



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening National Systems to Improve Governance and Management of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Conserved Areas and Territories			
Country(ies):	Philippines	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5826
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5389
Other Executing Partner(s):	Department of Environment & Natural Resources- Biodiversity Management Bureau (formerly PAWB), National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), Koalisyon ng Katutubong Samahan ng Pilipinas (KASAPI), Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID)	Submission Date:	June 17, 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	166,391
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	<p><b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.</p> <p><b>Indicator 1.1</b> Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1.1</b> Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool</p> <p><u>Project contribution to indicator:</u> Improved management effectiveness of NIPAS PAs with documented and recognised ICCAs, as reflected in at least 10% increases in METT scores – Mt. Apo National Park – baseline 77%; target 87%; Bataan Natural Park – baseline 53%, target 63% Management effectiveness of 10 ICCAs increased by at least 10% average from baseline of 53.3%</p>	GEF TF	1,751,484	5,025,239
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,751,484	5,025,239

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

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

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Policy Harmonization and Implementation	TA	<p><i>Legal and regulatory framework and administrative procedures that harmonize the mandates, plans and activities amongst all key stakeholders such as NCIP, PAWB (renamed to BMB), BFAR<sup>3</sup> and relevant local government units are established and effectively implemented for the identification, mapping, recognition and management of ICCAs, measured through:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved efficiency in official recognition of an ICCA from an average of 3.5 years from community orientation and mobilisation to completion of Community Conservation Plan (CCP) by an average of six months as measured for the 10 targeted sites</li> <li>• 100% of Certificates of ancestral domain titles (CADTs) and ancestral domain sustainable development protection plans (ADSDPPs) clearly identify and map Indigenous Cultural Communities (ICCs) where communities have expressed an interest.</li> <li>• Strengthened regulatory frameworks and integration of ICCAs into LGU CLUPs to control incompatible activities in at least 2 of the new ICCAs.</li> <li>• Improved management effectiveness of NIPAS PAs with documented and recognised ICCAs, as</li> </ul>	<p>1.1. Relevant policy issuances between NCIP, DENR-BMB, BFAR and Forest Management Bureau which harmonize and operationalize existing policies and regulatory frameworks that address inconsistencies and recognizes ICCAs as an innovative type of governance for protected areas and conservation</p> <p>1.2. Support to advocacy and consensus building on the ICCA Bill</p> <p>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</p> <p>1.4. Land use planning guidelines of LGUs are enhanced to incorporate the identified ICCAs</p> <p>1.5. Implementing guidelines and procedures for NIPAS PA management planning and zoning that incorporate identification, mapping, documentation and traditional governance systems in ICCAs</p>	GEF TF	292,582	868,864

<sup>3</sup> NCIP- National Commission on Indigenous Peoples; BMB- Biodiversity Management Bureau (formerly Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau); BFAR – Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

		<p>reflected in at least 10% increases in METT scores</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mt. Apo National Park</li> <li>- baseline 77%; target 87%; Bataan Natural Park</li> <li>- baseline 53%, target 63%</li> </ul>				
Capacity building for effective governance and management of ICCAs	TA	<p><i>Expansion of landscapes and seascapes under effective protection through enhanced governance and management capacity of targeted ICCAs, measured by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of the national PA estate to cover an additional 100,000 hectares of recognized terrestrial and marine/coastal ICCAs.</li> <li>• Improved capacity of DENR (BMB), NCIP and Philippine ICCA Consortium (NGO groups) to support ICCA documentation, mapping and research in each of the regional offices: BMB and NCIP – increase in average score for 5 capacity results by at least 0.5 points and a top score of 3 for (i) Capacities for Engagement; and (ii) Capacities to Monitor and Evaluate; Philippine ICCA Consortium – increase in average score in 5 capacity results by at least 1 point.</li> <li>• 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 [baseline and target to be established as soon as ICCA management established].</li> <li>• At least 10 ICC communities reporting receipt of assistance from the National ICCA Consortium</li> </ul>	<p>2.1. Regional networks of at least 9 ICCAs representing the country's ethnographic regions are identified, documented, mapped, recognised and registered at UNEP/WCMC.</p> <p>2.2. At least 10 community conservation plans, with relevant business plan sections incorporated, are developed to support ICCAs;</p> <p>2.3. Capacities of NCIP and DENR are strengthened to provide technical support to ICCA documentation and recognition. (trainings for all regions to support ICCAs)</p> <p>2.4. Capacity of Philippine ICCA Consortium developed to serve as the mechanism for exchange, advocacy, and legal support to ICCAs in distress.</p> <p>2.5. Capacities of ICCs in the network of least 9 ICCAs are strengthened to document, map, plan and implement actions to address the identified threats.</p> <p>2.6. A National Registry of ICCAs is established, supported by an appropriate system for validation, monitoring, and access by the public.</p>	GEF TF	1,299,676	3,704,103

		• Management effectiveness of 10 ICCAs increased by at least 10% average from baseline of 53.3%			
			Subtotal	1,592,258	4,572,967
			Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>	GEF TF 159,226	452,272
			<b>Total project costs</b>	1,751,484	5,025,239

**C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)**

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
National Government	Biodiversity Management Bureau	Cash	156,500
National Government	Biodiversity Management Bureau	In-kind	1,896,812
National Government	NCIP	Cash	425,000
National Government	NCIP	In-kind	891,540
CSO	PAFID, KASAPI, NTFP, AnthroWatch, ULAN, CI	In-kind	303,768
Local Funding Facilities/CSOs	PTFCF	Cash	250,000
Others	ICC Communities	In-kind	101,619
GEF Agency	UNDP Philippines	Cash	1,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>5,025,239</b>

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	BD	Philippines	1,751,484	166,391	1,917,875
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				1,751,484	166,391	1,917,875

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	45,000	-	45,000
National/Local Consultants (Policy Experts, Capacity Development Expert)	71,500	-	71,500

**F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT?**

No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

<sup>4</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

## **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

---

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.:

This is just to elaborate on the project's alignment to key national priorities and plans. The primary one is the 2011-2016 Philippine Development Plan (PDP). The Project can contribute in the following PDP priorities:

- Improvement of infrastructures - The conservation-related infrastructure will be identified in CCPs, especially in support of Local Government Units (LGUs) and relevant government agencies such as the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR).
- Good governance - Strengthening and recognition of traditional governance as a way to address lapses in governance;
- Human development - Capacity-building for key stakeholders especially the IP communities to address inadequate levels of human development
- Environment and natural resources conservation and management - The ICCA recognition is a viable conservation measure that at the same time upholds the rights and improves the situation of indigenous peoples.

Similarly, the Project will directly support the implementation of the Philippine Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (PBSAP) and achievement of the identified targets till 2028. The contribution of the Project will be in 12 PBSAP targets – 3 related to addressing drivers, 6 to reducing threats, 2 to enhancing economic services, and 1 to improving human well-being.

Aside from the two plans stated above and identified in the PIF, the Project is very much in line with the latest Organizational Performance Indicators (OPIF) of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), the government agency mandated to look after the interests of indigenous peoples. It directly contributes to the fulfillment of the OPIF's 4 Major Final Outputs (MFOs) as indicated in its OPIF as of 2 May 2014:

- MFO 1 on Policy Services – Outcome 1 focuses on policy enhancement or issuance; included in Outcome 1 outputs are support to the enhancement of 3 major NCIP policies (on titling, on Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan (ADSDPP) formulation and on FPIC)
- MFO 2 on Titling – An Outcome 1 output is enhancement of NCIP policy on titling; many activities of ICCA recognition are in line with titling activities (mapping, gathering of ethnographic data, social preparation)
- MFO 3 on Human, Economic and Environmental Development and Protection Services – CCP formulation is in line with ADSDPP formulation; CCP details both economic and environmental plans
- MFO 4 on Indigenous Peoples Rights Protection Services - ICCA recognition is a form of protection for indigenous peoples culture and governance

Lastly, the National PA System Master Plan is currently being formulated. This Project is therefore timely in that it creates an opportunity for a significant expansion of the national conservation estate, through recognition of ICCAs, which typically coincide with areas of greatest surviving endemism. The BMB likewise is set to adopt ICCA as a key OECM of its National PA System Master Plan, thus this Project provides the impetus for inputs derived from practical experience.

---

A.2. GEF Focal area and/or fund strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

No changes made with reference to the original PIF.

---

A.3. The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

No changes made with reference to the original PIF.

---

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The project described in the Project Document for CEO Endorsement is essentially aligned with the design described in the approved project design at the PIF stage. The situational analysis description has been expanded in the Project Document, in sections 1.2 (Philippine Biodiversity and its Global Significance), 1.3 (Threats and Root Causes), 1.4 (The Long-term Solution, Baseline Project and Barriers), 1.5 (Project Locations), and 1.6 (Stakeholder Analysis). This includes more information on the current ICCA status, threats and barriers, and a more elaborate description of the baseline projects. Similarly, there has been elaboration of the interventions per component of the project.

---

A.5. Incremental/Additional cost reasoning: describe the increment (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The section in the PIF on incremental cost reasoning and global environmental benefits has been elaborated in the ProDoc. In the latter, details of the final site selection process and site profiles illustrate how the project contribute to the site's tenurial security and economic opportunities, and to environment conservation at the local level. The threatened species of each site, including globally threatened species, have been identified in the ProDoc. Consultations with NGOs during the project preparation phase have resulted in a slight increase from the PIF in co-financing projections from.

A more elaborate description of the final project sites have been provided in the ProDoc. The PIF listed 23 potential sites from the Philippines' roster of 228 KBAs. An early criterion for the project site was that it should be in a Key Biodiversity Areas. Based on several separate and common discussions with the NCIP and Philippine ICCA Consortium, other criteria that were eventually agreed upon were; in the NCIP's list of priority environment sites; at least 1 site for each of the 7 ethnographic regions, site in each ethnographic region recognized by the NCIP Commissioner of that region, not a NewCAPP site, and preferably had attended the previous subnational and national consultations or known to have requested for assistance in ICCA recognition. The list of 10 sites throughout the project preparation phase was highly fluid as consultations between and among the Consortium, NCIP and BMB continued; some sites were firmed up early on by all while other sites identified by the Consortium were deliberated further between them and the NCIP. Ultimately the deciding factor for the latter sites was the feasibility of achieving project outcomes within the project time frame and budget. Of the 10 sites, 9 have been requesting for support to ICCA recognition since the 2011 subnational consultations held by KASAPI with NewCAPP support on Philippine indigenous peoples' interest in and desire for ICCA recognition. According to the NCIP's FPIC guidelines, when a project is community-solicited such as this one, then the NCIP simply conducts a community validation. The validation will be conducted in congruence with the Project orientation to be held at each site at Project start after the Inception Workshop. The Mount Polis site lacks a community resolution as of this submission because this site could only be finalized less than 2 months before this submission. The NCIP Commissioner to which this site belongs did not easily come into agreement to this site's inclusion as the preference was for a site which could not realistically achieve ICCA recognition given the Project's time frame and budget; this was even if the site had been suggested by the Commissioner as one of the possible sites in that ethnographic region. Nevertheless subsequent discussions with community representatives and other local stakeholders revealed a desire for inclusion.

Of the 10 final sites, 6 were in the PIF list. The final sites come from 7 administrative regions, with sizes ranging from 5,163 to 139,691 hectares and a mean size of 13,969, eight mainly terrestrial sites, 2 related to aquatic environment (1 marine and 1 lake), 4 with CADTs and 5 with ongoing CADT application, 5 with old ADSDPPs needing updating and 5 with no ADSDPPs yet. There are 3 sites whose areas intersect with part or all of a Protected Area, which could strengthen the management effectiveness of protected areas should the sites form ICCAs and indigenous peoples' management skills and support are fully integrated in the PA management; and there are a total of 158 threatened species across all sites. The main threats identified across sites are land conversion to agricultural farming, road development, mining/ quarrying, illegal logging, and erosion of traditional governance, There are 2 sites which have great potential vis-à-vis the other sites to be ICCA learning centers for indigenous peoples.

These 10 sites are strategically selected to pave the ground for institutionalization and develop models for those interested in ICCA documentation and recognition. It is assumed that these 10 sites will be significant in number to provide empirical evidence for the national governments to support and provide future investments in its institutionalization.

There have been minor changes in the Results Framework especially in Outcome 1. This is because the policy analysis done during the PPG has revealed that coming up with a joint memorandum circular (JMC) between and among DENR, NCIP and DA-BFAR will unlikely be achieved during the life of the project considering the average number of years for a JMC be passed especially when issues or concerns need further deliberations and discussions. Also, it is unlikely since BFAR is a new player in relation to the ICCA. It is under a different department, the Department of Agriculture, which has little concern for environment conservation and concentrates more on increasing agriculture-related production. This might also be affected by the possible change in leadership after the national election in 2016. Hence, in the ProDoc, the target output for a JMC was replaced with a more generic relevant policy issuances (eg. Department Order, Executive Order), which may have the same result in so far as harmonizing policies in support of ICCAs and in institutionalizing ICCAs.

One finding from the PPG is that there is a high risk in expecting a Joint Memorandum Circular (JMC) to be signed by the respective government agencies (NCIP, DENR and DA) by Project end, thus Output 1.1 of Component 1 was modified to expect instead policy issuances of individual agencies. This does not preclude the Project from endeavouring to achieve a joint issuance. Among them – several activities inherently contribute toward this: the Project implementation structure of establishing inter-agency committees at the regional level where Project sites are located will add to a bottom-up consensus-building toward possible JMC provisions. Consultations and workshops which are major activities for the Outputs of Component 1 may include as one of the discussion points a possible JMC. The national elections in 2016 will most likely result in the appointment of new officials for the government agencies concerned. In providing them an orientation on a Project, the possibility of a JMC shall be presented.

Likewise, the target increase in METT scores for PAs with documented and recognized ICCAs have been reduced from 20% to 10% since there majority of the criteria and assessment parameters in the METT are not directly relevant to ICCAs and that the Project will have no significant interventions in the PA management which can result to an increase of 20%. However, another indicator in the Project results framework was added to reflect its intention to target an increase in METT for ICCAs from its current baselines to 10% by end of Project.

The 2 components reflect the 2 outcomes of the Project as well as the key ingredients necessary in ensuring continuing achievement of goals – institutional mandates and capacities – even after a project comes to an end. Thus Component 1 focuses on ensuring that there are sufficient policy support and guidance for the overall objective to “Strengthen the conservation and management of key biodiversity sites in the Philippines, by institutionalizing ICCAs as a sustainable addition to the national PA estate”. The Project solicits policy support from 2 branches of government. For the legislative branch the Project will support the passage of an ICCA bill. For the executive branch, the Project seeks related policy issuances or revisions from several relevant government agencies (NCIP, DENR, DA-BFAR, HLURB). Component 2 meanwhile focuses on ensuring that the key stakeholders have adequate capacities to undertake the processes related to ICCA recognition given their respective mandates while taking into account coordination and complementation with other stakeholders. This component includes the establishment of a national registry of recognized ICCAs so that monitoring and official support to these ICCAs will be easier to elicit when the Project ends.

The consultations done during the PPG has produced the following figures for co-financing. The co-financing from DENR-BMB has increased by \$453,312.00 from PIF. However, the co-financing from CSO’s decreased by \$433,882. This was due to non-realization of possible cash co-financing from PhilAm Fund, a USAID-funded grant facility. The BMB has submitted a proposal to complement this project but there has no final clearance yet to date. However, additional co-financing was generated from 3 NGOs, which were not identified during the PIF formulation, namely: Conservation International- Philippines which is implementing activities in Balabac, one of the project sites; Non-Timber Forest Product (NTFP), which is implementing initiatives in Mt. Kimangkil, one of the project sites as well; and ULAN (Upholding Life and Nature), an environmental law firm which provides legal support and advices to communities including IPs. Over-all co-financing increased by only \$8,699. The Project will still endeavor to increase the co-financing during project implementation as this will give ample time to discuss collaboration with HLURB and DILG as well as LGUs as the project progresses in the CLUP updating with ICCA considerations.

**Table 1. Co-financing for the Project from Identified Stakeholders.**

Agencies	Co-financing (in USD)	
	At PIF	At ProDoc
DENR-BMB	1,600,000	2,053,312
NCIP	1,316,540	1,316,540
NGOs	987,500	553,768
IP Communities	112,500	101,619
UNDP	1,000,000	1,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,016,540</b>	<b>5,025,239</b>

The Project is also expected to contribute to the expansion and strengthening of the national PA system through the promotion of the ICCA as an effective conservation mechanism of KBAs. The Project will have positive impacts at different levels: local sites – through ICCA recognition which will contribute to the strengthening of the indigenous peoples traditional governance over the conservation areas; national – through a national law, policies of government agencies, Philippine ICCA Consortium which are the foundations for institutionalization of the ICCA recognition especially for government action; global – model for ICCA recognition, and contribution to conservation of global biodiversity given the country’s rich biodiversity (91 globally threatened species found across sites).

The budget allocation of the 2 components differ in the PIF and project document. The table below shows that for Outcome 1 the budget allocation in the project document is USD 148,277 less than that in the PIF, while for Outcome 2, the project document’s allocation is USD 148,277 more than that in the PIF. A lot of the inter-agency collaborative work will be undertaken at the local or site level, hence the increase. In addition, as there is an expectation to jumpstart some of the projects in the CCPs to be formulated, funds for local work has been increased. The experiences derived from the implementation of Outcome 2 will be helpful in crafting the technical papers and information materials for the Outputs of Outcome 1. Hence, the law and policies to be formulated or enhanced as Outputs of Outcome 1 will benefit, being grounded by Outcome 2 implementation (and budget).

**Table 2. Changes in Outcome Budget between PIF and ProDoc.**

Outcome	Budget in PIF	Budget in ProDoc	Difference
1 Policy Support	465,807	292,581	(173,226)
2 Capacity-Building	1,126,451	1,299,676	173,226
Project Management Cost	159,226	159,226	No change
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,751,484</b>	<b>1,751,484</b>	<b>No change</b>

The baseline scenario in the PIF has been elaborated on. Without the GEF support, there will be a slow response to threats to indigenous communities hosting rich biodiversity. There will be aggravated pressure on ICCAs due to inconsistencies in policies and implementing guidelines. Waning of current interest in and momentum of the movement for ICCA recognition will occur. The value of indigenous peoples in conserving biodiversity will remain hidden due to non-recognition of the value of ICCAs as a viable conservation mechanism. An opportunity for indigenous peoples themselves to be key players in ICCA recognition due to lack of capacity-building for the Philippine ICCA Consortium will be lost. And eventually, huge ecological and management gaps in the existing PA system, and the opportunity to take advantage of ICCAs as a cost effective strategy in addressing these, will be lost.

Local, National and Global Benefits: The Project expects to contribute to the expansion and strengthening of the national PA system through the promotion of the ICCA as an effective conservation mechanism of KBAs. The Project will have positive impacts at different levels: local sites – through ICCA recognition; national – through a national law,



policies of government agencies, Philippine ICCA consultation; global – model for ICCA recognition, and contribution to conservation of global biodiversity given the country’s rich biodiversity.

At the local level, the target ICCs gain national and international recognition for their ICCA. The related benefit is that they will have another form of recognition for their claim of ownership over the ancestral domain. Cultural integrity is maintained with this recognition of their governance over the portion of the KBA that their ancestral domain covers. Concrete conservation measures are detailed in the CCP to be formulated per site. The CCP may include plans for income-generating projects that will be mindful of biodiversity conservation and cultural integrity which will be ready for mobilisation. Linkages with key national institutions and private sectors for resource mobilization for these projects will be forged. In at least 3 sites the CCP will be interfaced with the respective LGU’s CLUP. The community-based activities which are part of the ICCA recognition process contribute to community consolidation, which is added strengthening for their governance. The community members involved in the different activities gain skills (documenting, mapping, planning, facilitation, presentation) that the individuals can leverage for the benefit of the community in future endeavors as well as being marketable skills.

In addition, the ICCs gain strength with the inter-agency coordination that will arise out of the joint implementation by local representatives of the NCIP and DENR, and from presentations to the LGUs on their case for LGU recognition of the ICCAs. This coordination work among the local personnel of line agencies and other local stakeholders will benefit the local units of the national agencies as well, as the cooperation established may be continued in future joint endeavors concerning indigenous peoples and the environment.

Institutionalization of the ICCA will be a direct gain at the national level by Project’s end through various policy modes so that ICCA recognition and strengthening shall be have legal basis beyond Project life. The Congress will have a bill refined through the incorporation of comments of the technical working groups to which the Project will provide support in the form of technical inputs and the building of support among constituents. The NCIP will have its guidelines on the ADSDPP and FPIC enhanced through the inclusion of procedures for the identification, documentation and mapping of ICCAs within ancestral domains. It will also have a Manual of Operations for these procedures in relation to CADT application, emanating from its existing Omnibus Rules on the Delineation of Ancestral Domains and Ancestral Lands. These NCIP guidelines and manual shall be able to direct NCIP staff on understanding ICCAs and how to have these recognized beyond the 9 ICC Project sites. The Project experience shall feed into the formulation of supplemental CLUP guidelines for the inclusion of the ICCAs in the CLUP that may steer LGUs toward more inclusion of ICCAs in CLUPs. The BMB Guidelines to be formulated which will contain the framework on PA management, planning and zoning, incorporating ICCAs will lead toward more culturally appropriate support for ICCAs. These various policies will pave the way for the conservation of more KBAs, through recognition and strengthening of ICCAs in KBAs. The Project experience will highlight that ICCA recognition and strengthening serve the dual purpose of biodiversity conservation and upholding of indigenous peoples rights.

The dual purpose is also achieved with the capacity-building of the Philippine ICCA Consortium. The Project’s contribution to strengthening the Consortium organizationally and with better linkages with relevant stakeholders. The Consortium members will be pivotal in encouraging other ICCs throughout the country to go for ICCA recognition by government. The Consortium will also be essential in building up broad indigenous peoples support for advocacy for ICCA-related policies.

At the global level, the Philippine experience is being observed as a possible global model on ICCA recognition for stronger biodiversity conservation. The sharing of good practices and lessons learned will hopefully lead to replication in other countries on aspects of policy, actual recognition and related capacity-building in relation to ICCA recognition. Being host to biodiversity richness, conservation of Philippine KBAs will contribute to global biodiversity conservation. Based on the KBA study, the Project sites host a total of 91 globally threatened species, which include the critically endangered Philippine eagle (*Pithecophaga jefferyi*) which is present in five sites: Mt. Anahawan Mountain Range, Mt. Diwata, Mt. Apo, Mt. Kimangkil and in the Engongot CADT in Aurora. Another critically endangered marine reptile - *Demochelys coriacea* – is present in the Balabac ancestral waters. (Table 3).

**Table 3: Summary of Globally Threatened Species in Project Sites**

Summary				
<i>Terrestrial</i>	CR	EN	VU	Total
Amphibia	-	2	24	26
Aves	1	2	26	29
Mammalia	-	3	8	11
Bryopsida	-	1	-	1
Coniferopsida	-	-	2	2
Magnoliopsida	1	4	8	13
Reptilia	-	0	1	1
Insecta	-	2	-	2
<i>Marine</i>				0
Mammal	-	-	1	1
Reptile	1	-	-	1
Coral	-	-	1	1
Seabird	-	-	3	3
<b>Total</b>	3	14	74	91

Legend: EN-Endangered; CR-Critically Endangered; VU-Vulnerable

The table below summarizes the incremental cost reasoning for the global benefits, where discussion in addition to that in the PIF was provided for in the ProDoc.

**Table 4. Incremental Cost Reasoning for Global Benefits.**

Current practices	Alternative Practice	Expected benefits*
There is no clear model yet globally on how to institutionalize ICCA recognition of indigenous communities. Other forms of conservation measures are not yet part of the PA system.	The models for ICCA recognition and institutionalization in the PA system is adapted in other countries contributing to more biodiversity areas covered by conservation mechanisms outside of the PA system.	There are more biodiversity areas outside of the Philippines that are covered by conservation measures because there is a clear model that may be adapted by other governments and indigenous communities outside of the Philippines.
There are inadequate conservation mechanisms in the Philippines for 91 globally threatened species found across the 10 project sites.	There are clear mechanisms for the contribution of the Philippines to the conservation of 91 globally threatened species, as stated in the CCPs of 10 sites and covered by the inclusion of ICCAs in the Philippine PA system.	Global biodiversity is maintained because pressure on these 91 globally threatened species do not increase, or if still increasing at least increase with a lower acceleration rate.
International ICCA registry needs improvement to take into account the special considerations in the management of cultural data of indigenous peoples	Culture-sensitive principles and steps in the submission of and access to the ICCA data of indigenous peoples in the International registry are in place.	More biodiversity areas in indigenous communities are covered by officially recognized conservation mechanisms because the indigenous peoples have more assurance regarding the protection of their cultural data.

#### **A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:**

The risks analysis undertaken at the PIF stage was further elaborated, especially in relation to elaboration of the risk and mitigating actions. An additional 3 risks were identified during project preparation: changes in appointive and elective officials in key positions which may affect ICCA-related activities as a result of the national and local elections to be held in May 2016; fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates which may result in lower peso value of project funds; and a note on peace and order situation. The updated risk assessment and proposed mitigation measures are given in Table 5 below.

**Table 5. Summary of Project Risks**

Identified Risk	Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Elaboration of Risk	Mitigating Actions
Policy harmonization and complementation will require work which goes beyond the life of the Project.	Political	LOW	VERY LIKELY	MEDIUM	Generally the process of having laws and policies approved and signed takes longer than the Project timeframe. In addition, there will most likely be changes in key positions (see below) which will result in renewal of explanations.	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. Preparation of timely information briefs and technical papers, and constant consultation with key actors for policy approval shall be important elements in Project implementation. ICCs and support groups can be reminded to assess the platforms of 2016 electoral candidates according to their support for environment conservation and indigenous peoples rights.
There will be difficulty in coordinating with partners of the Project given their different mandates and expertise. (	Institutional	MEDIUM	Moderately likely	MEDIUM	Because of their different mandates and expertise, partners might not always be in agreement with one another's views on priorities in focus and approaches, although agreement to Project implementation	Prospective project partners and key stakeholders have been involved in Project preparation. The Project implementing structure at the site level focuses on establishing interagency committees which will also include local people's organizations and NGOs. The broad composition of the Project Board provides a venue for airing and discussing

Identified Risk	Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Elaboration of Risk	Mitigating Actions
						interagency implementation issues at a higher level. The Project Management Unit, RPs and Consultants shall make sure that key stakeholders at all levels receive Project-related information in a timely manner.
Climate unpredictability will affect the achievement of outputs and outcomes of the Project.	Environmental	LOW	VERY LIKELY	MEDIUM	In recent years, the timing and target of the seasonal typhoons have not been according to previous patterns. There have also been noted increased and more serious flooding. Not only might they affect mobilization for Project activities but they might also conceivably affect the KBAs themselves. However, impact is low because Activities can be re scheduled, and conservation areas are large enough and spread out.	Climate change resiliency measures and analysis will be integral to the ICCA processes and reflected in the Community Conservation Plans. 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.
Change in elective and appointive positions in government may result in changes in policy directions.	Political	LOW	LIKELY	LOW	The 2016 national and local elections includes the voting for a new President, who will be expected to bring in his or her own set of people in key government positions including the key government agencies for this Project. These new people may possibly not see ICCA recognition as an important policy matter or may even have policy interests in conflict with the ICCA concept.	Government agencies' technical and other support staff are generally not appointive. Undertaking preparatory work with them, which has started during the Project preparation and will continue up to the election period, will contribute to better understanding by new officials of the ICCA concept and Project objective. Visible advocacy by constituents (i.e. ICCs and support groups), will also be beneficial.
LGUs will not be supportive of IPLCs and the concept of ICCAs.	Political	MEDIUM	Moderately likely	LOW	LGUs fully supportive of indigenous peoples issues is the exception than the rule, which makes up for much of	The Project will target LGUs in its advocacy activities and strongly engage them as site partners, emphasizing

Identified Risk	Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Elaboration of Risk	Mitigating Actions
					their vulnerability as a sector especially when they are a minority population within the LGU. Some LGUs even refuse to consider that there are indigenous peoples in their administrative unit, which fortunately is not a situation in any Project site. Possible economic interests of LGUs in ICCAs may make them feel threatened by the process of ICCA recognition.	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. Political mapping vis-à-vis level of ICCA acceptance (or at least possibility of existence) by newly LGU officials may be undertaken during the 2016 election period.
Lack of clarity and agreement on the role between and among the NCIP, BMB and Philippine ICCA Consortium will result in conflicts and delays in implementation.	Institutional	LOW	Moderately likely	LOW	These 3 agencies or organizations view the ICCA concept from differing priority standpoints which have not always been compatible with one another's: NCIP – IP rights; BMB – KBAs; and Consortium – IP perspectives direct from communities. It has been difficult for them to see that these are not mutually exclusive interests. Who should have more authority on ICCA-related concerns is a major issue.	Further clarifications on the specific roles of the NCIP, BMB, Philippine ICCA Consortium and other key actors were made during Project preparation to seek consensus thereby allowing the concerned organizations to expand their work in supporting ICCAs without generating conflicts. The involvement of these agencies are in the stakeholders analysis presented earlier in this Project document. For instance, BMB is expected to be able to provide technical assistance on environment topics, NCIP focuses on ensuring that indigenous peoples' rights and perspectives are taken into account. Civil society organizations provide other technical support and linkages. The Project implementation structure places an emphasis on inter-agency

Identified Risk	Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Elaboration of Risk	Mitigating Actions
						coordination for instance the creation of an inter-agency committee for each Project site.
Fluctuations in the foreign exchange rates may result in decrease in the peso budget.	Financial	LOW	Moderately Likely	LOW	In recent years a relative strengthening of the Philippine peso vis-à-vis foreign currencies has resulted in the lower peso value of grants pegged to foreign currencies. In addition, traditionally the influx of money during election periods likewise contributes to lower foreign exchange conversion rates.	Conservative assumption for foreign exchange rates is used in budgeting.
Eruptions of military skirmishes arising from existing armed conflict may disrupt project schedules.	Security	LOW	Moderately likely	LOW	As with almost all isolated and environmentally significant areas in the Philippines, some form of peace and order conflict exists in the Project sites resulting from the presence or existence of: armed guards of development projects (half of the project sites), ideologically motivated armed groups (Mindanao sites), or boundary conflicts (CAR sites).	Proper coordination with LGUs, ensuring that the whole ICC is updated on project activities, and monitoring of related information from the communities shall contribute to avoidance of danger to Project participants. Culture-sensitive approaches are also important to avoid actuations that may intensify tensions. The inculcation of culture-sensitive lens shall be incorporated in the design of capacity building activities.
The pace of community-based activities slow down when there are both internally and externally changes.	Social	MEDIUM	Moderately Likely	LOW	Changes may be due to changes in leadership or the unforeseen entry of projects that may be potentially harmful to biodiversity.	An overview of Project context and implementing arrangements will be part of the programme of community-based activities, a standard procedure of a participatory approach. There will be continuous lookout for the possible entry of said kind of projects. The highly respected leaders of the Philippine ICCA Consortium may assist through advice or

Identified Risk	Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Elaboration of Risk	Mitigating Actions
						mediation if called upon.

## A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

No changes made with reference to the original PIF

## B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

### B.1. Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Description of stakeholders and the expected roles and responsibilities during project implementation have been elaborated including those already identified in the PIF as implementing partner and responsible parties. The roles and responsibilities of specific DENR and NCIP offices have been specified, more stakeholders especially at the local level have been identified from different sectors (local government units, academe, local NGOs), other government line agencies have been added (Department of Agriculture, Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board, Department of Trade and Industry, Department of Tourism) as well as regional government agencies (Mindanao Development Authority and Palawan Council for Sustainable Development). For Outcome 1: The implementing partner and the other responsible partners shall coordinate with one another to ensure consistency in the content of policies to be enhanced or formulated, and joint planning and implementation shall be undertaken in support of the ICCA bill. For Outcome 2: Inter-agency committees per site will be established which expect the NCIP and DENR to work closely together and with the indigenous peoples communities for the process of ICCA recognition, with support from local NGOs and other local support organizations and government bodies. LGUs representatives will be engaged as well. The Table below provides the details.

**Table 6. Description of Stakeholders.**

Office/ Organization	Stakeholder Description
	<i>National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP)</i>
	The Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) provides that the NCIP is the primary government agency responsible for the formulation and implementation of policies, plans and programs to promote and protect the rights and well-being of the Indigenous Cultural Communities/ Indigenous Peoples (ICCs/IPs) and the recognition of their ancestral domains as well as their rights thereto. It shall protect and promote the interest and well-being of the ICCs/IPs with due regard to their beliefs, customs, traditions and institutions.
	The Commission is an independent agency under the Office of the President and is composed of seven (7) commissioners, each representing an ethnographic region. The commissioners compose the Commission en banc which exercises the quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial and executive/administrative powers and functions of the Commission. The Chairperson is designated by the President from among the commissioners and acts as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the agency.
<b>Office on Policy, Planning &amp; Research (OPPR)</b>	The OPPR is responsible for the formulation of appropriate policies and programs for ICCs/IPs. It shall ensure that the ICCA is integrated in the over-all development planning and management of the NCIP, as expressed in its OPIF, and that the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of NCIP engagement in the ICCA is effectively and efficiently carried out and attained at all levels of engagement.
<b>Ancestral Domains Office (ADO)</b>	The ADO is responsible in facilitating the delineation and titling of ancestral domains, formulation of ADSDPPs and the process of ensuring the right to FPIC of ICCs/IPs. It shall work closely with the OPPR to ensure that the requirements of ICCA recognition are appropriately addressed.



Office/ Organization	Stakeholder Description
<p><b>Operations</b></p> <p><b>Regional Offices (ROs)</b></p> <p><b>Field Offices (FOs)</b></p>	<p>Program/Project/Activity implementation through the Major Final Outputs of the agency is managed at the Regional Office level. The Regional Offices shall ensure that project implementation at the Field Office level is well supervised and an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system is formulated and carried out/implemented.</p> <p>The FOs is composed of the different Provincial Offices (POs) and Community Service Centers (CSCs). They serve as frontline offices of NCIP in the delivery of services to ICCs/IPs through the implementation of programs, projects and activities. The FOs shall be responsible in closely coordinating and facilitating the day-to-day identification, documentation and mapping of ICCAs and other pertinent activities with the ICCs/IPs at the field/site level.</p>
<p><i>Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)</i></p>	
<p><b>Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB)</b></p>	<p>Formerly known as Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB), the BMB shall be the implementing partner. It is mandated to conserve the country's biodiversity through formulation of recommended policies, guidelines, rules and regulations for the establishment of an integrated protected areas system such as national parks, wildlife sanctuaries and refuge, marine parks, and biospheric reserves. Included in its tasks is to develop new modalities to expand and diversify the protected areas system, and support conservation efforts of stakeholders. BMB is a staff Bureau under DENR.</p> <p>The recognition of ICCAs was one of the modalities established by BMB through NewCAPP. Efforts to institutionalize ICCA as a biodiversity conservation strategy is underway. Although when it comes to biodiversity management, the BMB is at the top of this field, the agency may encounter challenges working on ICCAs owing to the process-specific nature of working together with IPs, particularly, in the context of FPIC.</p>
<p><b>DENR Office of the Field Operations</b></p>	<p>Similar with other bureaus of the DENR, the field operations of BMB as a staff bureau, is coursed through the Office of the DENR Field Operations (FieldOps). The FieldOps has direct supervision/oversight over the 16 regional offices (ROs), 75 provincial offices (PENROs), 140 community offices (CENROs). For this project, the concerned field offices will be engaged to provide technical support for the documentation, mapping of ICCAs and formulation of the community conservation plans (CCPs).</p>
<p><b>DENR Field Offices</b></p>	<p>With the ICCs and support organizations, the site implementation will be carried out through the DENR field offices. These offices will include the following:</p> <p><b>Regional Office (RO)</b> The RO shall serve as the point of origin of feedback and information. It shall supervise and coordinate the administrative, financial and other support functions in the field.</p> <p><b>Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office (PENRO)</b> They shall oversee the activities of the CENROs under its jurisdiction. They shall also coordinate and consolidate province-wide concerns. The coordination with the LGUs, specifically at the provincial level, could be coursed through them.</p> <p><b>Community Environment and Natural Resources Office (CENRO)</b> As mandated, the CENRO shall be responsible for coordinating and/or providing directly the DENR support at the community level.</p> <p>In cases wherein the ICCAs are in protected areas, the <b>Protected Area Superintendent (PASU)</b> will be engaged as well. They will provide technical assistance in the documentation and ensure that the CCPs will be interfaced with the Protected Area Management Plan.</p>
<p><b>Other DENR Bureaus</b></p>	<p><b>Forest Management Bureau (FMB)</b> The FMB provides support for the effective protection, development, occupancy management, and conservation of forestlands and watersheds. One of its functions is to assist the LGUs formulate the Forest Land Use Plan (FLUP). The recognition of ICCAs and development of CCP shall be coordinated with FMB</p>



Office/ Organization	Stakeholder Description
	<p>for the interfacing of the two (2) plans, and to institutionalize CCP formulation in the FLUP process. KBAs which are not yet PAs, are still classified as forestlands. Majority of the ancestral domains are also located in forest areas.</p> <p><b>Environment Management Bureau (EMB)</b> The EMB is mandated to implement a number of environmental laws including the Presidential Decree (PD) 1586 (Philippine Environmental Impact Statement System (Philippine EIS System)). PD 1586 requires securing Environmental Compliance Certificate (ECC) for projects or areas identified/defined as environmentally critical project or area. Last July 2014, the EMB issued revised guidelines on the Philippine EIS System to include, among others, the ancestral domains as environmentally critical areas. This will provide additional layer of protection to ICCAs against extractive developments.</p> <p><b>Mines and Geosciences Bureau (MGB)</b> The MGB is mandated to administer and dispose mineral lands sustainably. However, most of the remaining mineral-rich areas are in KBAs and within ICCAs. These areas are either with mining permits or exploration. Policy harmonization is necessary to address the overlap and rationalize conservation and development objectives.</p>
<i>Other National Government Agencies (NGAs)</i>	
<b>National Economic Development Authority (NEDA)</b>	The NEDA is the primary agency responsible for formulating continuing, coordinating and fully integrating social and economic policies, plans and programs. It shall serve as one of the members of the Project Board who will steer the project and provide policy and implementation guidelines. The NEDA, as mandated, shall ensure the project remains consistent with established national priorities and relevant to the local needs. It shall also ensure coordination with other policies, plans, programs and projects of other government agencies.
<b>Department of Interior and Local Governance (DILG)</b>	The DILG is mandated to assist the President in the exercise of general supervision over local governments. It is expected to provide support to local government units to deliver improved performance in governance, administration, social and economic development and environmental management. Some of its specific tasks include: (i) advising the President in the promulgation of policies, rules, regulations and other issuances on the general supervision over local governments and on public order and safety; and (ii) establishing and prescribing rules, regulations and other issuances implementing laws on public order and safety, the general supervision over local governments and the promotion of local autonomy and community empowerment and monitor compliance thereof. The DILG shall also be a member of the Project Board. Its membership shall facilitate the involvement of concerned LGUs in site implementation and interfacing of the ICCA and CCP with other local plans.
<b>Department of Agriculture – Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (DA-BFAR)</b>	<p>The BFAR is the government agency responsible for the development, improvement, management and conservation of the country's fisheries and aquatic resources. However, ancestral water is not yet recognized by BFAR. Engaging BFAR to incorporate ancestral water in the following but not limited to will support ICCs with ancestral waters sustain their traditional governance and secure their livelihood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation and implementation of a comprehensive National Fisheries Industry Development Plan;</li> <li>• Issuance of licenses for the operation of commercial fishing vessels;</li> <li>• Formulation and implementation of a Comprehensive Fishery Research and Development Program, such as, but not limited to, sea farming, sea ranching, tropical / ornamental fish and seaweed culture, aimed at increasing resource productivity improving resource use efficiency, and ensuring the long term sustainability of the county's fishery and aquatic resources; and</li> <li>• Coordination with LGUs and other concerned agencies for the establishment of productivity-enhancing and market development programs in fishing communities to enable women to engage in other fisheries / economic activities and contribute significantly to development efforts.</li> </ul>
<b>Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board</b>	The HLURB is the lead agency in the formulation of the CLUP Guidelines and provision of technical assistance to local government units in the preparation of comprehensive land use plans. The interface of CCP in the CLUP ensures sustainability of the ICCA, and institutionalization in LGU plans. Consequently, this allows allocation of funds to implement the CCP through inclusion in the LGU Annual Investment Plan.

Office/ Organization	Stakeholder Description
<b>Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)</b>	The DTI is responsible for realizing the country's goal of globally competitive and innovative industry and services sector that contribute to inclusive growth and employment generation. Toward this, it is mandated to develop livelihood opportunities to marginalized sector, including the IPs. DTI will be one of the key agencies that can assist in the implementation of the CCP, which includes development of alternative sustainable livelihood.
<b>Department of Tourism (DOT)</b>	The eco-tourism potential of ICCAs is high as these represent among the most intact forests, watersheds, habitat of variety of species – mostly indigenous and endemic, and cultural/ ritual sites. Coordination with DOT which is the primary government agency charged with the responsibility to encourage, promote, and develop tourism as a major socio-economic activity is necessary to maintain the integrity of ICCAs and meaningful engagement of ICCs in terms of developing and managing the eco-tourism enterprise as alternative livelihood of the community.
<b>Mindanao Development Authority (MinDA)</b>	<p>The MinDA is mandated to promote, coordinate and facilitate the active and extensive participation of all sectors to effect the socioeconomic development of Mindanao. Among its specific functions relevant to the project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend to and, whenever necessary, call upon the proper agencies on the technical support, physical assistance and, generally, the level of priority to be accorded to agricultural, industrial, commercial, and infrastructure, environmental, and technological programs and projects soliciting or requiring direct or indirect help from or through the national government or any of its instrumentalities;</li> <li>• Promote and facilitate investments in any field that would enhance the socioeconomic development of Mindanao and uplift the living standards of the people and their socio-political activities in close coordination with agencies primarily mandated to undertake such functions; and</li> <li>• Explore sources for financing priority Mindanao-wide and/or Mindanao-specific inter-regional programs, projects and activities.</li> </ul> <p>MinDA would be a strategic partner for those project sites in Mindanao. It shall complement the project efforts and may take on the mobilization of resources for the implementation of CCPs.</p>
<b>Palawan Council for Sustainable Development (PalCSD)</b>	For Palawan, the PalCSD is a crucial partner. It is mandated to promote development, conservation, management, protection and utilization of the natural resources of Palawan for the present and future generations. PalCSD could provide technical assistance in the formulation of the CCP and ensure that this is integrated in province-wide development plan. It could also issue a policy adopting ICCA as a conservation strategy and development mechanism for its documentation, recognition and inclusion of CCPs in the development plan of the province.
<i>Legislative Bodies</i>	
<b>Senate of the Philippines (Senate)</b>	Development of specific law on ICCA would require engagement with the legislative branch of government. In the Philippines, this consists of the House of Representatives and the Senate which have the responsibility to deliberate policies and pass them in the form of statutes.
<b>House of Representatives (HOR)</b>	
<i>Local Government Units (LGUs)</i>	
<p>Since ICCAs are geographically located within local government administrative units, the LGU is a key factor for the actual recognition and management of ICCAs. LGUs in general are not supportive of indigenous peoples' governance or for the need to ensure services are culturally appropriate for the following reasons: this is seen as a threat to their own authority; reluctance to put resources for only a minority of the population; lack of appreciation for the importance of cultural diversity and related to this lack of awareness that respect for cultural diversity is a collective right they are duty-bound to uphold.</p> <p>The LGU in the Philippines consist of different levels:</p>	

Office/ Organization	Stakeholder Description
<b>Provincial LGU</b>	The provinces are the highest-level LGUs and are the primary political and administrative divisions of the Philippines. The exercise general supervisory powers over the entire province. They also pass laws for the welfare of the municipalities and cities within its jurisdiction. These functions will facilitate cooperation among different municipalities that have political jurisdiction over an ICCA. The Provincial LGU could develop a framework to consolidate adoption and support to ICCAs.
<b>City/Municipal LGU</b>	The provinces are divided into cities and municipalities. They have been granted corporate personality enabling them to enact local policies and laws, enforce them, and govern their jurisdictions. Among its functions is to develop Comprehensive Land Use Plan. They are also tasked to prepare Forest Land Use Plan. These plans are the bases for the formulation of Annual Investment Plans. They will be key targets of advocacy and IEC activities to create a platform for dialogues. These dialogues are expected to result in meaningful collaboration between the LGUs and ICCs, and interfacing of the local plans with the CCPs, and ultimately ADSDPP, which will result in funding for its implementation.
<b>Barangay LGU</b>	Each municipality or city is composed of a number of villages or barangays. The barangays are the smallest units of local government in the Philippines. Soliciting the support of the Barangay LGUs could facilitate the dialogues with the Municipal LGUs. It is also important for the ICCAs and CCPs to be integrated in the Barangay Plans. Aside from having local recognition, they could also assist in mobilizing funds for the CCPs.
<i>Support Organizations/ Non-Government Organizations (NGOs)</i>	
<b>Philippine ICCA Consortium (BUKLURAN)</b>	<p>This organization has been established and mandated by the indigenous communities to formulate a national program to support the ICCAs in the Philippines during the First National Conference. It intends to facilitate the recognition of and support for the governance and management of ICCAs in the Philippines. Known simply as BUKLURAN, it is comprised of representatives from IP groups across the country. However, there are plans to expand membership to other ICCs, support organizations, and distinguished individuals known to be champions of ICCAs and IP rights.</p> <p>As a group however, because it is still in the organizational stage, its capacities have yet to be tested although the individual representatives who comprise the consortium belong to IP groups and NGOs with extensive management experience. The Consortium will be a recipient of technical assistance so that its capacity is strengthened to fulfill its mandates stated in the Manila Declaration. It will also play a key part in the advocacies and in supporting ICC organizations whose ICCAs are under threat.</p>
<b>Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID) Inc.</b>	<p>A social development organization assisting indigenous communities secure or recover traditional lands and water since 1967. With its pioneering work on ICCA, BMB-NewCAPP partnered with them in 2010 for the pilot testing of ICCA to develop a new modality for expanding the national protected area system. PAFID served as Co-convenor of the First and Second National Conferences on ICCA.</p> <p>PAFID will have a key role as one of the Project Responsible Partners 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.</p>
<b>Koalisyon ng Katutubong Samahan ng Pilipinas (KASAPI)</b>	<p>Biggest national federation of different indigenous peoples organizations (IPOs) in the Philippines representing 64 ethno-linguistic groups from 127 ICCs. It advocates for the recognition of the rights of the IP to their ancestral domains, self-determination and cultural integrity. Another partner of BMB-NewCAPP for the pilot testing of ICCA and co-convenor of the First National Conference on ICCA.</p> <p>KASAPI will play a major role in supporting the Philippine ICCA Consortium, and in linking the Project with the various IP organizations in the Philippines. It is also one of the Project's Responsible Partners.</p>
<b>Philippine Tropical Forest Conservation Foundation (PTFCF)</b>	Established pursuant to the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America (USG) and the Government of the Philippines (GOP) under the Tropical Forest Conservation Act, the principal objective of PTFCF is to provide grants to projects that aim to conserve, maintain or restore tropical forests in the Philippines. PTFCF has helped the Bureau in the upholding of objectives of ICCAs through grants provided to selected sites. It has identified ICCA as one of its key result areas using the programmatic grant

Office/ Organization	Stakeholder Description
	<p>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.</p>
<b>Foundation for Philippine Environment (FPE)</b>	<p><b>Similar with PTFCF, FPE</b> is another national grant-making NGO that has adopted ICCA as a programme strategy. Again, this would open up opportunity for additional funding and complementation at the site level.</p> <p>FPE has supported a number of ICCA documentations through its EU project, Mainstreaming Indigenous People’s Participation in Environment Governance (MIPPEG). It is also the current NGO partner of SGP-5 in the Philippines, a potential source of funding for the implementation of CCPs.</p>
<b>Conservation International (CI)</b>	<p>CI’s work in the Philippines is focused on promoting healthy ecosystems for human well-being in one of the biodiversity-richest countries in the world through conservation science, ecosystem services, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and sustainable financing.</p> <p>It is currently working in Palawan. Balabac and other sites could benefit from its expertise in conservation science and climate change. It could enhance the ICCA documentation. CI could also support development of mechanisms for financing the CCPs.</p> <p>CI’s work in Palawan is demonstrating how ecosystem services benefit humanity and how protected area management that values and protects nature’s assets supports human well-being.</p>
<b>Local NGOs</b>	<p>A number of active NGOs support indigenous peoples groups in the Philippines. Some of them are members of the Philippine 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In Palawan, the Environmental Legal Assistance Center (ELAC) is an environmental non-government organization committed to helping communities uphold their constitutional right to a healthful and balanced ecology. It is a potential local partner to assist Balabac, and perhaps other ICCs in Palawan, in the ICCA documentation, mapping, and conservation planning. Thus, ELAC may also be a recipient of capacity building. ELAC is well accepted among the ICCs in Palawan.</p> <p>Other local NGOs will be identified during implementation.</p> <p>In Mindanao, the PAFID and KASAPI can potentially work with the following NGOs to increase local capacity to provide technical assistance to ICCs in ICCA documentation, mapping and community conservation planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bukidnon – Father Vincent Cullen Tulugan Learning and Development Center (FVCTLDC)</li> <li>• Philippine Eagle Foundation</li> <li>• Fr. Bert Alejo Foundation</li> </ul>
<i>Private Sector</i>	
<p>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.</p>	

Office/ Organization	Stakeholder Description
	<p>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.</p> <p>Most of the sites, if not all, have potential for payment for ecosystem services (PES). The following organizations are potential partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cagayan de Oro River Basin Management Council (CDORBMC). This is one of the organizations that NewCAPP worked with in developing a PES scheme in Mt. Kalatungan.</li> <li>• Coops. These may be directly benefitting from the ecosystem services, and may want to participate in PES to ensure continued provisioning of services such as water.</li> <li>• Water Districts. May serve as collecting agent</li> <li>• Multi-national corporations and local businesses.</li> </ul>
<i>Academic and Research Institutions</i>	
<b>University of the Philippines – National College of Public Administration and Governance (UP-NCPAG)</b>	UP-NCPAG is a pioneering leader in governance and public administration education in the Philippines and in Asia. They were one of the Co-convenors of the First National Conference on ICCA in the Philippines. NewCAPP has also partnered with them for the development of an ICCA Publication. This project could also engage them to provide professional and policy advice, and develop other publications to further advance ICCAs in the country.
<b>Xavier University (Ateneo de Cagayan) – Xavier Science Foundation (XU-XSF)</b>	With a vision to develop Mindanao as a center for agricultural development, XU-XSF has grown to become a respected member of the social development community. It has supported varied development programs and projects in partnership with government institutions, donor organizations and corporate foundations in the country and those operating internationally. It has committed its resources to the upliftment of the marginal sectors, including the indigenous peoples, through various programs on institution building, rural social leadership, management training and sustainable agriculture development, among others. In fact, XU-XSF is a key partner in the PES scheme developed in Mt. Kalatungan with BMB-NewCAPP. XU-XSF is the fund manager and has also mobilized additional resources to encourage more stakeholders to participate in the PES. Similarly, XU-XSF could extend the same assistance it has provided to Mt. Kalatungan with the ICCAs in Mindanao.
<b>Other academic institutions</b>	<p>Potentially other academic institutions could be tapped to expand the support group for ICCAs. These institutions could be cultivated to provide the same assistance being given by UP and XU-XSF. Some of these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UP Mindanao, Ateneo de Davao University, Central Mindanao University, and Mindanao State University for Mindanao, UP Pamulaan Foundation, Notre Dame University</li> <li>• UP Baguio, UP Los Baños, St. Louise University, and Isabela State University for Luzon, Nueva Viscaya State University, Central Luzon State University</li> <li>• Palawan State University for the Island Group</li> </ul>
<i>United Nations Development Programme – Philippines</i>	
	<p>The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) partners with people at all levels of society to help build nations that can withstand crisis, and drive and sustain the kind of growth that improves the quality of life for everyone. On the ground in more than 170 countries and territories, we offer global perspective and local insight to help empower lives and build resilient nations. In the Philippines, UNDP fosters human development for peace and prosperity. Working with central and local Governments as well as civil society, and building on global best practices; UNDP strengthens capacities of women, men and institutions to empower them to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the objectives of the Philippine Development Plan. Through advocacy and development projects, with a special focus on vulnerable groups, UNDP works to ensure a better life for the Filipino people. With Global Environment Facility, UNDP supported the implementation of NewCAPP. Building on NewCAPP, UNDP will continue to work through BMB and NCIP for the institutionalization of ICCA in the country.</p>

**B.2. Describe the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SSCF).**

In addition to conserving biodiversity, the 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.

Socio-economic benefits will be sought after especially at the local level. It aims to benefit around 65,000 individuals of IP communities in the 10 project sites, directly and indirectly. Thus, the Project will see to it that economic benefits from ICCAs are given practical attention in CCPs, which will further be strengthened if these are interfaced with the LGU's CLUP. The Project also intends to assist sites in networking to generate support for socio-economic projects in the CCPs. The long-term socio-economic benefits to the country lie in the fact that irreplaceable natural resource are conserved for future generations. There will be negative economic implication as a result of dwindling natural resources (described in the Project Document's Situational Analysis). For example, eco-tourism possibilities that do not add pressure on biodiversity and at the same time are respectful of indigenous communities. The CCP will help define the management strategies to sustain the very resource of their survival economically and culturally.

Socio-economic benefits are more detailed and immediate at the local level. The CCPs are expected to identify socio-economic projects that will benefit local economies while protective of biodiversity and respectful of indigenous culture. The Project intends to assist communities in jumpstarting such projects by providing start-up funds, by working toward the inclusion of CCPs in the CLUP or having the LGU recognize them for possible LGU support, by actively searching for additional funds for these projects from other sources, and by initiating and cementing linkages that will broaden their economic support base.

Gender Mainstreaming. In some ways indigenous groups are said to be more egalitarian than mainstream societies. Some examples: the premium placed on a consensus-building approach in community decision-making calls for the perspectives of women to be considered; and, some swidden agriculture societies recognize inheritance of land tracts by women. However, in terms of a public voice and concomitant mobility within society in general indigenous women's participation, or lack thereof, is distinctive as evidenced by attendance sheets in activities. Furthermore, in ethnographic data-gathering there is a tendency to have predominantly male respondents so that women's roles in governance and conservation are not surfaced. The Project intends to avoid these pitfalls by ensuring support for women's attendance in Project-related activities, gender disaggregation in data-gathering and project reporting; ensuring that policies consider the gender dimension. The Project shall pursue a non-confrontational approach in dealing with gender issues that may crop up in Project implementation so as not to alienate traditional leaders some of whom may interpret the highlighting of the gender dimension as an intrusion into their traditional culture. Ensuring the active participation of women and youth of indigenous communities in Project activities has been emphasized as a core design principle. This will also contribute to stronger replication and sustainability possibilities due to the involvement of a broader segment of the population. Gender mainstreaming will also be achieved by adherence to gender disaggregation of data gathered and the use of a gender lens in the gathering and analysis of data. The inculcation of such gender lens will be integrated in the culture-sensitivity orientations.

---

**B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design.**



The experience of UNDP-GEF NewCAPP, the Project's precursor, has demonstrated the cost effectiveness of ICCA in biodiversity conservation. This has been recognized by no less than the Convention on Biodiversity during the 11<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties, and the IUCN World Parks Congress (WPC) held in November of 2014. These important gatherings acknowledged that ICCAs (in the case of the CBD), and other effective area based conservation measures (OECMs, in the case of the IUCN-WPC), are effective in achieving the Aichi targets.

The NewCAPP project showed the potential of reducing the cost required from government to improve the management of protected areas through the expansion and diversification of the national PA system. Unlike PAs established through the NIPAS, ICCAs are de- facto managed by IP communities, thus the cost of enforcement and effective governance are low, and considering that local resource users and managers derive benefits from their own efforts. The approach is also mutually beneficial, as both government and local communities stand to benefit from ICCAs. The strategy to involve local communities and other partners will ensure there is strong ownership and responsibility for managing the selected key biodiversity areas.

The choice of interventions was strategic and catalytic, embedding ICCA processes in the standard provisions of the indigenous peoples-led ancestral domain management planning processes and PA management planning, thus ensuring that the Project is able to influence existing systems and procedures for systematic upscaling of initiatives. By focusing on key actors – the DENR-BMB (for biodiversity conservation), NCIP (to uphold indigenous peoples rights) and the KASAPI/ Philippine ICCA Consortium (as representatives of the base stakeholders), the envisioned capacity development support are expected to result in stronger institutions prepared to tackle the challenges expected over the long term.

Cost effectiveness was further enhanced through incorporation of cost-effective measures in the design principles especially that of building up of synergies. The latter is further illustrated in the actual design of project activities. Specific examples in the project design include: The Project intends to ensure that the processes for ICCA recognition will be imbedded in the relevant existing NCIP policies which are undergoing enhancement. In the selection of project sites, there was an intent to come up with a broader spectrum of ICCA recognition experiences through the identification of a variety of sites (e.g. in terms of location, size, indigenous groups, geographic conditions, potential level of LGU support, amount of data already available for the ICCA recognition processes, and the like). The inter-agency approach in Project implementation will build up coordination mechanisms that may extend beyond Project purposes and time frame. Capacity-building is consciously undertaken through a "learning-by-doing" approach apart from more formal, center-based trainings.

---

## **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN**

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

### *Project start*

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP Manila staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.

- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

### *Quarterly Reports*

Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.

Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).

Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.

Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

### *Annual Reports*

*Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR):* This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

### *Periodic Monitoring through Site Visit*

UNDP Manila will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP APRC and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

### *End of Project*



An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned. The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation. During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

### *Learning and Knowledge Sharing*

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Table 6. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget

<b>Type of M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Budget US\$</b> <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	<b>Time frame</b>
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Manager</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.</li> </ul>	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oversight by Project Manager</li> <li>▪ Project team</li> </ul>	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RTA</li> <li>▪ UNDP EEG</li> </ul>	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> </ul>	None	Quarterly
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team,</li> </ul>	Indicative cost:	At least three months

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	\$45,000.00	before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ local consultant</li> </ul>		At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> </ul>	Indicative cost per year: 7,000 (21,000)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate)</li> <li>▪ Government representatives</li> </ul>	For GEF supported projects, UNDP costs are paid from IA fees and Government representatives from operational budget	Yearly
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 76,000.00	

### *Communication and Visibility Requirements*

Full compliance is required with UNDP’s Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the UNDP logo. These can be accessed at <http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/reaching-the-outside-world/outside-world-core-concepts-visual.shtml>. Full compliance is also required with the GEF Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of GEF logo. These can be accessed at [http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF\\_logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo). The UNDP and GEF logos should be same size. When both appear on a publication, the UNDP logo should be on the left top corner and the GEF logo on the right top corner.

Full compliance is required with the GEF’s Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the “GEF Guidelines”)<sup>5</sup>. Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in the project publications, vehicles, supplies, and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements, regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

<sup>5</sup> The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08\\_Branding\\_the\\_GEF%20final\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf)


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**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 form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
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(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.		June 17, 2015	Johan Robinson, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD, UNDP	+66-2-304-9100	johan.robinson@undp.org

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project Targets	Sources of Information	Risks and Assumptions
<p><b>Project Objective:</b> 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.</p>	Expansion of national PA estate as a result of institutionalizing ICCAs as an additional PA category in the Philippines	5,581,927 hectares	5,681,917 hectares, or increase by 1.7%	BMB reports National ICCA Registry	Delays owing to identified Project risks may affect timely completion of ICCA processes within the timeframe of the Project
	Improved capacities of BMB, NCIP and Philippines ICCA Consortium illustrating institutional support to ICCAs	Baseline average scores in the capacity assessment scorecard:  BMB = 2.5 NCIP = 1.0 Philippine ICCA Consortium = 0.71	At least an average increase in 5 capacity results by 0.5 to 1 for BMB and NCIP with a high score of 3 in the following indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacities for Engagement</li> <li>• Capacities to Monitor and Evaluate</li> </ul> (see Annex 2 for the capacity scorecard) At least an average increase in 5 capacity results by 1 to 1.5 for Philippine ICCA Consortium with a high score of 1 to 2 in the following indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacities for Engagement</li> <li>• Capacities to Generate, Access and Use of Information and Knowledge</li> </ul> (see Annex 2 for the capacity scorecard)	Capacity Assessment Scorecards	*Inconsistent participation by agencies and organizations especially at regional and local levels (including lack of continuity in participating representatives) *Inability of regional and local representatives of key stakeholders to agree on roles

	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project Targets	Sources of Information	Risks and Assumptions
	<b>IRRF Sub-indicator 1.1.3.A.1.1:</b> Extent to which institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing of natural resources, BD and ecosystems	To be defined at start of project	To be defined at project start	Policies and procedures enacted by DENR, NCIP and relevant agencies	
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Legal and regulatory framework and administrative procedures that harmonize the mandates, plans and activities amongst all key stakeholders such as NCIP, BMB, BFAR and relevant local government units are established and effectively implemented for the identification, mapping, recognition and management of ICCAs	<p>1.1. Relevant policy issuances between NCIP, DENR-BMB, BFAR and Forest Management Bureau which harmonize and operationalize existing policies and regulatory frameworks that address inconsistencies and recognizes ICCAs as an innovative type of governance for protected areas and conservation</p> <p>1.2. Support to advocacy and consensus building on the ICCA Bill</p> <p>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</p> <p>1.4. Land use planning guidelines of LGUs are enhanced to incorporate the identified ICCAs</p> <p>1.5. Implementing guidelines and procedures for NIPAS PA management planning and zoning that incorporate identification, mapping, documentation and traditional governance systems in ICCAs</p>				
	Improved efficiency in official recognition of an ICCA over the project period	Average of 3.5 years from community orientation and mobilization to completion of CCP	Reduced by an average of six months as measured for the 10 targeted sites	Project reports	<p>*Agency leaders, who may be new given an expected new national administration, will need time to study ICCA concerns.</p> <p>*Agency leaders, who may be new given an expected new national administration, may not reach an agreement with one another given other policy directions</p>
	% of CADTs and ADSDPPs that clearly identify and map ICCAs as part of the process where communities have expressed an interest	To be established in first year of project	100%	Project and NCIP reports, National ICCA Registry	<p>*The project time frame is not congruent with the 3-year legislative cycle.</p> <p>*Lawmakers may be preoccupied with electoral campaigns</p>

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>End of Project Targets</b>	<b>Sources of Information</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	Number of LGUs where ICCAs are fully integrated into CLUPs and CLUPs control incompatible activities in regards to BD conservation	None	2 LGUs	CLUPs Project Reports	Changes in local leadership following elections may mean changes in priorities and support by LGUs
	Improved management effectiveness of NIPAS PAs with documented and recognized ICCAs as indicated by the change in METT scores	Baseline METT Scores of:  Mt. Apo Natural Park- 77% Bataan Natural Park – 53%	At least 10% increase in METT scores of 2 PAs: Mt. Apo Natural Park – 87% Bataan Natural Park – 63%	METT Scorecards	Disagreement among PAMB members on the role of IP communities and recognition of ICCAs within PAs
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Capacity of key stakeholders for the effective governance and management of ICCAs strengthened	<p>2.1. Regional networks of at least 9 ICCAs representing the country’s ethnographic regions are identified, documented, mapped, recognised and registered at UNEP/WCMC.</p> <p>2.2. At least 10 community conservation plans, with relevant business plan sections incorporated, are developed to support ICCAs;</p> <p>2.3. Capacities of NCIP and DENR are strengthened to provide technical support to ICCA documentation and recognition. (trainings for all regions to support ICCAs)</p> <p>2.4. Capacity of Philippine ICCA Consortium developed to serve as the mechanism for exchange, advocacy, and legal support to ICCAs in distress.</p> <p>2.5. Capacities of ICCs in the network of least 9 ICCAs are strengthened to document, map, plan and implement actions to address the identified threats.</p> <p>2.6. A National Registry of ICCAs is established, supported by an appropriate system for validation, monitoring, and access by the public.</p>				

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>End of Project Targets</b>	<b>Sources of Information</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	Number of ICCs rating assistance from the National ICCA Consortium as satisfactory <sup>6</sup>	To be developed in first year	10 ICC Communities	Satisfaction rating reports	*Lack of mutual understanding with the NCIP re Philippine ICCA Consortium roles and responsibilities in relation to ICCAs *Gatekeeping attitude arises *Failure to reach out to networks beyond KASAPI *Inconsistent participation by Consortium members
	ICCAs are expanded to include additional 100,000 hectares and recognized in the national PA system	9,297 hectares registered at the international ICCA database (UNEP-WCMC) 3 registered at the international ICCA database; 2 ICCAs ready for submission	109,297 hectares of ICCAs within key biodiversity areas are recognized and registered	Copy of the community declaration of ICCA National ICCA Certification of recognition/ registration at the national/international registry Inclusion in the national/international database/ registry	*Passage of relevant policy instruments is a political process and dependent on numerous factors *National elections in 2016; election period from October 2015 to June 2016 will preoccupy policymakers and LGUs; anticipated change in national government administration will affect agency leadership
	Capacity of ICCs in 10 sites to reduce threats	To be established at project start <sup>7</sup>	To be established at project start	Capacity Assessment Scorecard	

<sup>6</sup> An appropriate satisfactory rating form will be developed together with the communities in the first year of the Project

<sup>7</sup> Capacity development scorecard developed and completed once the selected 10 ICCAs ICC management has been established

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>End of Project Targets</b>	<b>Sources of Information</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
	National ICCA Registry is in place	None	In place	Enabling policy creating national ICCA registry and its operating procedures URL (website address) of the National Registry	Agencies and stakeholders will reach consensus on the management arrangements for the Registry
	Management effectiveness of 10 ICCAs	Mt. Taungay = 52% Mt. Polis = 53 Ikalahan/Kalanguya (Imugan) = 60 Kanawan, Bataan = 53 Engongot CADT-Aurora sector = 61 Balabac = 29 Mt. Kimangkil = 48 Mt. Apo = 77 Mt. Diwata – Esperanza = 43 Dinarawan = 57	Mt. Taungay = 62 Mt. Polis = 64 Ikalahan/Kalanguya (Iugan) = 72 Kanawan, Bataan = 64 Engongot CADT-Aurora sector = 73 Balabac = 35 Mt. Kimangkil = 58 Mt. Apo = 92 Mt. Diwata-Esperanza = 52 Diarawan = 68	METT Scorecards	



**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

N/A

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>8</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD75,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Component A. Technical Review	11,550	2,222	9,428
Component B. Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	16,650	2,949	13,701
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments	16,650	2,949	13,701
Component D: Validation workshop	16,650	2,949	13,701
Component E: Completion of final documentation	13,500	1,662	11,838
<b>Total</b>	<b>75,000</b>	<b>12,731</b>	<b>62,269</b>

<sup>8</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS** (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)