resources initiated by individuals in pilot provinces but are not yet part of formal documentation of IKSP. | | |
| Output 3.2.1: ABD considerations included into knowledge sharing programmes ¹⁶ in target areas for upscaling (other parts of core provinces and regions, and elsewhere) | | | | Reported in previous PIR |
| Output 3.2.2: Partnerships with private sector established to facilitate the introduction of agrobiodiversity products into larger markets | | | | Reported in previous PIR |
| Output 3.2.3: Arrangements for outreach collaboration with actors in other municipalities, provinces and regions (NGOs/Government) | | | | Reported in previous PIR |

¹⁶ The knowledge sharing (extension, FFS, F2F, CPAR etc.) initiatives of relevant existing programmes and institutions e.g. ATI, BAR, LGUs, SUCs, PA Management Boards, NCIP

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

The project had final evaluation and was only kept operational to address some key safeguard issues arising.

As part of the closure process of the 'Dynamic conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity in traditional agro-ecosystems of the Philippines' project or the 'agrobiodiversity project' (ABD), an Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) was undertaken:

- (1) to determine adherence of the ABD project to applicable mandatory requirements as laid out in the Environment and Social Management Guidelines (ESMG) as well as focal environmental and social safeguards mandated in international policies and national legal frameworks;
- (2) to identify key environmental and social issues associated with the environmental and social performance of the project; and,
- (3) to gather stakeholder inputs in designing recommendations for environmental and social mitigation measures and in ensuring sustainability of gains from project results.

Adherence to the following applicable Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) in the ESGM were assessed for its operationalization in the project:

- ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats;
- ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA);
- ESS 8: Gender Equality; and,
- ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage.

The assessment was undertaken through a desk review and focus group discussions (FGDs). Key documents such as the project document, the midterm review (MTR), the terminal evaluation reports and relevant documents such as the FPIC Memorandum of agreement (MOA) with Indigenous Peoples (IPs), Community Seed Bank (CSB) guidelines, black box agreement (BBA), policy issuances pertaining to ABS for PGRFA, Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plans (ADSDPP) of the T'boli-Ubo peoples, and the Protected Area Management Plan (PAMP) of the Allah Valley Protected Landscape (AVPL), etc were gathered and assessed. Findings from the desk review were validated through FGDs among target stakeholders from project framers to implementers and evaluators gathering perspectives from the national to local level to reconstruct and assess project experiences specifically relating to risk management, FPIC and ABS. A total of 7 national level FGDs, 5 FGDs in the Ifugao province, and 4 FGDs in the South Cotabato province were undertaken. Tailor-fit tools were designed for each of the FGDs conducted.

The ABD project was observed to have complied with all of the ESS applied with a Low to Moderate risk at the closure stage. High risk assessments in relation to ESS 3 and ESS 9 were identified specific to the Ifugao Province.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

| | FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁷ | FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁸ | Comments/reasons¹⁹ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Manager / Coordinator | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | The gradual easing up of containment measures caused by the pandemic has contributed to conduct of more field activities including frequent coordination with the local partners. However, the conducted terminal evaluation has consumed a lot of time in terms of arranging respondents (from the field) during virtual meetings and preparation of documents/evidence to support or counteract the evaluators' findings. Some activities have been put on hold due to some recommendations but was resumed after further consultation with government and IP beneficiaries (e.g. registration of TRVs to be done by the farmers). Nonetheless, all planned activities were conducted with minimal spill-over during the approved extension months. |
| Budget Holder | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | The project is implemented on track and most outputs have been completed or above 96% delivery. |
| GEF Operational Focal Point²⁰ | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | The project has accomplished majority of its target outputs as reported, by realizing above 90% of its deliverables. |
| Lead Technical Officer²¹ | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | |

¹⁷ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁹ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

²⁰ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.


²¹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|--|
| GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO) | Moderately Satisfactory | Satisfactory | <p><i>The overall project progress by the end of the project is rated moderately satisfactory, in line with overall rating by the independent evaluators in 2022. However, the follow up work that the project undertook to address the concerns raised on safeguard issues raised by the final evaluation team has been Satisfactory. The project has thoroughly addressed by recruitment of an independent expert and under the guidance of FAO's Environment and Social Safeguards team.</i></p> <p><i>In line with FAO policies, the management response to the final evaluation recommendations have been prepared and FAO Country Office, in partnership with relevant government and other stakeholders, will need to ensure that the action items identified as part of management response are followed through and reported in due course.</i></p> |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|--|

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please indicate if new risks have emerged during this FY.


| Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement | Expected mitigation measures | Actions taken during this FY | Remaining measures to be taken | Responsibility |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| ESS 1: Natural Resource Management | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture | | | | |
| | Ex-situ safe duplicates deposit in PhilRice genebank following the blackbox agreement and international genebanking standards | Secured certification from the Philrice on the safety duplication and ex-situ conservation of the TRVs collected through the project specifying that PhilRice follows the international genebanking standards | An ESIA national consultant was hired to conduct environmental and social impact assessment of the project to identify and propose mitigation measures/recommendations if needed and applicable. See attached executive summary of the report  ESIA_ABD project_Executive Surr | PMCU-FAOPH/PhilRice/LGUs FAOPH, in coordination with FLO, LTO and ESM colleagues. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Finalization of the blackbox agreement and signing of both parties | | |
| ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 7: Decent Work | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 8: Gender Equality | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage | | | | |
| | | | | |
| New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY | | | | |
| | | | | |

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

| | |
|---|--|
| Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission) | Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²² . If not, what is the new classification and explain. |
| High risk (Terminal Evaluation) | Moderate based on the FAO Environmental and Social Screening Checklist prepared for the project and cleared by LTO (updated version as of March 2023). |

²² **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

| | |
|--|---|
| |  <p>ESMG_Screening_Ch ecklist_updated as of :</p> <p>This considers the results of the ESIA study. Based on the study, the ABD project was observed to have complied with all of the ESS applied with a Low to Moderate risk at the closure stage. High risk assessments in relation to ESS 3 and ESS 9 were identified specific to the Ifugao Province.</p> |
|--|---|

Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

| | Type of risk | Risk rating ²³ | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Government budgetary constraints at national and local level | 40% | Modest Risk | <p>Review of the development and investment plans and aligning the ABD or expanding to ABD with the existing plans and ensuring proper, documented and reported utilization.</p> <p>All the plans of the two pilot provinces and the three pilot municipalities already included ABD considerations with funding allocation including cost-sharing down at the barangay level.</p> <p>Continued follow up on the co-financing status and utilization.</p> | <p>South Cotabato PLGU already provided funding support for the construction of the processing centers in the 5 pilot barangays of Lake Sebu</p> <p>Municipal Tourism Office of Lake Sebu encouraged the resorts and restaurant owners in the municipality to promote and market the processed ABD products including budget allocation for the establishment of display area for the ABD products.</p> | |

²³ Risk ratings means a rating of the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

| | Type of risk | Risk rating ²³ | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 2 | Low level of participation and support from stakeholders | 20% | Low Risk | <p>Proper timing and proactive coordination for the conduct of activities were considered to: ensure availability of the target attendees, cost-sharing with participants such transportation expenses, encourage hosting (to hold the activity in specific office of partner stakeholder)</p> <p>Timing is considered so that schedule of trainings will not coincide with the partners and beneficiaries' office, farm, and/or household activities.</p> <p>Participants travel expenses were reimbursed by the project and meals and snacks are provided during face-to-face meetings and workshops.</p> <p>Proper safety protocols are being implemented to show to the participants that they are safe in attending project activities.</p> | <p>This situation is site specific and dependent on the timing of the activity. In Lake Sebu, there is a high level of participation and support from farmers and LGU, while in Hingyon and Hungduan, there is also a high level of support from LGU and the farmers. Difficulty in the level participation is encountered when the project activities coincide with farm activities during planting and harvesting seasons. In some instances, there are low level of participation among beneficiaries due to typhoons (which poses risks especially in upland areas due to landslides).</p> <p>The new normal, that is utilizing the digital platform during trainings paved way for more flexible learning through recorded lectures by the resource persons, as requested.</p> | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating ²³ | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 3 | Insufficient consumers' "willingness to pay" for the products. | 20% | Low Risk | <p>Development of proper labelling to reflect the nutritional, cultural, social and ecological benefits of patronizing the ABD products, and lobbying for government and/or DTI accreditation are continuous to enhance product value.</p> <p>Additionally, further enhancement to include embedded short story about the producers in product packaging is being conceptualised (for value addition) including the development of merchandising modules.</p> | <p>At this stage of the project, the willingness to pay of the consumers for eco-labelled products at premium price is high given, specifically for naturally grown crops or products and its social and nutritional value.</p> <p>It is deemed that the information about the product being produced by IP beneficiaries supported by the project, provides value addition as well- (socio-cultural relevance).</p> <p>The labelling of processed ABD products is continuous and will be improved, through partnership with the Department of Trade and Industry, Department of Tourism, and with PhilRice for the nutritional analysis.</p> | <p>Consumers are willing to pay for the ABD products produced through the project</p> |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating ²³ | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 4 | Limited capacity of local/national institutions for implementing project activities | 20% | Low Risk | <p>Development of knowledge products such as articles and visibility materials/signage related to the project objectives, supporting activities and benefits, as well as continuous updating with the local and national institutions.</p> <p>This will pave the way for continuous training of trainers by the national and local government institutions.</p> <p>Experiences in the implementation of the ABD project are being shared during year end assessment workshops organized by the SPCMAD, Department of Agriculture and participated-in by various government (national and local) agencies.</p> <p>Provincial Coordinators and Community Facilitators of the project are provides technical support to government partners, depending on their needs.</p> | The local/national institutions have sufficient capacity in implementing project activities. | |
| 5 | Climate change | 100% | High Risk | <p>Participatory development of activity calendar and updated cropping calendar and introduction of resilient varieties</p> <p>Construction of CSBs for seed storage has been completed and turned-over, making all these CSBs functional (seed borrowing and returns).</p> | Climate change adaptation strategies are integrated across all the capacity-building activities particularly through FFFs being implemented at the local level in partnership with national government agency. | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating ²³ | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 6 | Limited private sector involvement | 20% | Low Risk | <p>Participation to the multi-stakeholder events/congresses/fora and trade fairs and exhibits to ensure awareness about the project and ABD in general.</p> <p>Partnership with the private sectors has been established by the project, and at present there are 4 partners from the private sector. Private sector partners could be buyers of processed products or as trainers during enterprise capacity building activities.</p> | <p>There are many private sector entities that are willing to help the IP producers/processors in the designing, packaging and marketing of their products as experienced during the project's participation in trade fairs and exhibits. This includes hotels, resorts, retail stores, among others</p> <p>The project has a good collaboration with DTI and Local Government Units and they will further provide support on referrals/market matching of more private stakeholders, if needed.</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|-------------|--|---|--|
| 7 | Coordination between ministries and with local institutions | 50% | Medium Risk | <p>Facilitation of the regular meetings of the relevant committees such as the Project Steering Committee, Technical Working Group and the Provincial Coordinating Committee, Municipal Coordinating Committee and TWG for LIAHS (municipal level). Conduct agency meetings regarding ABD policy considerations.</p> <p>The existing memorandum circulars, plans, and other policy instruments will further strengthen the collaboration.</p> <p>Specifically, the development of policy instruments like the DA-DENR-DAR-DILG Joint Memorandum Order (JMO) facilitates close coordination/collaboration between major departments in charge of the National Convergence Initiatives (NCI) Framework wherein ABD considerations shall be included in the said NCI framework. The draft JMO has been finalized and is now with the NCI Secretariat for submission to the NCI Board for approval. Once approved it is now ready for implementation and local coordination with the various institutions involved in the JMC shall be implemented.</p> <p>Same with the development of the DA-DENR-NCIP-NCCA Joint Memorandum Circular (JMC) on LIAHS/NIAHS. The creation of Municipal TWGs for the documentation of LIAHS facilitates close collaboration with partners at the local level. At the national level, the project TWG reviewed the draft JMC during the TWG meetings thus coordination among partner agencies represented in the TWG has been implemented.</p> <p>Implementing the facilitating role of FAO, and a multi-stakeholder participatory approach, several coordination meetings were attended various government partners and stakeholders</p> | <p>Interdepartmental coordination is being addressed through the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and TWG meetings which are reinforced by the 1) Provincial Coordinating Committees in Ifugao and South Cotabato, 2) Municipal Coordinating Committees in Hungduan and Hingyon, Ifugao and in Lake Sebu, South Cotabato, and lastly 3) the three TWGs for LIAHS in all the pilot municipalities.</p> <p>The mitigation measures mentioned have been vital to strengthen the FAO PMCU coordination among government agencies, local institutions and various stakeholders</p> | |
|---|---|-----|-------------|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---|------------|----------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>8</p> | <p>Community quarantines brought by the COVID-19 pandemic</p> | <p>30%</p> | <p>Moderate Risk</p> | <p>Continue preparation of articles and case studies about the project for submission;</p> <p>Participation on on-line webinars;</p> <p>Conduct of trainings virtually</p> <p>Regular coordination with partner agencies, and project staff through phone call, emails and text messaging while getting recent updates on the local travel restrictions, and health protocols;</p> <p>Continuous monitoring of the food security status of the IP farmers in the pilot sites, and the assistance provided to them by the national government, Department of Agriculture and other agencies including LGUs.</p> <p>The project workplan has been adjusted prioritizing the project activities that can still be carried out remotely while project staff are in a work-from-home arrangement</p> <p>Conduct of online FGDs for the ABD crops Farmers' Characterization;</p> <p>Conduct of online mentoring on the documentation of the Locally Important Agricultural Heritage System;</p> <p>Conduct of virtual PSC and TWG Meetings at the national level as well as PCC and MCC meetings at the local level.;</p> <p>Conduct of virtual PMCU meetings to provide updates on ongoing project activities and address issues pertaining to project implementation.</p> <p>Maximizing the capacities of the partner local stakeholders (Municipal Agriculture Office and farmer leaders) to lead the conduct of activities requiring face-to-face such as the FFS sessions</p> | <p>Strict compliance to the LGU advisories will be done.</p> <p>Some activities shall be implemented at a later date(s) and some activities shall be conducted back-to-back when normal situation has returned.</p> | |
|----------|---|------------|----------------------|--|---|--|

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High):

| FY2022 rating | FY2023 rating | Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period |
|---------------|---------------|--|
| Moderate | Moderate | |

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report. **(Please note that a final evaluation has been conducted in 2022)**

| MTR or supervision mission recommendations | Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u> |
|--|---|
| Recommendation 1: | |
| Recommendation 2: | |
| Recommendation 3: | |
| Recommendation..... | |
| Recommendation..... | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</p> | <p>Yes, the project has exit/sustainability strategy/plan, which was finalized in consultation with the government partners and beneficiaries, to enable and sustain the progress, gains and positive contribution of the project in the area of agrobiodiversity conservation at the policy/institutional level and on the ground or site level. This Sustainability Plan lists the important activities delivered by the project, their status, and subsequently, this document will be turned over to government partners for follow-up actions.</p> <p>Selected activities are as follows: policy recommendations for implementation, site-level activities related to ABD conservation which includes community seedbanks management and maintenance, mapping and inventory of TRVs, ABD database establishment and maintenance, extension modules development, capacity building on product development and enterprise management, farm tools and equipment maintenance, consumer awareness on ABD, partnership with the private sector, promotion and marketing of the developed ABD products, ABD considerations included in the grade 5 and 8 workbooks and lesson plans, abaca propagation, integrated pest management (IPM), and partnership with the DA's 4-Ks project, among others. The matrix that shows the details of the Plan including its status as of June 2022 and the proposed lead responsible unit(s). Also included in the matrix is the list of the co-implementing entities and partners that may have to take over and sustain the activities.</p> |
|--|---|

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²⁴. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

| Category of change | Provide a description of the change | Indicate the timing of the change | Approved by |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Results framework | | | |
| Components and cost | | | |
| Institutional and implementation arrangements | | | |
| Financial management | | | |
| Implementation schedule | No cost extension up to March 2023 approved to conduct ESIA Assessment | | LTO and FLO |
| Executing Entity | | | |
| Executing Entity Category | | | |
| Minor project objective change | | | |
| Safeguards | | | |
| Risk analysis | | | |
| Increase of GEF project financing up to 5% | | | |
| Co-financing | | | |
| Location of project activity | | | |
| Other minor project amendment (define) | | | |

²⁴ Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

| Stakeholder name | Type of partnership | Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement | Challenges on stakeholder engagement |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| Government institutions | | | |
| Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Technical Working Group from the National Government Agencies; | PSC members are responsible for the overall coordination, foster cooperation with other government agencies and active partnership among LGUs, NGOs, and other concerned institutions, as well as ensuring that the project is coordinated and implemented for maximum outputs. Per SO the PSC is created to provide the general oversight, policy direction and guidance to ensure the smooth and timely project implementation and towards the attainment of desired outputs and outcomes. The TWG reviews the workplan and policies developed by the project, and provide technical support/advice to the project. | Regular conduct of meetings for timely advisory actions | |
| Provincial Coordinating Committees from the Provincial Local Government (Ifugao and South Cotabato); | The PCC reviews the proposed provincial workplan of the project; provides technical support to the project | | |
| Municipal Coordinating Committees | The MCC provides technical support and technical advises on the implementation of the project and conduct monitoring of project activities | | |
| Local Technical Working Groups for Locally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems from the Municipal Local Government | Multi-stakeholder participation in the documentation of LIAHS | | |
| | | | |
| NGOs²⁵ | | | |
| Jaime V. Ongpin Foundation | One of the members of the PSC representing the private sector. | One of the technical advisers for project | |

²⁵ Non-government organizations

2023 Project Implementation Report

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | implementation across all components since it is also a member of the PSC. | |
| Lake Sebu Indigenous Women and Farmers Association, Hungduan Heirloom Rice Producer Organization, Hingyon Hingland Agrobiodiversity Producers and Processors Organization | Producer groups project partners | Continuous processing, and selling of ABD products. | |
| <i>Private sector entities</i> | | | |
| Gemma Dimog of Os-os Farm | Resource Person to provide technical support for Enterprise Development | Coaching and mentoring on enterprise operations | |
| Dr Jay Balogbog | Resource Person to provide technical support during the mapping, inventory and documentation of ABD and IKSPs in Lake Sebu | Documentation Report | |
| <i>Others²⁶</i> | | | |
| University of the Philippines Los Baños | Resource Person to provide technical support during Farmers Characterization | Farmer Descriptors List | |
| Sta Cruz Mission School | Contextualization of the learning module to include ABD and IKSP | Learning module developed | |
| <i>New stakeholders identified</i> | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

²⁶ They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women’s groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then

10. Gender Mainstreaming

| Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period. | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| Category | Yes/No | Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period. |
| Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages. | Yes | The priority trainings identified and requested were continued during the reporting period such as skills training on business development and management, as well as enterprise support which promote and provide them with additional livelihood activities, in turn providing additional incomes. |
| Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment? | Yes | Provision of women-friendly entrepreneurial skills trainings which enhance the roles of women beneficiaries, and promote women empowerment, were conducted. The project also facilitated the participation of women's organizations in different fora. |
| Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage): | | |
| a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources | Yes | The project was able to contribute to the three areas mentioned, closing gender gaps, improving women's participation and decision making as well as generating socio-economic benefits. |
| b) improving women's participation and decision making | Yes | |
| c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women | Yes | |
| M&E system with gender-disaggregated data? | Yes | Activity Tracker and beneficiary lists are gender-disaggregated |
| Staff with gender expertise | Yes | The PMCU staff refers to the FAO Policy on Gender Equality, as reference. There is no project-hired PMCU staff who is a gender expert, but at any rate, the project team regularly coordinates with the FAOPH Gender Focals, for technical support. |
| Any other good practices on gender | | Reported in previous PIR |

11. Knowledge Management Activities

| Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u> | |
|--|---|
| Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far. | The project's knowledge management strategy was developed by the Communications Specialist, which is included in the Communications Plan. It has two tools for knowledge management: (a) the good practices documentation guide and (b) the success stories documentation guide. These are used as guides by the PMCU at the national and provincial levels to document good practices and success stories that they have observed during the project implementation. |
| Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year . | Yes, the project has a communication strategy, which is fleshed out in a communication plan and is adjusted based on emerging needs. The agrobiodiversity briefer has been updated as of December 2022. This was disseminated to other stakeholders for potential resource mobilization. |
| Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits. | http://www.fao.org/philippines/our-programmes-projects/success-stories/cash-from-crisis/en/ https://www.fao.org/philippines/news/detail/en/c/1500128/ |
| Please provide links to related website, social media account | oldcompendium.bar.gov.ph/agrobiodiversity-project |
| Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web. | https://www.fao.org/philippines/news/detail/en/c/1500128/ https://www.fao.org/philippines/news/detail/en/c/1500135/ http://www.fao.org/philippines/our-programmes-projects/success-stories/cash-from-crisis/en/ http://www.fao.org/3/cb4932en/cb4932en.pdf https://www.fao.org/3/cb6895en/cb6895en.pdf |
| Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details | Former Communications Specialist: Melanie Sison |

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

Before the actual project implementation, the project was able to be issued with a Certificate of Pre-condition from the National Commission on Indigenous People (NCIP) which indicates the completion of the FPIC process and authorizes the project to start. This has been achieved by completion all the necessary documents and procedures such as community consultations, dialogue with the IP elders, and coordination meetings with NCIP. The primary farmer-partners of the project are the IPs, particularly from the *Tuwali* tribe in Ifugao and the *T'boli and Ubo* tribes in South Cotabato. Similarly, the project is working closely with the local government unit officials who are also IPs.

Aside from the documentation role of the NCIP during the FPIC process, the NCIP also monitors the timely delivery of commitments and agreements set between the IPs and the project.

Recognizing the indigenous knowledge systems and practices among the IPs, the members of the PMCU value, observe, promote, and practice the participatory consultations with the IPs to ensure that the tools/facilities and other interventions introduced by the project are aligned with their IKSPs. These include guidelines developed on the access and management of CSBs and the tools and equipment by the community, among others. The developed contextualized learning modules were validated with the IP students, IP leaders and community elders to ensure correctness and appropriateness to their culture. The blackbox agreement regarding the safety deposit of the traditional rice varieties has been thoroughly discussed with the IPs and all their concerns were taken into consideration.

The visibility materials and signage and community-developed guidelines are written in their local/IP dialects for ease of understanding and socio-cultural alignment. Knowledge products/signage developed are with the approval also of the NCIP and the IPs.

In the project's Provincial and Municipal Coordinating Committees, the IPs are also being represented by the Indigenous People Mandatory Representative (IPMR) including NCIP, the relevant agency it is attached to.

The IPs' participation in all the trainings both for conservation and sustainable use are valued by the project and adjustments are being made to accommodate their availability. Relatedly, the project avoids the schedules of the trainings to coincide with their farm and off-farm activities, and ensure that the training modules are aligned with their knowledge and learning capacities.

Essentially, the beneficiaries' (Indigenous Peoples') wisdom, traditional knowledge and practices, have been taken into account in all the project activities, recognizing their role as safeguards of the environment, and their contributions which are essential in designing and implementing sustainable solutions for food systems, agrobiodiversity and ecosystems.

13. Co-Financing Table

| Sources of Co-financing ²⁷ | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing ²⁸ | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval | Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023 | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) | Expected total disbursement by the end of the project |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| National Gov't. | DA-Bureau of Agricultural Research | In-kind | 2,172,214 | 1 418 092.77 | 1,055,879 | 7768, 370.19 |
| | DA-Agricultural Training Institute | In-kind | 90,910 | 69 277.75 | 11,364 | 28,129.33 |
| | DA-Bureau of Soil and Water Management | In-kind | 88,335 | 200.00 | For verification | 88,135.00 – for confirmation |
| | DA-Bureau of Plant Industry | In-kind | 113,636 | 41 600.00 | 40,000 | 32,036 for confirmation (Already allocated Php5,000,000 for CY2021 for CSB mainstreaming and ABD sustainability) |
| | DA-PhilRice | In-kind | 1,136,364 | 27 389.98 | For verification | 5,000.00 for confirmation |

²⁷Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁸Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

2023 Project Implementation Report

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | DENR Biodiversity Management Bureau | In-kind | 27,838 | 30 228.17 | 1,495 | exceeded the commitment |
| | DENR Cordillera Administrative Region | In-kind | 3,794,369 | 3 593 742.00 | 3,593,742 (for validation) | For confirmation |
| | DENR Region 12 | In-kind | 16,205 | 13 857.00 | 13,364 | 2,841 for confirmation |
| | National Council for Indigenous People | In-kind | 2,272 | 2 311.58 | 2,272 For verification | 0 (Already exceeded commitment by USD1,632 or 71.83%) |
| Local Government | South Cotabato Provincial Government | In-kind | 1,014,270 | 105 389.16 | 49,214 | 40,000.00 for confirmation |
| | Lake Sebu Municipality | In-kind | 94,887 | 65 831.57 | 9,788 | 42,076 for confirmation |
| | Hingyon Municipality | In-kind | 1,118,862 | 26 256.16 | 4,817 | 2,000.00 |
| | Ifugao Provincial Government | In-kind | 815,682 | 35 621.16 | 23,934 | 40,000.00 |
| | Hungduan Municipality | In-kind | 475,680 | 27 068.16 | 13,177 | 4,000.00 |
| International Organization | World Agricultural Heritage Foundation | | 100,000 | 100, 000 | 100,000 | 0 (Commitment already utilized 100%) |
| | FAO | | 457,800 | To be verified | To be verified | To be verified |
| | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | 11 519 324 | 5 556 865.46 (48.24%) | 3 814 736.18 | |

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement?

Partner agencies realigned their committed co-financing for 2020 due to COVID-19 response programs (as required by the Department of Agriculture and other government partners), which lessened the actual utilization for the ABD project.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

| Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. | |
|--|---|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice” |
| Satisfactory (S) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits |

| Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan. | |
|--|---|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice” |
| Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. |

| Risk rating will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: | |
|--|--|
| High Risk (H) | There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks. |
| Substantial Risk (S) | There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks |
| Moderate Risk (M) | There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk |
| Low Risk (L) | There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks |

Annex 2.**GEO LOCATION INFORMATION**

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

| Location Name | Latitude | Longitude | Geo Name ID | Location & Activity Description |
|---------------|----------|-----------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.