PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)
PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND:GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project Title:	Strengthening National Systems to Improve Governance and Management of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Conserved Areas and Territories		
Country:	Philippines	**GEF Project ID:**	5826
GEF Agency:	UNDP	**GEF Agency Project ID:**	5389
Other Executing Partner(s):	Department of Environment and Natural Resources – Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (DENR – PAWB), National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), Koalisyong ng Katutubong Samahan ng Pilipinas (KASAPI), Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID)	**Submission Date:**	May 7, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	**Project Duration:**	36 months
Name of parent program: **For SFM/REDD+** ☐	N/A	**Agency Fee:**	166,391

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
BD-1	GEFTF	1,751,484	5,016,540
Total Project Cost		1,751,484	5,016,540

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: Strengthen the conservation, protection and management of key biodiversity sites in the Philippines, by institutionalizing ICCAs as a sustainable addition to the national PA estate.

Project Component	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative Financing from GEF	Indicative Cofinancing ($)
Policy Harmonization and Implementation	TA	*Legal and regulatory framework and administrative procedures that harmonize the mandates, plans and activities amongst all key stakeholders such as NCIP, PAWB, BFAR and relevant local government units are established and effectively implemented for the identification, mapping, recognition and management of ICCAs, measured through:* • Improved efficiency in official recognition of an ICCA over the project period [Baseline and targets to be established during the PPG] • Certificates of ancestral domain titles (CADTs) and ancestral domain sustainable development protection plans (ADSDPPs) of all remaining ICC (Indigenous Cultural Communities) claims and ancestral domains clearly identify and map ICCAs as part of the process • Strengthened regulatory frameworks and integration of ICCAs into LGU CLUPs to control incompatible activities in at least 2 of the new ICCAs.	1.1. Joint Memorandum Circulars between NCIP, DENR-PAWB, Forest Management Bureau and BFAR which harmonise and operationalize existing policies and regulatory frameworks that address inconsistencies and recognizes ICCAs as an innovative type of governance for protected areas and conservation 1.2. Support to advocacy and consensus building on the ICCA Bill 1.3. Policy for adoption and complete roll-out of revised NCIP Guidelines and procedures for ancestral domain delineation and ADSDPP preparation incorporating the identification, mapping and documentation of ICCAs 1.4. Land use planning guidelines of LGUs are enhanced to incorporate the identified ICCAs 1.5. Implementing guidelines and procedures for NIPAS PA management planning and zoning that incorporate identification, mapping, documentation and traditional governance systems in ICCAs	465,807	2,378,567

		• Improved management effectiveness of NIPAS PAs with documented and recognised ICCAs, as reflected in at least 20% increases in METT scores – list of PAs to be confirmed			
Capacity building for effective governance and management of ICCAs	TA	*Expansion of landscapes and seascapes under effective protection through enhanced governance and management capacity of targeted ICCAs, measured by:* • Expansion of the national PA estate to cover an additional 100,000 hectares of recognized terrestrial and marine/coastal ICCAs. • Joint DENR, NCIP and NGO groups with sufficient capacities to support ICCA documentation, mapping and research in each of the regional offices. • Reduced threats to BD resources and ecosystems in 100,000 hectares of ICCAs through improved governance capacities of ICCs and support organizations, measured by an increase in the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard. • At least 10 ICC communities reporting receipt of assistance from the National ICCA Consortium. • A National ICCA Registry adopted as part of the processes of review of EIAs and preparation of LGU CLUPs and agency plans and programs, monitoring and evaluation of status of BD resources and PA governance and reporting to CBD	2.1. Regional networks of at least 10 ICCAs representing the country's ethnographic regions are identified, documented, mapped, recognised and registered at UNEP/WCMC. 2.2. At least 10 community conservation plans, with relevant business plan sections incorporated, are developed and implemented to support ICCAs; and mainstreamed into ADSDPPs and LGUs CLUPs and investment plans. 2.3. Capacities of NCIP, DENR, PAWB, FMB, BFAR in all regions are strengthened to provide technical support to ICCAs. 2.4. Capacity of National ICCA Consortium developed to serve as the mechanism for exchange, advocacy, and legal support to ICCAs in distress. 2.5. Capacities of ICCs in the network of least 10 ICCAs are strengthened to document, map, plan and implement actions to address the identified threats. 2.6. A National Registry of ICCAs is established, supported by an appropriate system for validation, monitoring, and access by the public.	1,126,451	2,181,924
Sub-total				1,592,258	4,560,491
Project management Cost:				159,226	456,049
Total project costs				1,751,484	5,016,540

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, ($)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount ($)
National Government	Biodiversity Management Bureau	Cash	600,000
National Government	Biodiversity Management Bureau	In-kind	1,000,000
National Government	NCIP	Cash	425,000
National Government	NCIP	In-kind	891,540
CSO	PAFID, KASAPI, FPE, PTFCF	In-kind	237,500
Local Funding Facilities/CSOs	Philam Fund, FPE, PTFCF	Cash	750,000
Others	ICC Communities	In-kind	112,500
GEF Agency	UNDP Philippines	Cash	1,000,000
Total Co-financing			5,016,540

D. INDICATIVE TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)

NA

E. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Please check on the appropriate box for PPG as needed for the project according to the GEF Project Grant:

	Amount Requested ($)	Agency Fee for PPG ($)[1]
• (up to)$100k for projects up to & including $3 million	75,000	7,125

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

A.1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A.1.1 Global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed

The Philippines is the world's second largest archipelago country after Indonesia and includes more than 7,100 islands covering 297,179 km2 in the westernmost Pacific Ocean. It is one of the world's richest countries biologically. The country is one of the few nations that is, in its entirety, both a hotspot and a megadiversity country, placing it among the top priority hotspots for global conservation. The island geography, the climate and the once extensive areas of rainforest, have resulted in a high level of biodiversity endemism in the country. At the very least, one third of the more than 9,250 vascular plant species native to the Philippines are endemic. Of the 530 bird species found in the Philippines, 185 (35%) are endemic. 61% of the mammal species, 68% (160 species) of reptiles and 70% of nearly 21,000 recorded insect species found in the Philippines are endemic. The endemism is even higher (85% or 90 species) for amphibians, Philippines plays host to 65 endemic fish species, with 9 endemic genera. 70% of the nearly 21,000 insect species are aendemic.[2]

Biodiversity loss is a problem of global proportions. The world's biodiversity is estimated to be experiencing rates of extinction at least 1,000 times higher than any time previously in Earth's history, with some 20,000 species known to be threatened with extinction and many more likely to be threatened (Barber et al., 2004, p. 30). Habitat destruction is identified as the main driver of biodiversity loss. To prevent further habitat destruction and conserve biodiversity, countries and governments designated national terrestrial and marine protected areas. As of January 2009, there are 122,512 nationally designated protected areas in 235 countries and territories included in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). These areas cover 21,242,195 sq km, or about 12.1 per cent of the earth's surface. This includes both terrestrial and marine protected areas. While there has been considerable progress in the growth of protected areas over recent decades, there is growing scientific agreement and policy recognition that existing areas are not sufficient to meet the increasing challenges of biodiversity conservation.

In the Philippines, where 5.4 million hectares have been established as protected areas (representing 18% of the country's total land area), there is agreement among stakeholders that there are huge gaps in coverage and representativeness of the protected area system. Compared to the extent of identified key biodiversity areas (KBAs) in the country, existing protected areas cover only 35% of KBAs. There are an estimated 4.6 million of KBAs that need to be placed under some form of effective protection. Filling these gaps only by expanding conventional protected areas is impractical given both the enormous areas to be covered and issues of jurisdiction where about 4.3 million hectares have been recognized as ancestral domains and an additional 2.6 million hectares are covered with application for certificates of ancestral domain titles (CADTs). Using the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) approach, the legislation required to gazette a protected area takes years to complete. Unless there are other cost effective ways of accelerating the expansion of conservation coverage, it is likely that degradation will cause irreparable damage to these KBAs before these can be placed under effective protection, resulting in direct loss of Philippine endemic biodiversity. In order to address this, the government, through the UNDP-GEF supported New Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project (NewCAPP), has pilot tested the recognition of new and diversified governance regimes in the establishment and management of protected areas. One which has gained international recognition is the country effort in documentation, mapping and recognition of indigenous community conserved areas (ICCAs) in territories occupied by indigenous peoples, which have overlaps in biologically significant terrestrial areas, estimated to reach about 1,345,198 hectares (involving CADTs in 91 KBAs). This means that 29% of the entire area of KBAs requiring protection falls into territories occupied by indigenous peoples, so creating mechanisms for recognition and strengthening of ICCAs creates the enabling enviornment for a significant contribution to the strategic expansion of the protected area estate to protect globally significant biodiversity. Through the NewCAPP, the potential for more cost effective expansion and diversification of conservation coverage has been documented; with proven co benefits to upholding the rights of indigenous peoples, protection of their livelihoods and cultural and spiritual values associated with such ICCAs. In the Philippines, ICCAs include sacred sites and natural features, indigenous territories, cultural landscapes and seascapes. They are found in both terrestrial and marine ecosystems in the country. The ICCA sites also represent different bio-geographic regions. They can be found from the

[1] PPG fee percentage follows the percentage of the GEF Project Grant amount requested.
[2] http://www.eoearth.org/view/article/150648/ accessed 04/16/2014

mountain ridges to the coral reefs. They provide habitats to a high diversity of flora and fauna, as evidenced from the high degree of overlaps between KBAs and ancestral domains. Based on experience from NewCAPP, the Indigenous Cultural Communities's (ICC) designated ICCAs can range from their sustainable hunting grounds which are governed by traditional systems of resource use; to sacred places and entire forest corridors; depending on the value of ICCAs to a particular ICC community.

By working on several pilot areas, NewCAPP has initiated policy and structural changes, such as the inclusion of new forms of protected areas in the National PA System Plan that is currently under formulation. This has created an opportunity for a significant expansion of the national conservation estate, through recognition of ICCAs, which typically coincide with areas of greatest surviving endemism. As a result of the work done by NewCAPP and other partners such as NGOs and NCIP, there is now significant interest from many ICC groups to map, document and recognize their ICCAs.

Long-term Vision and Barriers

The **long-term vision** is to adequately represent the biodiversity of the Philippines in its protected area system of which the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Conserved Areas and Territories form an integral part. The **barriers** to this long term vision are briefly described as follows:

Inconsistent or lack of clear policy to support ICCA establishment and management

Policy harmonization is required to ensure existing policies afford ample protection to the ICCAs; and are duly integrated and recognized in local and national planning systems. The Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA) provides for the conservation of natural resources as one of the prime objectives in the management of ancestral domains; however, the ICCAs do not enjoy the same level of policy protection as protected areas declared under the NIPAS. For example, NIPAS clearly prohibits mining activities within PAs, as well as the construction of renewable energy plants exceeding 3 megawatts. Any infrastructure exceeding this capacity should be supported by legislation. This is not the case for ICCAs, where in addition to environmental impact study; all that is needed is FPIC from the community affected. The proposed ICCA Bill could strengthen the policy cover for ICCAs, as areas identified for conservation purposes, but it does not yet have widespread support, and there is a need for advocacy to build consensus around the objectives of the Bill. Other policies, such as resource use in ancestral domains, land use planning preparation, and related laws have fragmented and sometimes contradictory objectives, and need to be harmonized to ensure the potential of ICCAs to effectively contribute to biodiversity conservation and well-being of ICCs. In protected areas established through the NIPAS, there is currently a lack of documentation and recognition of ICCAs; including support to implementation of community conservation plans, and providing this recognition would strengthen on the ground protection. Installing such procedure in the NIPAS guidelines would ensure all PAs covering ancestral domains would have provisions for recognition of the traditional governance mechanisms of ICCs in the sustainable management and protection of specific portions of gazetted PAs. Recognition of these traditional practices and resource use policies of the ICCs is also absent from formally established PAs, and should also be clarified through a series of administrative issuances, to ensure the ICCs are allowed to sustain their practices without being labeled as violating specific provisions of the NIPAS act.

Lack of capacities of national, provincial and local governments to integrate ICCAs into their existing planning and governance systems

At present there is a lack of capacity at all levels to systematically incorporate the mapping, documentation and recognition of ICCAs as part of ancestral domain delineation and management planning, as called for in the delineation of certificate of ancestral domain title (CADTs), and ancestral domain sustainable development protection plan (ADSDPP) formulation; following the IPRA. To optimize this potential, there is a need to improve the capacities of national government agencies such as NCIP, provincial and local governments to embed ICCA procedures into existing systems, and provide support to ICC groups. Likewise, the capacity of the National ICCA Consortium, now on its nascent stage with support from NewCAPP, needs to be strengthened to enable the ICCs and NGO support groups to effectively utilize the Consortium as the medium for formulating their priority self-determined plans and programs, policy advocacy, securing broader support for ICCAs, and protect these from unwanted forces that threaten the erosion of traditional knowledge and practices that provide the bedrock for ICCAs to exist. To strengthen the recognition system and the support mechanism by government, there is a need to institute an official recognition process for ICCAs and other forms of conservation measures, through the establishment of a National ICCA Registry, linked with the global ICCA registry at UNEP/WCMC. The registry should be able to formally acknowledge the ICCAs declared by the communities, and share such information with development support organizations to catalyze resource provision, and as reference for land use planning and development by local government units, key agencies and the private sector. The discussions started at NewCAPP can be brought to a level where the registry is operational through a vetting process; and as an instrument for monitoring progress towards the contribution of ICCAs in meeting BD conservation targets and sustainable management of natural resources.

A.1.2 Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects

Under the NewCAPP, seven pilot ICCs within KBAs are being supported in the documentation and mapping of their ICCAs. Two of these - the Menuvu ICC community in Mt. Kalatungan and the Ayta ICC community of Cabangan, Zambales have been successfully registered at the ICCA global database held at UNEP/WCMC. In these pilots, capacities of ICC partners were strengthened on 3D mapping, resource inventory, analysis of the state of their forests, documentation of traditional knowledge and governance systems on ICCAs. Moreover, the process involved the formulation of community conservation plans to address the threats and sustain their ICCAs. These pilots cover an estimated 90,000 hectares of ICCAs, in six KBAs. Based on these experiences, a Procedures Manual is being developed to help provide guidelines for other support organizations on the process for ICCA documentation, mapping and registration.

Through NewCAPP's advocacy work, there has been significant acceptance of ICCA among the ICC leaders in the country as a key strategy to conserving what are regarded as the most sacred and important sites within their ancestral domains. The subnational and national ICCA Conferences enabled understanding among ICC communities that the approach is not a new concept but rather reinforces their cultural and spiritual connections to the land, and their associated obligations as a community group to protect these. These events likewise helped galvanize the linkage between the goals of biodiversity conservation, sustainable natural resources management, and ICCAs. As a result, key ICC leaders have formulated a Manila Declaration which expresses the principles for engagement with support groups, development organizations and agencies on ICCAs, as well as the major programs that are needed to propel ICCA as a national strategy. Based on the Manila Declaration, NewCAPP is supporting the setting up of the National ICCA Consortium - a coalition of key ICC leaders and support organizations, personalities, that will serve as the platform for further engagement in further supporting ICCAs in the Philippines.

In view of the encouraging support of ICC organizations on ICCAs, and the evidence demonstrated in the NewCAPP sites, other grant funding organizations such as the Foundation for Philippine Environment (FPE) and the Philippine Tropical Forest Conservation Foundation (PTFCF); have adopted ICCA in their programs. PTFCF has in fact, identified ICCA as one of its key result areas using the programmatic grant approach in the review of proposals. These would open up opportunities for funding site level efforts to document and recognize ICCAs, formulate, and implement community conservation plans. Other NGOs have likewise started to mainstream ICCA as part of their strategy. Conservation International for example, is reviewing potential sites where it can support a landscape ridge to reef approach on ICCA. The Philippines' Biodiversity Management Bureau is likewise set to adopt ICCA as a key element of its National PA System Master Plan; and has submitted proposals for funding by the Department of Budget and Management to support additional ICCAs under the 2015 General Appropriations Act. The NCIP, in its recently issued guidelines on ADSDPP preparation, provides for the identification of traditionally conserved zones, but operationalizing these has continued to be a challenge for lack of capacities and specific procedures. The systems that have been developed in the identification and delineation of ICCAs could contribute to operationalizing such provision. Moreover, there have been discussions at the Mining Industry Coordinating Committee that was created by virtue of Executive Order 78, to identify areas as no go zones for mining. Firming up ICCAs as established zones within the ADSDPP could help facilitate such discussions.

A.1.3 Proposed alternative scenario, with description of expected outcomes and components

The Government of Philippines is requesting GEF support through this Medium-Sized Project project to remove, in an incremental manner, the existing barriers **to strengthening the conservation, protection and management of key biodiversity sites in the Philippines, by institutionalizing ICCAs as a sustainable addition to the national PA estate.** Two components are planned:

Component 1: Policy Harmonization and Implementation: This component shall focus on ensuring that policy and regulatory frameworks governing natural resources in the Philippines support the expansion, management and conservation of protected areas by recognizing and supporting the governance and management of ICCAs in a coherent and comprehensive way. The component will identify gaps, inconsistencies, and opportunities for harmonization in the policy framework (particularly gaps between the mandates and jurisdictions of NCIP and DENR-PAWB), develop new or revised policies and regulations to address these gaps and work with the relevant national and local stakeholders to have these strengthened instruments put into effect. The Congressional Committee on Indigenous Peoples shall be supported in the review and stakeholder consultations, as well as advocacy in the discussions of the proposed ICCA Bill that is being formulated. Policy and technical inputs, particularly the lessons and experiences from implementation will be provided to the Bill sponsors to strengthen the case for the proposed legislation. The component will focus on policies and regulations at the national level, but will also work with local government units and the League of Municipalities to strengthen local government policies and regulations where required. The identification of policy gaps and inconsistencies and recommendations for revisions will be developed by an interagency task team including the indigenous peoples, the DENR/PAWB, the NCIP, academic experts and other stakeholders. This component will also ensure that in addition to strong scientific and ecological conservation criteria, the development and application of policies is anchored on the bundle of ICC rights provided under the IPRA. The component will

ensure that the selection and prioritization of conservation sites is strengthened by mainstreaming governance and management of ICCAs.

Component 2: Capacity Building for effective Governance and Management of ICCAs: The integration of ICCA governance will bring a comprehensive, adequate, representative and resilient sample of biodiversity under protection in the networks of protected areas. The project outcomes and results will expand the area of biodiversity under protection, by adding at least an additional 100,000 ha of terrestrial and marine/coastal habitat to the national PA system, in addition to establishing the enabling conditions for systematic documentation, mapping and registration which will make further expansion of a network of ICCAs in the country possible in future. Through this component, at least 10 ICCAs will be identified, documented and mapped and regional networks established for information and experience exchange. The indicative list of ancestral domains from which the potential ICCA sites will be chosen is listed in Annex A. Community conservation plans will be developed for each of the new ICCAs with necessary sections dealing with the long-term financial sustainability of the areas included. The project will support the implementation of the plans and financial sustainability strategies in order to incentivize communities to continue with the conservation of the areas after project end. The project will also strengthen the management and conservation of existing ICCAs by increasing technical and institutional capacities for conservation management. This component seeks to build the capacities of indigenous communities, the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples, and other support groups in mainstreaming conservation. The activities shall include building capacity to conduct mapping and documentation of ICCAs, enhancement of the ADSDPPs to include conservation measures and targets, supported by spatial plans that clearly mark the boundaries and locations of ICCAs, and linked to the surrounding landscapes of the ancestral domains. To ensure the effective participation and role of Indigenous Communities in the Governance of the project; Capacity Building needs identified by the National ICCA Consortium shall be supported. This shall ensure the viability of the National ICCA Consortium to perform its task as the representative of Indigenous Communities in the implementation of the project. Under this component, lobbying and advocacy activities shall be carried out for the inclusion of ICCAs in the national and sub-national development planning. This would also entail engaging with local government units to find the most suitable and appropriate process and arrangement between the local development plans such as the CLUP, and the ADSDPPs. As part of the capacity building strategy, the project shall strengthen the traditional governance and management of ICCAs by supporting such initiatives as schools for living traditions and customary laws like the Timuay justice system of the Tedurays in Mindanao and the Lapat and Dap-ay of the Maeng tribe in Abra (Luzon). ICCAs in distress and under threats shall be provided with support. Help will be accorded to communities to defend themselves from legal charges meant to harass them such as SLAPP suits and other similar actions because of their resistance to external aggression. To complement and improve the traditional governance systems, paralegal training shall also be conducted. The role of the National ICCA Consortium in setting up and management of an ICCA Defense Mechanism shall be examined and capacity building support provided. A comprehensive information, education and communications campaign shall be carried out specifically targeting non-indigenous peoples for them to have a better understanding of ICC rights and raise public awareness about their roles in conservation. Culturally sensitive modules shall be developed for this purpose. The training shall primarily be conducted for the local government units, government policy implementers, and other agencies.

A.1.4 Incremental cost reasoning and global environmental benefits

In the baseline scenario, the expansion of the PA estate through the incorporation of ICCAs will be slow, with risks that the momentum already achieved through UNDP-GEF NewCAPP support will dissipate. It is important that the institutionalization of ICCA be strengthened by tackling the remaining policy inconsistencies, developing further institutional and community capacities, and formulation of sustainable sources of financing for the likely expansion of ICCAs. Under the baseline situation, there will be strong support for ICCAs in the pilot sites, but not enough to muster national level attention and systemic support for its expansion. Other ICCAs will continue to face threats in light of inconsistencies in policies, limited understanding, and weak capacities of support institutions and community groups. By establishing strong networks of ICCAs at the landscape and seascape levels, the overall viability of ICCAs as a mode of conservation governance will be strongly recognized. The attendant support to capacity building, mainstreaming in policies and plans, and the buildup of a robust database of registered ICCAs will help thrust this approach into mainstream policy and socio economic agenda. Successfully tackling these barriers will ensure that the integration of ICCA governance will bring a comprehensive, adequate, representative and resilient sample of biodiversity under protection in the networks of protected areas. The project will lay the basis for systematic expansion of biodiversity under protection, particularly through incorporation of ICCA processes in the documentation of claims by indigenous peoples communities, preparation of ADSDPPs.

In the Philippines, it is estimated that between 60 and 65 percent (or roughly 4.5 million hectares) of the Philippines' 6,838,822 hectares (DENR-FMB 2003) of remaining natural forests are within the ancestral domains of indigenous peoples (PAFID, 2011). This could be attributed directly to the conservation efforts of indigenous peoples. In addition, at least 69 protected areas overlap with 86 ancestral domains and ICCAs of indigenous peoples. The aggregate area of overlap is almost a million hectares (PAFID 2011). This is further evidence that a significant portion of the country's remaining biological resources are within

ancestral domains. In addition, there is an overlap of an estimated 1,345,198 hectares of territory occupied by indigenous peoples that has been identified as falling into mapped Key Biodiversity Areas, the inclusion of which in the expansion of the protected areas estate is critical to enhancing its representativeness. Strengthening the traditional governance and management systems of the indigenous peoples both in existing protected areas and in new ICCAs would result in improved management and conservation of globally important biodiversity. Greater coordination and coherence, and strengthened management capacity at national and local levels will support the creation of a robust, representative and resilient system of PAs safeguarding a representative sample of the Philippines' biodiversity. The institutionalization of ICCAs as conservation areas would extend the current protected areas coverage by 100,000 ha to close the gaps that still exist for specific ecosystems and species, and to ensure the physical connectivity essential for their long-term survival. Investments in the governance of ICCAs will improve the management of the protected areas that already exist and make them more cost-effective.

Socio-economic benefits: In addition to conserving biodiversity, the proposed project will provide significant socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels. At the national level, a strengthened PA system will increase the resilience of the Philippines' resource base, safeguarding the productivity of an important national resource which supports industries such as tourism and fisheries. More resilient ecosystems will also reduce the potential physical, social and economic impact of extreme weather events such as typhoons, cyclones and storm surges, to which the Philippines is highly vulnerable. At the local level, the project will also contribute to the livelihoods, and more importantly the food security of large numbers of poor and vulnerable people, including women-headed households. A larger and more resilient PA system will support more sustainable livelihoods, particularly indigenous peoples, small scale local (municipal) fisherfolk, and farmers, these groups are amongst the poorest households in the Philippines, with dependence on local resources correlating strongly with landlessness and marginalization. The creation of a larger network of ICCAs will also broaden opportunities for indigenous peoples and local communities (including women) to engage in alternative livelihood activities.

A.1.6 Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up

Recognizing and supporting the governance and management of ICCAs is an innovative way of expanding and improving the effectiveness of biodiversity conservation. ICCAs are an important complement to official protected area systems. They come in all sizes, from the very small to the very large, stretching the very concept of protected "area". ICCAs are established for a variety of purposes and managed to various ends, including "mostly preservation-focused areas" broadly corresponding to IUCN categories I-IV, and "areas mostly focused on sustainable use", broadly corresponding to IUCN categories V-VI. Both strict preservation and sustainable use can be effectively enforced by indigenous peoples and local communities, while practical/ economic motivations can positively reinforce ethical/ spiritual reasons in setting up and maintaining CCAs.

Sustainability: ICCAs present a long history of conservation and sustainable use that is much older than the government-managed protected areas. Indigenous peoples and local communities, both sedentary and mobile, have for millennia played a critical role in conserving a variety of natural environments and species. They have done this for a variety of purposes, economic as well as cultural, spiritual and aesthetic. At present, there are many thousand ICCAs across the world, including forests, wetlands, and landscapes, village lakes, water catchment, rivers and coastal stretches and marine areas. These ICCAs are often neglected or not recognized in official conservation systems. Many of them face enormous threats. Fortunately, there is also a growing recognition of ICCAs and acknowledgement of their role in the conservation of biodiversity.

The socioeconomic benefits described above are closely linked to the sustainability of the project since it is these local developmental benefits which underpin the support that local government units will provide for PAs. LGUs establish, manage and finance PAs because they recognize the valuable role such reserves play in supporting and protecting the livelihoods of poor communities. Thus a significant portion of the financial and political support PAs receive is tied to their socioeconomic value, while also underpinning the global environmental benefits they provide. At the institutional level, the project has been designed to integrate governance and management of ICCAs into the activities and development programmes of Local Government Units, which are the primary governance structures at sub-national levels. By explicitly linking conservation of biodiversity resources to local development and livelihoods outcomes (e.g. through the role of ICCAs as a resource base), the institutional and social support (and therefore sustainability) of the project is assured.

Replication: will be achieved through the direct replication and scaling up of the establishment of ICCAs. The full potential of the spatial extent over which recognition and institutionalization of ICCAs can be applied in the Philippines is still to be determined. However the number and coverage of approved Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT) is a useful indicator. The approval of CADT depends on the ability of the claimant community to prove that "they traditionally had access to it for their subsistence and traditional activities" practiced in observance of their customary laws (IPRA Sec 3a). As of 30 September 2010, the NCIP has approved 156 Certificate of Ancestral Domain Titles (CADT) having a total area of 4,249,331.544 hectares of land and water. These areas are part of the 6 to 7 million hectares of land and water that the NCIP estimates could still be recovered as ancestral domains. Further, the project will also be issuing joint memorandum circulars between NCIP, DENR-PAWB, Forest Management Bureau and BFAR that will recognize ICCAs as an innovative type of governance for protected areas and conservation, paving the way for increased replication. The process will be further streamlined by the revision of the

NCIP guidelines and procedures for ancestral domain delineation and ADSDPP preparation incorporating the identification, mapping and documentation of ICCAs.

A.2. STAKEHOLDERS. IDENTIFY KEY STAKEHOLDERS (INCLUDING CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS, INDIGENOUS PEOPLE, GENDER GROUPS, AND OTHERS AS RELEVANT) AND DESCRIBE HOW THEY WILL BE ENGAGED IN PROJECT PREPARATION:

Stakeholders	Roles and Responsibilities	Involvement in the Project
Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs)	They are the base stakeholders of the project at the site levels. They directly manage ancestral domains, prepare ADSDPPs, and are responsible for maintaining the traditional governance in their ICCAs	They are the ones whose governance and management of their ICCAs shall be recognized and supported by the Project. They shall be the main actors in the identification, mapping and registration of ICCAs, with support from other organizations and agencies
Local Government Units	They will be one of the primary project stakeholders at the local and municipal level. LGUs are responsible for supporting the management and supporting local ICCAs, and LGU budgets are seen as one of the main sources of support for these sites.	LGUs will be responsible for establishing supportive local regulatory frameworks to encourage the recognition and support of ICCAs, and for supporting enforcement and community monitoring activities to reduce poaching and encroachment.
National agencies such as NCIP and DENR/BMB	Their mandates directly impact on ICCAs. NCIP is responsible for supporting the ICC rights, and implementation of the IPRA; while the BMB is mandated to support conservation efforts of stakeholders.	Both agencies will be part of the implementation at the site level as well as leading the review of national and local policies and appropriate actions that need to be undertaken to make policies more relevant and supportive of ICCAs
Philippines ICCA Consortium	This organization has been established and mandated by the indigenous communities to establish a national program to support the ICCAs in the Philippines during the First National Conference.	The Consortium will be a recipient of technical assistance so that its capacity is strengthened to fulfill its mandates under the Manila Declaration. It will also play a key part in the advocacies and in supporting ICC organizations whose ICCAs are under threat
Koalisyon ng mga Katutubong Samahan sa Pilipinas (KASAPI)	This coalition is the foremost ICC organization advocating the recognition and support in the governance and management of ICCAs in the Philippines. It has been part of the piloting ICCA project under NewCAPP.	KASAPI will play a major role in supporting the National ICCA Consortium, and in linking the Project with the various IP organizations in the Philippines.
Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID)	This organization has pioneered mapping and documentation of ICCAs in the Philippines and has since been providing technical assistance to ICCs for the recognition and support in the governance and management of ICCAs. PAFID has been a part of the piloting ICCA Project under NewCAPP.	PAFID will have a key role in developing capacities of other NGOs and ICC organizations in such skills as 3D mapping, documentation of IKSP, resource inventory (RI) and thematic mapping, and participatory analysis of RI results, including community conservation planning.
Other national and local NGOs	A number of active NGOs support indigenous peoples groups in the Philippines. Some of them are members of the National ICCA Consortium. Others have important roles to play in supporting ICC communities incorporate ICCAs in their work in supporting the delineation of ancestral domains and preparation of ADSDPPs. Other NGO financing facilities such as the Foundation for Philippine Environment (FPE) and the Philippine Tropical Forest Conservation Foundation (PTFCF) support indigenous groups in their conservation efforts and can therefore become efefctive partners of the Project. Other NGOs play a large role in implementation and in networking with other initiatives in areas which will not be covered by the project.	Some of these NGOs will be recipient of technical support to partner with DENR and NCIP offices to work out plans for documenting regional representative ICCAs in their localities. These NGOs are expected to mainstream ICCA procedures in their engagement with ICC communities in the course of their work. Other funding organizations such as FPE and PTFCF are expected to provide parallel financing to replication of ICCAs in other communities and KBAs by virtue of their BD conservation programs.

Stakeholders	Roles and Responsibilities	Involvement in the Project
Private sector	A number of private sector organizations are supporting ICC rights and their conservation practices. Some however, are involved in extractive activities that threaten or undermine ICCAs.	Those involved in extractive activities will become important targets of education and advocacy campaigns, such that they recognize the ICC communities' policies and values of ICCAs in their investment decision making processes.

A.3 RISKS

Risks	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigating Strategy
LGUs will not be supportive of IPLCs and the concept of ICCAs.	MEDIUM	The Project will target LGUs in its advocacy activities, strongly engage them as site partners, emphasizing that the Project is non partisan and stands to benefit the marginalized communities of the area. The Project will be inclusive and the engagement with LGUs shall commence at the very start of the Project. Project implementation shall adopt transparency, accountability and participation in its systems, processes and standards.
There will be difficulty in coordinating with partners of the Project given their different mandates and expertise.	MEDIUM	The process of designing and developing the Project shall be a partnership building strategy. To ensure transparency, objectivity and efficiency in managing the Project, he institutional and implementation arrangements will be thoroughly discussed during project preparation.
Lack of clarity and agreement on the role of NCIP and BMB will result in conflicts and delays in implementation.	LOW	NCIP has already issued a favorable endorsement of the Project recommending the BMB as the lead agency. Further clarifications on the specific roles of NCIP, BMB and other key actors will be made during project preparation to seek consensus thereby allowing the concerned organizations to expand their work in supporting ICCAs without generating conflicts.
Climate unpredictability will affect the achievement of outputs and outcomes of the Project.	MEDIUM	Climate change resiliency measures and analysis will be integral to the ICCA processes. Data on resilience and climate changes impacts, including community and traditional indicators, will be generated, compared, and analyzed for each ICCA and among the ICCA sites.
Policy harmonization and complementation will require work which goes beyond the life of the Project.	MEDIUM	Efforts will be made to define significant milestones in policy harmonization and complementation and commitments sought among agencies. Progress on these will be regularly monitored and reported to the Project Board.

A.4. COORDINATION. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELEVANT GEF FINANCED AND OTHER INITIATIVES:

The proposed Project will complement other ongoing initiatives. It will serve as the scaling up of NewCAPP, through strengthening the policy environment and improvement of capacities of key support organizations by working with a representative sample of 10 ICCAs that include parts of KBAs. Other projects, such as the GIZ assisted Protected Area Management Enhancement (PAME) Project, are also supporting other forms of governance in the expansion of the country's PA system; and have adopted the ICCA approach in working in KBAs inside areas occupied by ancestral domains. On the part of NCIP, this Project strongly supports the strengthening of relevant provisions of the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA), as well as enhances the current system for documentation of ancestral domain claims and preparation of ADSDPPs, with spatial considerations and well delineated conservation zones. The Project will also complement the programmes of other funding institutions such as FPE and PTFCF, in light of their current focus on ICCAs to support local community efforts in BD conservation. Once institutionalized, the ICCA processes could very well be adopted by the UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Partnerships Programme (BPP), as a way of mainstreaming BD into the plans and programs of ICC communities. The recently approved UNDP-GEF Small Grants Programme, designed to support local initiatives in biodiversity conservation, shall also be complemented by the proposed Project. It is envisaged that a large portion of the funding portfolio will be dedicated to ICC partners in the SGP's priority areas in Sierra Madre and Palawan where there are large concentrations of ICCs. The proposed Project will also coordinate and maximize synergy with a recently approved project managed by UNDP and funded by the International Climate Initiative of the German Government on "Support to indigenous peoples' and community conserved areas and territories (ICCAs) through the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) as a contribution to the achievement of Targets 11, 14 and 18 of the CBD Aichi 2020 framework'" which identifies the Philippines as one of the target countries for implementing work on 1) Legal, policy and other forms of support for ICCA recognition and conservation (including governance assessments

of protected areas and landscapes) and 2) Networking, knowledge production and exchange between national CSO initiatives at regional and global levels.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 NATIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANS OR REPORTS AND ASSESSMENTS UNDER RELEVANT CONVENTIONS, IF APPLICABLE, I.E. NAPAS, NAPS, NBSAPS, NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, TNAS, NCSAS, NIPS, PRSPS, NPFE, BIENNIAL UPDATE REPORTS, ETC.:

The Philippine Development Plan (PDP) espouses inclusive growth through among others, the sustainable management and protection of the country's environment and natural resources. It also mentions that one of the country's key development constraints is degradation of its environment and important ecosystems. The establishment of a network of protected areas is identified as key to this strategy. The updated Philippine Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (PBSAP) likewise calls for the recognition of ICCs and LGU contribution to BD conservation, as part of the direct actions to protect and conserve existing natural habitats, improve resilience of local communities, and regulate resource extraction to sustainable limits. The ICCA is embedded as a key strategy in the PBSAP.

B.2. GEF FOCAL AREA AND/OR FUND(S) STRATEGIES, ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND PRIORITIES

The project conforms closely to the GEF's Operational Strategy, the objectives and the eligible activities under the Biodiversity Focal Area (FA) Strategy; supporting directly Strategic Objective 1, "To improve the sustainability of protected area systems", mainly through Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. This project will catalyze the expansion of the country's PA estate, through the integration of ICCA processes in the documentation of ICC claims, delineation of ancestral domains, documentation of IKSP and traditional governance mechanisms that contribute to the sustainability of ICCAs, and the formulation of ADSDPPs that strongly feature BD conservation objectives. The impact would be acceleration of the process of institutionalizing and strengthening the ICCAs, as well as improving management effectiveness in formal PAs overlapping with ancestral domains, thereby resulting in METT scores which reflect better relations with ICC communities and on the ground protection and management. In addition, the project will contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets of the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity, for which the GEF serves as the financing mechanism, in particular under the strategic goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes and strategic goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building; Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all levels.

B.3 THE GEF AGENCY'S COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE FOR IMPLEMENTING THIS PROJECT:

The proposed project responds directly to key elements of the UN System UNDAF for 2012 – 2016, specifically Outcome 4 in increasing capacities of national and local government officials and communities to conserve and sustainably manage the country's environment and natural resources, including biodiversity and sustainable energy sources. This project will specifically contribute to the whole initiative of UNDP Country Programme of maintaining the ecosystem services of the natural resources and at the same time decreasing its vulnerability to climate change by the addition of new conservation sites.

UNDP Philippines has an extensive track record in developing and implementing environmental management and conservation programmes, including a large portfolio of GEF-supported investments cumulatively totalling in excess of US$40 million. The UNDP Country Office has a total of 5 staff in its Environment Unit. Staff in the Operations and Financial Management unit also support project implementation, and oversight is provided by the senior management team composed of the UNDP Resident Representative, Country Director and Unit Team Leaders. UNDP Philippines delivers approximately US$15 million per year in overall development assistance, derived from a variety of sources, including core UNDP programme funds, bilateral donors and multilateral mechanisms such as GEF and the MDG Achievement Fund. The UNDP-managed GEF Small Grants Programme in the Philippines has a strong track record in working to facilitate networking between ICCAs.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT AND GEF AGENCY:

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE
Atty. Analiza Rebuelta-Teh	Undersecretary and GEF-Philippines Operational Focal Point	Department of Environment and Natural Resources	04/14/2014 and 04/22/2014

B. GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation.

Agency Coordinator	Signature	Date	Project Contact	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator and Director a.i.		May 7, 2014	Johan Robinson Regional Technical Advisor, EBD	+ 662 3049100	johan.robinson@undp.org

Annex A. ICCA Potential Sites

Proposed ICCA Sites	Ethnographic Regions	KBA Sites	KBA Area (ha)	Biodiversity Value	Possible ICCA Area[3]
Luzon					
Daguioman, Baay Licuan	CAR and Region 1	Balbalasang Balbalan National Park	81,539.094	Important Bird Area; Conservation Priority Area - 9 Vulnerable Species; 6 Irreplaceable Species	24,461.73
Agta CADT	Region II	Quirino Protected Landscape*	164,542.720	Conservation Priority Area - 2 Endangered Species; 13 Vulnerable; 45 Irreplaceable Species	20,000.00
Engongot CADT	Region II	Casecnan Protected Landscape	90,718.370		38,125.10
North Eastern Cagayan PLS	Region II	North Eastern Cagayan Protected Landscapes and Seascapes*	180,027.000	Important Bird Area; Conservation Priority Area - 2 Critically Endangered Species; 3 Endangered; 16 Vulnerable; 13 Irreplaceable Species	20,000.00
Subic (Kanawan CADT)	Region III	Bataan NP and Subic Bay FR	25,254.000		10,000.00
Subic (Subic CADT)	Region III	Bataan NP and Subic Bay FR	25,254.000		3,000.00
Mt. Dingalan (Dibut CADT)	Region III	Mt. Dingalan	46,891.000	Important Bird Area - 1 Critically endangered; 1 endangered; 15 Vulnerable Species	7,500.00
Batanes	Region II - Island Group	Batanes Island	213,578.000	Important Bird Area; Conservation Priority Area; Batanes Protected Land and Seascape (Proc#335 / RA8991) - 2 Vulnerable Species; 7 irreplaceable Species	15,892.55
Balabac Island (Palawan)	Region IVA - Island Group		35,830.000	Important Bird Area; Conservation Priority Area - 1 Critically endangered species; 2 endangered; 10 vulnerable; 33 irreplaceable Species	30,000.00
Sub-total			***863,634.184***		***168,979.38***
Visayas					
Central Panay Mountains	Region VI	Central Panay Mountains	85,658.000	IBA (PH061), CPA 86	
Mindanao					
Manay	Region 11 - Southern and Eastern Mindanao	Mt. Kampalili Puting Bato	169,909.000	Important bird Area; Conservation Priority Area - 2 critically endangered species; 1 endangered, 13 vulnerable	5,000.00

[3] Please note that only 100,000 ha of the total area mentioned here will be part of the protected area expansion component of this project.

Proposed ICCA Sites	Ethnographic Regions	KBA Sites	KBA Area (ha)	Biodiversity Value	Possible ICCA Area[3]
Mt. Apo (Magpet)	Region 12 - Southern and Eastern Mindanao	Mt. Apo Natural Park	99,091.000	Important Bird Area Conservation Priority Area Mt. Apo Natural Park (Proc # 882 / RA 9237) - 2 Critically endangered species; 3 endangered; 28 vulnerable; 33 irreplaceable Species	20,000.00
Mt. Tago (Mintapod)	Region 10 - Northern Mindanao	Mt. Tago Range	83,416.000	IBA (PH093), CPA 128; 1 critically endangered species	2,341.78
Bayog	Region 9 - Zamboanga Peninsula	Mt. Sugarloaf	34,419.000	IBA (PH0109), CPA 155; 1 critically endangered and 6 vulnerable species	4,000.00
Lebak and Kalamansig, Sultan Kudarat		Mt. Daguma IBA	20,000.00	IBA (PH0103), CPA 144; 1 critically endangered, 1 vulnerable species	4,000.00
Bislig (Trento)		Bislig	154,828.810	IBA (PH086), CPA 125; 1 Critically endangered species; 14 vulnerable	2,000.00
Bislig (Bunawan)					5,000.00
Bislig (Bislig)					4,043.01
Mt. Diwata Range (Esperanza)		Mt. Diwata Range	93,798.090	IBA (PH084), CPA 123; 1 Critically endangered species; 7 vulnerable species	
Esperanza					1,000.00
Mt. Magulo (Malungon)		Mt. Matutum PL	15,600.000	Important Bird Area; Candidate Priority Conservation Area - 1 Critically endangered species; 1endangered; 11 vulnerable; 15 irreplaceable	4,161.00
Butuan City, Sibagat, RTR		Hilong-Hilong	240,239.860	IBA (PH083), CPA 123; 2 Critically endangered species; 1 endangered; 12 vulnerable	4,000.00
San Pablo, Jabonga		Lake Mainit	14,525.000	CPA 120	5,903.00
			2,889,017.128		**399,407.541**