

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

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

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

<b>Table 1. Project Summary Table</b>				
<b>Project Title : The Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF – Small Grants Programme in the Philippines (otherwise known as GEF-SGP OP5)</b>				
<b>GEF Project ID (PIMS #)</b>	4517		<b>At Endorsement (US \$ M)</b>	<b>By end June 2016<sup>1</sup> (US \$ M)</b>
<b>UNDP Project ID:</b>	0082868	<b>GEF Financing:</b>	4,583,333.00	1,325,642.52
<b>Country:</b>	Philippines	<b>UNDP</b>	1,000,000.00	
<b>Region:</b>	Asia	<b>Government:</b>	3,002,907.00	
<b>Focal Area:</b>	Biodiversity	<b>Other (NGOs, LGUs, communities)</b>	1,100,000.00	
<b>Operational Program:</b>	GEF-5 Strategic Program:	<b>Total Co-financing:</b>	5,102,907.00	
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	UNDP	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	9,686,240.00	
<b>Other Partners Involved:</b>	Civil Society Organizations, The Foundation for the Philippine Environment as Responsible Party (Grants Management)	<b>ProDoc Signature:</b>	June 2013	
		<b>Date Project began:</b>	June 2013	
		<b>(Operational) Closing Date:</b>	July 2017	<b>Proposed (Approved):</b> December 2018

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: support local people's organizations, NGOs and CBOs in designing and implementing projects to contribute to global biodiversity conservation using the landscape approach and modeling and implementation of best practices. Individual small grant projects will contribute concrete outputs to the achievement of three inter-related components and their respective outcomes: (1) Community-based actions improve the sustainability of protected areas (PAs); (2) Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors (PLS); and; (3) Cross Cutting Capacity Development and Knowledge Management. The majority of individual grants funded under this project will contribute to the achievement of the main project objective and targets included in the project results framework.

<sup>1</sup> To be determined in January, 2013.

The goal of SGP-5 is to ***secure global environmental benefits through community-based initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines.***

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

An overall approach and method<sup>2</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, SGP project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser (Upgraded Country Programmes **Global Coordinator (UCP GC)**) and key stakeholders and grantees. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to select project sites in the aforementioned three priority sites of the Programme. The complete list of these projects, their corresponding project sites, grantees and their contact details is included in Annex B. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Members of the National Steering Committee
- Members of the Project Technical Review Committee
- Officials of the Biodiversity Management Bureau
- GEF Operational Focal Point
- Staff/Consultants of SGP-5
- Officials and Staff of the Responsible Party (The Foundation for the Philippine Environment)
- Staff of UNDP Country Office
- Officers and staff of NCIP
- Officers and Staff of Site Hubs
- Officers and Staff of Grantee Organizations
- Officers and Staff of Local Government Units

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers

---

<sup>2</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/ Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully

mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>3</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in the Philippines. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 27 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	27 March 2018
Evaluation Mission	15 days	16 April 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	7 days	07 May 2018
Final Report	2 days	28 May 2018

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO

<sup>3</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by UCP GC, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international (Team Leader, who shall finalize the Report) and 1 national evaluators. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The national Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Master's Degree on sociology, environmental science, environment & natural resources management or any related course
- Minimum five (5) years of relevant professional experience especially on results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, and experience of working on GEF evaluations
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area and familiarity with biodiversity conservation issues in the Philippines
- Knowledge and experience in diversification of protected area governance regimes, including recognition of ICCAs, community-based management schemes, and strengthening the role of sub-national governments in biodiversity conservation
- Demonstrated experience in implementation and/or evaluation of capacity-building efforts in developing countries, in the area of biodiversity conservation
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, indigenous peoples, farmers and fishers
- Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills required for both consultants
- Fluency in the Filipino Language; knowledge of Waray, Cuyuno or Ilocano is an advantage

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

---

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

The financial proposals from possible candidates should be expressed in lump sum amount inclusive of all financial costs related to this engagement (i.e. professional fees, transportation/travel to and from residence-Manila, reproduction, communications including internet). Domestic airfare, food

and accommodation of the team outside Manila will be shouldered by UNDP separately and only 20% of the DSA following the NIM rates will be provided.

%	Milestone
10%	Following acceptance of Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Applicants are requested to apply online

<http://www.ph.undp.org/content/philippines/en/home/operations/jobs.html> by 20 February 2018

Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

### PIMS 4517: The Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF – Small Grants Programme in the Philippines

#### FIFTH OPERATIONAL PHASE OF THE GEF SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME IN THE PHILIPPINES PROJECT LOGFRAME (REVISED AS OF 26 NOVEMBER 2014)

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective</b>  Global environmental benefits secured through community-based biodiversity conservation initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines	1. Increase in area under protection in community-managed or community-supported protected areas  2. Increase in area under certified or verified sustainable use by communities	1. None supported by the project  2. None supported by the project.	1. At least 100,000ha of protected areas under community management/ co-management by recipients of grants under this project.  2. At least 400,000ha of community agricultural, fishing or forestry area under certified or verified sustainable use by communities that are recipients of grants under this project.	1. GEF-SGP portfolio reports/ PIR reports and final evaluation  2. GEF-SGP portfolio reports/ PIR reports and final evaluation	
<b>Outcome 1</b>  Effective models for community-based governance of	Number of community managed or co-managed PA	No specific community co-management models identified in target areas.	At least 10 communities exhibit management or co-management models of protected areas	Grantee progress reports and data from DENR-PAWB	Communities in the project areas have the interest and willingness to engage in the

protected areas demonstrated	models operational in project areas				management or co-management of PAs.
	Number of hectares protected through community-PA	Individual small community protection initiatives in existence in some local communities, but no comprehensive data available	At least 10 community-managed protected or conservation areas established or enhanced encompassing at least 100,00 hectares	Grantee progress reports	Communities in the project areas have the interest and willingness to engage in the management or co-management of PAs.
	% increase in METT	Relevant METT indicators and baseline scores to be decided prior to each relevant grant inception.	40% increase in relevant dimensions of management effectiveness in target protected areas	METT scores reported in grantee progress reports	Improvement in the capacity of communities translates into significant increases in relevant dimensions of the METT framework during project lifetime.
	Number of hectares of mangroves and/or seagrass rehabilitated or protected.	None identified	1,000 hectares of mangrove and/or seagrass areas within the 100,000 ha community-managed protected or conserved areas are rehabilitated or protected	Grantee progress reports	Suitable mangrove areas are available with communities that are willing and able to protect them.
<b>Component 2</b>					
Outcome 2. Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity	Number of hectares under improved community “mainstreamed” management within	Zero – no hectareage is under improved community-mainstreamed management.	400,000 hectares of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management	Grantee reports and grant portfolio overview reports	



conservation objectives	PLS, reducing threats to BD from slash and burn farming; over-harvesting of timber, and destructive fishing.		arrangements, mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives, thereby reducing threats to biodiversity	prepared by the GEF-SGP team	
	Number of community-based land use plans or Ancestral Domain plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.	None	At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plan incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations	Copies of the plans as provided by grantees.	Ancestral Domain plan preparation processes are not unduly delayed by procedural requirements.
	Number of communities adopting TEV reports or similar ecosystem valuation approaches in development of ADSPs or other community land-use plans.	No community level TEV reports		Copies of land-use plans with references to TEV or other ecosystem valuation approaches.	Communities do not recognize the value of ecosystem valuation approaches sufficiently to invest the effort required to learn and apply the approach.
Outcome 3. Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products produced and	Number of biodiversity-friendly products produced and marketed by communities.	There are no records bearing out the biodiversity-friendly products of local communities	30 communities produce and market biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products.	Copies of relevant regulations or citations in grantee progress reports.	

marketed by 30 communities					
<b>Component 3</b>					
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Increased capacity of GEF-SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions	# of community-level resource users and managers who are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.	None amongst grantees to be selected (grants are generally awarded to grantees who have not previously benefitted from GEF-SGP capacity support)	At least 4,000 community-level resource users and managers are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.	Training records; APR; Interviews.	
	# of new grants that replicate approaches	None	Conservation and sustainable use approaches of the projects are replicated in at least 20 new grants by year 4.	Actual grant proposals themselves; APR reports.	
	% increase in amount of co-funding for the Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3	Minimum of 1:1 co-funding for grants	50% increase in amount of co-funding for Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3	Co-funding agreements.	External financial factors do not inhibit availability of donor funding
	Number of governors who launch	Zero	Community-based partnership initiatives for GEF-SGP	Official declarations/ records/interviews	

	community-based partnerships by year 4		launched by at least 4 LGUs by end of year 4		
<b>Outcome 5.</b> Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends	# of GEF-SGP grantees participating in monitoring and evaluation training; % increase in knowledge before/after training	Grantees not yet trained	SGP Philippines M&E framework is established	Training records; Before/after quiz results.	GEF-SGP grantees will have the discipline and inclination to monitor their project's progress.
			All project grantees, except Planning Grant recipients are trained on GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, improving 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E		
			At least 80% of projects, except Planning Grants, adopt/adapt and implement GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, and improve on the quality and accuracy of project monitoring reports, as assessed by progress reports		



## ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS AND PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER GEF-SGP OP5

### LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS<sup>4</sup>

The evaluation will include the review of the following documents:

- Project Document and CEO Endorsement – The Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF – Small Grants Programme in the Philippines
- Annual Reports (2014 Annual cum Inception Report, 2015, 2016 and 2017)
- Quarterly Reports
- APRs/PIRs (2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017)
- Minutes of National Steering Committee meetings
- Work and Financial Plans (2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018)
- SGP-5 Grant Making Guidelines
- Mid-Term Review Report

### PROJECT BRIEF

The Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF-Small Grants Programme in the Philippines (GEF-SGP OP5) was designed to: support local people's organizations, NGOs and CBOs in designing and implementing projects to contribute to global biodiversity conservation using the landscape approach and modeling and implementation of best practices. Individual small grant projects will contribute concrete outputs to the achievement of three inter-related components and their respective outcomes: (1) Community-based actions improve the sustainability of protected areas (PAs); (2) Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors (PLS); and; (3) Cross Cutting Capacity Development and Knowledge Management. The majority of individual grants funded under this project will contribute to the achievement of the main project objective and targets included in the project results framework.

The goal of SGP-5 is to ***secure global environmental benefits through community-based initiatives and actions in selected priority sites in the Philippines.***

SGP-5 has three components that encompass five outcome areas. The following enumerates these elements as well as the national targets under them:

**Component 1:** Community-based actions improve the sustainability of protected areas<sup>5</sup>

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

**Indicators:**

1.1 At least 10 communities exhibit management or co-management models of protected areas<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> This list will be updated before TE as more documents become available.

<sup>5</sup> This component will help to support the development and implementation of community-based protected area models as a complementary form of PA management to NIPAS.

<sup>6</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

- 1.2 At least 10 communities exhibit management or co-management models of protected areas<sup>7</sup>
- 1.3 At least 10 community-managed protected or conservation areas established or enhanced encompassing at least 100,000 hectares<sup>8</sup>
- 1.4 40% increase in relevant dimensions of management effectiveness in target protected areas, as measured by the METT
- 1.5 1,000 hectares of mangrove and/or seagrass areas within the 100,000ha community-managed protected or conserved areas are rehabilitated or protected<sup>9</sup>

**Component 2:** Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors (PLS)<sup>10</sup>

**Outcome 2:** Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives

**Indicators:**

- 2.1 400,000 hectares of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management arrangements, mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives, thereby reducing threats to biodiversity<sup>11</sup>
- 2.2. At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations.<sup>12</sup>

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

**Indicator:**

- 3.1 30 communities produce and market biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products.<sup>13</sup>

**Component 3:** Cross-cutting Capacity Development and Knowledge Management

**Outcome 4:** Increased capacity of GEF-SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions

**Indicators:**

- 4.1 At least 4,000 community-level resource users and managers are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.
- 4.2 Conservation and sustainable use approaches of the projects are replicated in at least 20 new grants by year 4<sup>14</sup>
- 4.3 50% increase in amount of co-funding for Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>8</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>9</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>10</sup> This component will support community initiatives in understanding and consequently integrating the principles, practices, and strategies of biodiversity conservation in the community's economic production activities.

<sup>11</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>12</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>13</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>14</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>15</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

- 4.4 Community-based partnership initiatives for GEF-SGP launched by at least 4 LGUs by end of Year 4<sup>16</sup>

**Outcome 5:** Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends

**Indicators:**

- 5.1 SGP Philippines M&E framework is established<sup>17</sup>
- 5.2. All project grantees, except Planning Grant recipients, are trained on GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, improving 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E<sup>18</sup>
- 5.3. At least 80% of projects, except Planning Grants, adopt/adapt and implement GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, and improve on the quality and accuracy of project monitoring reports, as assessed by progress reports<sup>19</sup>

The Project commenced in June 2013 and was originally expected to end in June 2017. However, it has been granted a no-cost extension by the UNDP GEF Executive Coordinator until December 2018. It is implemented in Palawan, Samar Island and the Sierra Madre Mountain Range (which covers the provinces of Quezon, Laguna, Rizal, Bulacan, Aurora, Quirino, Nueva Ecija, Nueva Vizcaya, Isabela and Cagayan) as priority sites. It is managed by the Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB, formerly PAWB) which has established a Country Project Management Unit (CPMU) to implement certain outputs and coordinate the work of partners in pilot sites.

## LIST OF SGP-FUNDED PROJECTS

Proponent Details	Project Title	Project Site	Project Commitments	Grant Amount
<b>Priority Site: Samar Island</b>				
<b>Site Hub:</b> Center for Empowerment and Resource Development, Inc. (CERD) <b>Address:</b> 117-D Kamuning Road, Quezon City  <b>Contact Person:</b> Julio Galvez Tan Managing Trustee +639209000234 jujutatan@gmail.com	Samar Island Hub and Learning Center for Biodiversity Conservation	Samar Island	7,500 hectares of managed landscapes  1 community land/seascape plan that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	146,311.28
Eastern Visayas Partnership for Rural Development, Inc. (EVPRD) <b>Address:</b> PCA Compound, UEP Zone 3, Catarman 6400 Northern Samar, Philippines  <b>Contact Person:</b>	Creating A Model on Social Fencing for SINP through Establishment of Organized Production and Marketing System for Abaca and other CBFM Products	Brgy. Cablangan, Mondragon, Northern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model  300 hectares of community-managed area	50,000.00

<sup>16</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>17</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>18</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

<sup>19</sup> As restated in the Progress Implementation Report, 30 June 2014.

MR. GREGORIO O. SARMIENTO Project Coordinator evprd2004@yahoo.com; egegsarmiento@yahoo.com			40 hectares of managed landscapes  1 community/CBFM plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation  1 community engaged in BDFE (abaca)	
Nortehanon Access Center, Inc. (NAC)  <i>Address:</i> Nortehanon Access Center, Inc. (NAC) Lot 8, Block 10, University Homes, Catarman, Northern Samar  <i>Contact Person:</i> MS. MAYBELLE M. CAMPS BOD Chairperson camps.maybelle@gmail.com/092 73256156	Enhanced Sustainable Rice Production Techniques: An Approach To Biodiversity Conservation	Municipalities of Catarman, Mondragon and Bobon Northern Samar	12 hectares of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management arrangements  1 community produces and markets 4 biodiversity-friendly agricultural products (rice/ palay, salted egg, balut, palay seeds)	43,151.63
Green Mindanao, Inc.  <i>Address:</i> Old Phase 1, Block 6 Lot 14, Xavier Height Subdivision Upper Balulang, Cagayan De Oro City  <i>Contact Person:</i> MR. GLICETO O. DAGONDON Executive Director butch_dagondon@yahoo.com; 09209134922	Basey Nipa Community Conservation Project	Basey, Eastern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model  50 hectares of community-managed area  100 hectares of managed landscapes  1 community land/seascape plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation  1 community engaged in BDFE (nipa)	51,195.65
Pasay, Kinis and Bangus Producers Association (PAKIBA)  <i>Address:</i> Brgy. P. Tingzon, San Jose, Northern Samar  <i>Contact Person:</i> MS. EDITH A. VILLOCERO President	Community Based Mangrove Management and Protection for Sustainable Utilization	Brgys. Tingzon and Bagong Sabang in San Jose, Northern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model  1 community-managed area  management of 450 hectares of mangroves	22,336.95



c/o CERD: cerd@cerd.ph; 09999195530; 091620194208			2 communities engaged in BDFE	
Lakas at Pagkakaisa ng Asosasyon sa San Pedro (LAPAS) <i>Address:</i> Brgy. San Pedro, Biri Northern Samar  <i>Contact Person:</i> Ricardo Albario LAPAS President 09217811745	Increase Fish Catch to Increase Income Through Protection and Rehabilitation of the Coastal and Marine Resource	Brgys. McArthur, Kauswagan and San Pedro, Biri, Northern Samar	3 community-based/co-management model  1 community-managed area  management of 564 hectares of mangroves  3 communities engaged in BDFE	22,488.04
NSEP-UEP <i>Address:</i> CESA Office, University of Eastern Philippines, University Town, Northern Samar <i>Contact Person:</i> MYRNA NICOL OGOC, PhD Chairperson/CEO myrna_uep@yahoo.com; 093990774757	Coastal Ecosystems Biodiversity Enhancement Project	Biri, Northern Samar: Kauswagan, Poblacion, Pio del Pilar Lavezares, Northern Samar: Borobaybay and Villaflores Rosario, Northern Samar: Jamoog and Vizcaya San Jose, Northern Samar: Dao and Geratag	1 community-based/co-management model  5 community-managed areas  40% METT increase in 1 community PA  1 communities engaged in BDFE	32,608.69
Sentro Ha Pagpauswag Ha Panginabuhi, Inc. (SPPI)  <i>Address:</i> National Highway, Brgy. Cawayan, Catarman, Northern Samar  <i>Contact Person:</i> Ms. JOELYN SOLDEVILLA-BIAG Executive Director sppi07@yahoo.com; 09258474337; 09778214419	Building Capacities on Biodiversity: Strengthening the Samar Island Seaweeds Value Chain Network	Biri, Lavezares, Rosario, San Jose, San Antonio, Capul, Mondragon and Laoang, Northern Samar	8 communities engaged in BDFE	39,134.78
Samar Center for Rural Education and Development, Inc. (SACRED)  <i>Address:</i> Guevarra Apartment, Room 1, Brgy. Dalakit, Catarman, Northern Samar  <i>Contact Person:</i> MR. RAUL C. DE LEON Executive Director sacred1990ngo@yahoo.com; 055 5009953; 09274976621	Upper Caynaga Community-based Upland Resource Development & Management Project	Brgy. Upper Caynaga, Lope de Vega, Northern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model  1 community-managed area  management of 50 hectares of mangroves  1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and	44,540.21

			ecosystem services valuation  1 community engaged in BDFE	
<p>Cansangaya Fishermen's Association (CFA)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Brgy. Cansangaya, Can-avid, Eastern Samar</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. RAUL R. PRENSICA President dan_alura@yahoo.com; 09193600071</p>	Cansangaya Marine Protected Area, Can-avid, Eastern Samar	Brgy. Cansangaya, Can-avid, Eastern Samar	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>1 community-managed area</p> <p>40% METT increase in 1 community PA</p> <p>management of 50 hectares of mangroves, seagrass and coral reef area</p> <p>1 community engaged in BDFE</p>	17,391.30
<p>Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> PSDC Bldg., Magallanes cor. Real Streets, Intramuros, Manila</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. RAFAEL C. LOPA Executive Director pbsp@pbsp.org.ph; 02 2325270</p>	San Jorge Forest Reserve Protection Through Coffee Production	Barangay San Jose, Barangay Sung-an, Barangay Mercedes municipality in Eastern Samar	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>2 community-managed areas management of 5 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>10 hectares of managed landscapes</p> <p>2 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	32,608.69
<p>Guiuan Development Foundation, Inc. (GDFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Guimbaolibot Ave., Guiuan, Eastern Samar</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> PROF. MARGARITA T. DELA CRUZ Executive Director cruzmarge2003@yahoo.com; 09189295852/09173211942</p>	Lawaan Integrated Ecosystems Conservation Project	Lawaan, Eastern Samar	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>2 community-managed areas</p> <p>1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p> <p>7696.16 hectares of managed seascapes/ 13,826 hectares of managed landscapes</p> <p>management of 132 hectares of corals and</p>	102,097.82

			275 hectares of mangroves  3 communities engaged in BDFE	
<b>Priority Site: Sierra Madre Mountain Range</b>				
<b>Site Hub, for Lower Sierra Madre:</b> Tanggol Kalikasan (TK)  <i>Address:</i> M-02 CRM III Bldg., 106 Kamias Road, Quezon City  <i>Contact Person:</i> RAMON GRIMALDO President 02 3760842 c/o gene1631@gmail.com	Strengthening the Networks of Lower Sierra Madre CSOs for Biodiversity Conservation and Management	Provinces of Nueva Ecija, Aurora, Bulacan, Rizal, Laguna, and Quezon	At least 1 community-managed protected or conservation area enhanced encompassing at least 5,000 hectares  1,000 trained to use SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms;  5 replication projects; 25% increase in co-financing;  1 partnership with LGU launched  M&E System; grantees trained on M&E; 80% of project holders adopt/adapt SGP M&E framework	133,695.65
<b>Site Hub, for Upper Sierra Madre:</b> The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement, Inc. (PRRM)  <i>Address:</i> 56 Mother Ignacia Avenue corner Dr. Lazcano St., Brgy. Paligsahan, Quezon City  <i>Contact Person:</i> MR. ISAGANI R. SERRANO President info@prrm.org, iserrano@prrm.org; (+632) 3724989	Strengthening the CSO Partners of GEF-SGP in Upper Sierra Madre	Provinces of Nueva Vizcaya, Cagayan, Isabela and Quirino	creation of 1 CSO-based network  7 communities engaged in BDFE (organic agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products)  150 farmers trained on sustainable agriculture technologies; CSOs trained on biodiversity management, sustainable agriculture, social entrepreneurship, disaster risk reduction and management	130,434.47
Tanim Kalikasan (TanimK)  <i>Address:</i> M04 CRM III Building 106 Kamias Road, Quezon City 1102 Philippines  <i>Contact Person:</i>	Community-based Alternative Livelihood Initiatives in Southern Sierra Madre	SIERRA MADRE General Nakar	7,086 hectares of managed landscapes  1 community engaged in BDFE (coffee)	49,992.68

MR. ESTACIO S. LIM, JR. Executive DirectorJayslim41@gmail.com				
Sustainable Environment for Rural Development Association (SERD)  <i>Address:</i> Project Development Office, Quirino State University, Andres Bonifacio, Diffun, Quirino  <i>Contact Person:</i> MS. ELIZABETH T.CARIG Executive Director Sustainable Environment for Rural Development Association, Inc. serd_quirino@yahoo.com	R2R (Ridge to River) Management of Natural Resources: A Showcase Project for Watershed Management and Biodiversity conservation in Quirino Province	SIERRA MADRE Barangays Eden and Dibibi, Cabarroquis, Quirino	1 community-based/co-management model  3,953 hectares of community-managed area  40% METT increase in 1 community PA	49,853.66
Kalahan Educational Foundation, Inc. (KEF)  <i>Address:</i> Imugan, Sta. Fe, Nueva Vizcaya  <i>Contact Person:</i> <b>MR. MOISES O. PINDOG</b> Chairman of the Board kalahanef@gmail.com; sammybalinhawang@yahoo.com	ICCA and Community Enterprise Development Project in Cluster 1 of the Ikalahan/Kalanguya Ancestral Domain	SIERRA MADRE Brgys. Bacneng, Barabac, Imugan, Malico, Sta. Rosa and Unib, Municipality of Sta. Fe, Nueva Vizcaya	3,000 hectares of community-managed area  40% METT increase in 1 community ICCA  100,000 hectares of managed landscapes  1 community plan incorporating ICCAs  3 communities engaged in BDFE (mushroom, sweets, ecotourism)	50,000.00
Community Forestry Foundation, Inc. (CFFQI) <i>Address:</i> Capitol Hills, Brgy. San Marcos, Cabarroquis, Quirino  <i>Contact Person:</i> For. Bernardo A. Faraon Executive Director cffi_qi_ngo2003@yahoo.com/ 0935-803-4567/0936-495-3723	Integrated Micro-Watershed Enhancement Project Within Critical Slopes Of The Cagayan River Basin In Quirino Province	SIERRA MADRE Nagtipunan, Quirino	100 hectares of managed landscapes  1 community plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	44,634.15
DALUHAY Daloy ng Buhay, Inc.  <i>Address:</i> Sitio Tibag, Purok 5, Brgy. Sabang, Baler, Aurora <i>Contact Person:</i> MARIVIC G. PAJARO, Ph.D Philippine Coordinator	Synergistic and Ecocentric Capacitation of Sierra Madre's Indigenous and Artisanal Communities	Aurora Province, Municipalities of Casiguran, Maria Aurora, Baler, San Luis and Dingalan	7 community-based/co-management model  26,535 hectares of community-managed area	130,434.78

<p>daluhay@gmail.com/ 09127806338/09358100981</p>			<p>40% METT increase in 9 community PAs/MPAs protection of 25 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>139,691 hectares of managed landscapes (ancestral domain)</p> <p>9 community land/seascape plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p> <p>4 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	
<p>Friends of Environment for Development and Sustainability, Inc. (FRENDs)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 56B Quezon St., DDM, Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. TERESITA SERMONIA-ACOSTA Executive Director friends1_99@yahoo.com/ 09209546491</p>	<p>Co-Managing Sierra Madre's Palali Mountain Range As Local Conservation Area for Biodiversity Conservation and Ecosystem Services</p>	<p>SIERRA MADRE Bambang, Bayombong, Kasibu and Quezon, Nueva Vizcaya</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>43,359 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>40% METT increase in 1 community PA</p> <p>20,000 hectares of managed landscapes</p> <p>1 community land/seascape plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p> <p>4 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	148,817.07
<p>Sitio Maguli Marginal Farmers and Producers Cooperative (SMMFPC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Antagan 1st, Tumaini, Isabela</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. SAMUEL A. DIVINA BOD Chairman samanakatuwa@gmail.com/ 09289888009; 09178349215</p>	<p>Restoration of Degraded Forestlands and Biodiversity within the Tumauni Watershed Forest Reserve</p>	<p>Tumauni Watershed Forest Reserve (TWFR) Brgy. Antagan 1st, Tumauni, Isabela</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>30 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>40% METT increase in 1 community PA</p>	41,220.10

<p>Tribal Center for Development Foundation, Inc. (TCD)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 86 Gomez St., Barangay Poblacion 39, Infanta, Quezon</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. CONCHITA CALZADO Executive Director</p> <p>tribalcenterdev@yahoo.com;sagibin_katutubo@yahoo.com;sagibin_ln@yahoo.com; (042) 535-2453 09995567958; 09284891841; 09466275433</p>	<p>Bantay Lupang Ninuno: Towards Strengthening the Dumagat-Remontado Indigenous Communities Conserved Area in Mts. Irid-Angelo, Barangay Lumutan, General Nakar, Quezon, Region 4-A, Philippines</p>	<p>Mts. Irid-Angelo, Barangay Lumutan, General Nakar, Quezon, Region 4-A</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>2,60 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>40% METT increase in 1 community PA</p> <p>1 community land-use plan or ancestral domain plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p> <p>1 community engaged in BDFE (almaciga resin)</p>	<p>43,478.26</p>
<p>Marine Environment and Resources Foundation, Inc. (MERF)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Administration Office, Ground Floor, The Marine Science Institute Velasquez St., U.P. Diliman, Quezon City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> DR. GIL S. JACINTO President admin@merf.org.ph; 4333645 mirasanchez@yahoo.com; 5867484</p>	<p>Initiating Bioregional Community-Based Biodiversity Conservation on the Benham Rise Seamount</p>	<p>Northern Philippine Sea Bioregion – Batanes, Cagayan, Isabela, Aurora, Quezon, Camarines Sur, Camarines Norte, Catanduanes, Albay and Sorsogon</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model (initiated by at least 7 PLGUs/SUCs)</p> <p>Formation of a cadre of future leaders in the BBS-NPS region on Tropical Marine Ecosystems Management (TMEM)</p>	<p>43,478.26</p>
<p>Bagong Lumad Artists Foundation, Inc. (BLAFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 11 Sta. Lucia Street, Rosalia Compound, TandangSora, QC</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Mr. Joey Ayala President +6324567665 +632456 7665 joeyayala@blafi.org, pauline@blafi.org</p>	<p>SiningBayan Social Artistry: Sierra Madre-North Philippine Sea Diversity and Protected Areas Enhancement</p>	<p>Cagayan, Isabela, Aurora, Quezon, Quirino, Nueva Vizcaya and Catanduanes</p>	<p>1 album of songs and dances collected from at least 7 communities in NPS and Sierra Madre as a tool to improve biodiversity conservation approaches</p> <p>At least 1 Sierra Madre and North Philippine Sea group of YEAN formed with at least 14 youth leaders from target sites trained to promote biodiversity conservation and bioregional</p>	<p>32,608.69</p>

			<p>stewardship; at least 14 community level resource users are trained</p> <p>1 action plan for biodiversity conservation strategies for individual sites and across the NPS</p> <p>1 TESDA training regulations obtained on biodiversity conservation and management using social artistry</p> <p>1 biodiversity conservation festival conducted with plans for annual or bi-annual gathering. Included</p> <p>1 website/ Facebook page developed for NPS-Sierra Madre TrACK</p> <p>1 online library for collection of TrACK songs, dance and others from objective 1</p>	
<p>Save Sierra Madre Network Alliance, Inc. (SSMNA)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Room 232, St. Anthony Blvd., Cambridge St. cor. Aurora Blvd., Cubao, Quezon City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Fr. PEDRO MONTALLANA Chairperson and Acting Executive Director savesierram@yahoo.com; 912 0224</p>	Conserving and protecting the Sierra Madre Mountain Range through collective actions and sustainable community practices	The community sites are located at Sitios Sari, Baykuran, Cablao, and Maktang all in the municipality of General Nakar, Quezon Province; Brgy. Paltic, Dinagalan in Aurora Province; Brgy. Sto. Cristo, Norzagaray, Bulacan; Palaui Island in Cagayan; Sito Binbin in Carranglan, Nueva Ecija; and, Brgy. Dingading, San Guillermo, Isabela province.	<p>9 community-based/co-management models</p> <p>4 community-managed areas</p> <p>9 community plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p> <p>5 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	84,782.60
Earth Day Network, Philippines, Inc. (EDNP)	Protecting Biodiversity Through Developing Community-based	Daraitan, Tanay, Rizal	15 hectares of managed landscapes	28,260.86

<p><i>Address:</i> Suite D3, 3rd Floor, Agcor Building, 335 Katipunan Ave., Brgy. Loyola Heights, Quezon City 1108 Philippines</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Mr. Ryan Vita Executive Director (632) 239-0729; (632) 239-0729 secretariat@earthdayphilippines.org</p>	Sustainable Use of Natural Resources		1 community engaged in BDFE	
<p>UP Los Banos Foundation, Inc. (UPLBFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> UPLBFI Bldg., A.P. Aglibut Ave., UPLB, Los Banos, Laguna 4031</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Dr. Casiano S. Abrigo, Jr. Executive Director 09217122591 cs_abrigo@yahoo.com</p>	Organic Farming as a Sustainable Approach to Biodiversity Conservation in Ecologically Vulnerable Areas.	Brgy. Daraitan, Tanay, Rizal	3 communities engaged in BDFE	35,869.56
<p>Gabriela Masipag Farmers Multi-Purpose Cooperative (GMFMPC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Gabriela, Diffun, Quirino</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Antonio Agnapan Chairman 09214174224 antonioagnapan@rocketmail.com</p>	Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management	Brgy. Gabriela, Diffun, Quirino	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>1 community-managed area</p> <p>management of 100 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>1 community engaged in BDFE</p>	17,934.78
<p>Malasi Lake Producers Cooperative</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Malasi Tree Park and Wildlife Sanctuary Critical Habitat Sub-Office, Sitio Malasi, San Antonio, Cabagan, Isabela</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Alexander C. Malsi Chairman Malasi Tree Park and Wildlife Sanctuary Critical Habitat Sub-Office, Sitio Malasi, San Antonio, Cabagan, Isabela 09364251922 malasilakes@gmail.com</p>	Enhancement and Conservation of Wetlands Conservation Sites (Malasi Lakes)	Sitio Malasi, Barangay San Antonio, Municipality of Cabagan, Isabela Province	<p>1 community-managed protected or conservation area encompassing at least 40 hectares.</p> <p>At least 178 hectares of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management arrangements, mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives, thereby</p>	1,000,000.00



			<p>reducing threats to biodiversity.</p> <p>1 alternative biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry product produced and marketed by communities</p>	
<p>Philippine Permaculture Association (PPA)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 20 Maginhawa Street, UP Village, Quezon City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Bert Peeters President 20 Maginhawa Street, UP Village, Quezon City 09178041590 philippinepermacultureassoc@gmail.com</p>	<p>A Permacultured Divilacan: Integrating Permaculture Principles in the Development Framework of Divilacan Town Proper</p>	<p>Municipality of Divilacan, Isabela Province</p>	<p>1 community protected areas established or enhanced encompassing 10 hectares</p> <p>10 hectares are under improved community “mainstreamed” management within production landscapes and/or seascapes</p> <p>1 Livelihood center established for trading, storing and making agricultural, fisheries and/or forestry products</p>	<p>1,000,000.00</p>
<b>Priority Site: Palawan</b>				
<p>Palawan NGO Network, Inc. (PNNI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Manalo Extension cor. Gabinete Road, Brgy. Bancao-Bancao Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> ATTY. ROBERT A. CHAN Executive Director pnnipal@gmail.com/ 048 4335525</p>	<p>Palawan Envi-KATaLoG: Environmental Knowledge Archives Translated for Local Governance</p>	<p>The entire province of Palawan as an environmental knowledge hub</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>2,000 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>protection of 2,000 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>700,000 hectares of ECAN managed by communities through law enforcement</p>	<p>146,341.46</p>
<p>Palawan Center for Appropriate Rural Technology, Inc. (PCART)</p> <p><i>Address:</i>  <i>Unit 2, Zanzibar Bldg., Rizal Ave., Puerto Princesa City</i></p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. LAURENCE J. PADILLA Executive Director</p>	<p>Protecting Endangered Species Along Barbacan River and its Mangrove Areas</p>	<p>PALAWAN Seven (7) Barangays north of Roxas, Palawan</p>	<p>2 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>5,400 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>40% METT increase in 1 community PA</p>	<p>50,004.88</p>

Palawan Center for Appropriate Rural Technology, Inc. biofarm@gmail.com; oyen.padilla@gmail.com			protection of 1,747 hectares of mangroves  8 communities engaged in ecotourism	
Abaroan Small Farmers Association, Inc. (ASFA)  <i>Address:</i> Barangay Abaroan, Roxas, 5304 Palawan  <i>Contact Person:</i> MR. ERNESTO D. SILVANO President asfaroxas@gmail.com	Toward Sustainable Management of Tutud Watershed and the whole CBFM in Abaroan, Roxas, Palawan	PALAWAN Brgy. Abaroan in Roxas	1 community-based/co-management model  3,953 hectares of community-managed area	25,332.93
Institute for the Development of Educational and Ecological Alternatives, Inc. (IDEAS)  <i>Address:</i> Sitio Sabsaban, Tabon, Quezon, 5304 Palawan  <i>Contact Person:</i> MR. ROGER V. GARINGA Executive Director ideaspalawan@yahoo.com.ph; rvgaringa@gmail.com	Enhancing Indigenous Food Plant Biodiversity Conservation and Promotion for Community Food Security	PALAWAN Southern Palawan – Selected Communities as Pilot sites within Mt. Mantalingahan Protected landscape, Malanut Watershed, and Victoria Anepahan Range within the administrative jurisdiction of the municipality of Quezon in the province of Palawan	3 community-based/co-management model  5900 hectares of community-managed area  3 community plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation  1 community engaged in BDFE (indigenous food plants)	48,780.40
Kalipunan ng Pundasyon ng mga Tagbanua (SARAGPUNTA)  <i>Address:</i> Brgy. 1, Poblacion, Coron, Palawan  <i>Contact Person:</i> Rodolfo Aguilar Chairperson 09475599237	Programa ng Pagpapatibay ng Pangangalaga ng Lupain at Karagatan ng Tribung Tagbanua	Labing apat (14) na komunidad sa Municipalidad ng Coron, Busuanga at Culion, Palawan	4 community-based/co-management model  10,000 hectares of community-managed area  40% METT increase in 1 community PA  90,108 hectares of managed landscapes  2 ADSDPPs	117,315.21
Community Centred Conservation (C3) Philippines, Inc.  <i>Address:</i> Salvacion, Busuanga, Palawan <i>Contact Person:</i> MR. REYNANTE V. RAMILO	Establishment of Dugong Sanctuary in Busuanga, Palawan: Strengthening Community Participation and Enhancement of	Barangay Quezon, Cheey and Calauit, Busuanga, Palawan	1 community-based/co-management model  50 hectares of community-managed area	43,086.95

<p>Programme Coordinator rey@c-3.org.uk/ +63 998 4951 972</p>	<p>Conservation Benefits</p>		<p>40% METT increase in 1 community PA</p> <p>protection of 300 hectares seagrass beds and 200 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>1 community engaged in BDFE</p>	
<p>Philippines Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc. (PBCFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> c/o Negros Forest Ecological Foundation, Inc., South Capitol Road, Bacolod City, Negros Occidental</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> RAFAEL COSCOLLUELA President lmjpaguntalan@pbcfi.org.ph/ 034-4358209</p>	<p>Developing Local Biodiversity Conservation Strategies in Globally Important Areas: Busuanga Island</p>	<p>Barangays Cheey, Bogtong and New Busuanga</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>1,000 hectares of community-managed area</p>	<p>48,780.48</p>
<p>Palawan Conservation Corps, Inc. (PCC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 3rd Floor, City Coliseum, Brgy. San Pedro, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. CHERRY F. DE DIOS Executive Director palcorps1999@gmail.com/ 048-4349854</p>	<p>Expansion of the Conservation Scope of PPSRNP (PA and WHS) in adjacent communities through the establishment of Community-Conserved Areas (CCAs) for Habitat Protection and Biodiversity Conservation</p>	<p>PALAWAN Brgys. Macarascas, Bahile, Babuyan, Tanabag and Binduyan in Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p>	<p>2 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>1,500 hectares of community-managed area</p>	<p>50,000.00</p>
<p>Palawan State University – Center for Strategic Policy and Governance (PSU-CSPG)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> G/F Medical Building, Palawan State University Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> PROF. MARILYN G. PABLICO Vice Chair, Board of Incorporators and Trustees cspgpsu@yahoo.com/ 048-4348752</p>	<p>Empowering Men and Women for Biodiversity Conservation in Magsaysay, Palawan</p>	<p>Magsaysay, Palawan</p>	<p>7,597 hectares of managed landscapes</p> <p>1 community land/seascape plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p> <p>4 communities engaged in BDFE (cashew, lato, ecotourism, salt)</p>	<p>161,595.60</p>
<p>Maliliit na Mangingisda ng Caramay Multi-Purpose Cooperative (MMCPCC)</p>	<p>Conserving and Protecting an Island</p>	<p>Green Island Bay, Roxas Palawan</p>	<p>7 community-based/co-management model</p>	<p>43,478.26</p>

<p><i>Address:</i> Caramay, Roxas, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. MEDARDO C. CAPUNO Chairman mmcpc_coop@yahoo.com/ 09296756605</p>	Bay through Networking of MPAs		<p>252 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>40% METT increase in 10 MPAs/MPA Network</p> <p>protection of 500 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>118,951 hectares of managed landscapes</p>	
<p>Bono-Bono Gintong Butil Multi-Purpose Cooperative</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Bono-Bono, Bataraza, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. LEONY P. BALIGUAT Chairman bonobonogintongbutil@yahoo.com.ph; +63 920 977 1884</p>	Improving the Coastal Resource Management of San Antonio Bay	Coastal Barangays in San Antonio Bay Bgy. Bono-Bono, Bataraza, Palawan	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>23,345.21 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>40% METT increase in 1 community PA/MPA</p> <p>protection of 1,000 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>3 communities engaged in BDFE (crab fattening, sea cucumber culture, organic farming, nipa products)</p> <p>150 managers on MPA and biodiversity management; 35 bantay-dagat members trained and deputized</p>	44,565.21
<p>Sabang Mangrove Paddle Boat Tour Guide Association Inc. (SMPBTGAI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Sitio Sabang, Brgy. Cabayugan, Puerto Princesa City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. NESTOR C. ELIJAN President miCam1221@yahoo.com; <a href="mailto:bethmclang@yahoo.com.ph">bethmclang@yahoo.com.ph</a>; 09277113637; 09201048287</p>	Sustaining economic growth for Indigenous Cultural Communities (ICCs) through an improved environment, natural resources and biodiversity management in ancestral domains and the Puerto Princesa Subterranean National Park (PPRSNP)	Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park, Western Coast of Palawan, Philippines	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>100 hectares of IP production landscapes</p> <p>5 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	130,4334.78

<p>Sabang Sea Ferry Multipurpose Cooperative (SSFMP)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Sitio Sabang, Brgy. Cabayugan, Puerto Princesa City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. TERESITA C. AUSTRIA BOD Chairperson Ssfsc06@yaoo.com/ tesscaustria@yahoo.com; bethmclang@yahoo.com.ph; 0917 585 1980</p>	<p>Promoting Biodiversity and Ecological Integrity of PPSRNP Through Community-Based Livelihood Enterprises</p>	<p>Communities within Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park and its environs including Ulugan Bay</p>	<p>7 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>22,000 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>20% METT increase in 1 community PA</p> <p>4,400 hectares of managed landscapes</p> <p>1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p> <p>7 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	<p>130,4334.78</p>
<p>Culion Foundation, Inc. (CFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Room 507, Evekal Building, A. Arnaiz Avenue, Legaspi Village, Makati City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. EUGENIO M. CACCAM, JR. Executive Director culionfoundation@gmail.com; 02 812 2170</p>	<p>Achieving Economies of Scale in the Value Chain through Transformation and Consolidation of Biodiversity-Friendly Products in the Calamianes Group of Islands, Palawan</p>	<p>Municipalities of Busuanga, Coron and Culion in Palawan</p>	<p>10 communities engaged in BDFE (mat-weaving, honeybee production, casher nuts production, dried squid/fish processing, sea cucumber processing)</p>	<p>94,884.78</p>
<p>Candis III Marketing Cooperative (C3MC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> C3MC, Bacungan, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. JOEL M. GERMINA Chairman dsaligumba@yahoo.com; +63 907 674 3003</p>	<p>Improving Lives of Upland Dwellers thru the Implementation of Functional Community Based Forest Management</p>	<p>CBFM area of Candis III Marketing Cooperative. Bacungan Watershed connecting Irawan Watershed, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan.</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>463 hectares of community-managed area (watershed)</p> <p>1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p> <p>1 community engaged in BDFE (wood and rattan crafts)</p> <p>At least 50 (est.) participants on Handicraft, souvenir items, wood and</p>	<p>44,343.47</p>

			rattan craft –making; 4 forest wardens deputized; training conducted on financial management and marketing.	
<p>Non-Timber Forest Products – Exchange Programme (NTFP-EP)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 92-A Masikap Extension, Central Diliman, Quezon City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Ms. RUTH CANLAS Executive Director rpcanlas@yahoo.com; 02 426 2757</p>	<p>Enhancing capacities of Indigenous, cultural and local communities as co-managers of VAMR through engagement in biodiversity friendly and sustainable economic activities</p>	<p>Victoria-Anepaan Mountain Ranges (VAMR) Areas in the Municipalities of Aborlan, Narra, and Quezon in Southern Palawan, Philippines</p>	<p>4 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	<p>43,976.08</p>
<p>Katala Foundation, Inc.</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 3rd Floor, JMV Bldg., National Highway, Bgy. Santa Monica, Puerto Princesa City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Indira Dayang L. Widmann Chief Executive Officer +63 48 4347693 ldlacerna@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Community-based wildlife warden scheme</p>		<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>16,000 hectares of managed landscapes</p> <p>1 community engaged in BDFE</p>	
<p>Palawan Katutubo Mission (PKM-AVPPI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> PKM-AVPPI, Chancery Office, Apostolic Vicariate of Puerto Princesa, # 14 Taft St., Puerto Princesa City (5300), Palawan, Philippines</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Rev. Fr. Armando R. Limsa Executive Director 09154337334/09394942976 armanlimsa@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' towards Environmental Protection and Conservation of Biodiversity in the Victoria Anepaan Mountain Ranges (VAMR), Palawan Province</p>	<p>Municipalities of Aborlan and Narra, Palawan Province</p>	<p>3 community-based/co-management models</p> <p>1 community-managed area</p> <p>20,000 hectares of ICCA and 200 hectares of community-managed area (watershed)</p> <p>management of 200 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p>	<p>43,478.26</p>
<p>The Samdhana Institute</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 32F Kalambaguhan St., 9000 Cagayan de Oro City</p>	<p>Capacitating Tagbanua Women and Youth as Ancestral Domian</p>	<p>Decabobo-San Nicolas-Decalachao-San Jose Ancestral Domain,</p>	<p>18,368.37 hectares of managed landscapes</p> <p>1 community land-use plan that incorporates</p>	<p>39,130.43</p>

<i>Contact Person:</i> Joan U Jamisolamin Grant Manager - Regional Office +63-88-851-9238 +63-88-851-9238 crisi@samdhana.org, joan@samdhana.org	Caretakers and Conservation Leaders	Municipality of Coron, Palawan	biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	
---	--	-----------------------------------	---	--

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international objectives?</li> <li>How does the project support the objectives of UNCBD, especially the Aichi Targets?</li> <li>Does the project support other international conventions, such as the UNFCCC?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design</li> <li>Level of implementation of UNCBD in the Philippines and contribution of the project</li> <li>Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design</li> <li>Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally</li> <li>UNCBD and other international convention websites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project relevant to GEF biodiversity focal area?</li> <li>How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>GEF focal areas strategies and documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>GEF website</li> <li>Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project relevant to the Philippines' environment and sustainable development objectives?</li> <li>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Philippines?</li> <li>Is the project country-driven?</li> <li>What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?</li> <li>What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?</li> <li>Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</li> <li>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</li> <li>Appreciation from national and local stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>National policies and strategies, e.g., Philippine Development Plan, Philippine Biodiversity Strategic and Action Plan</li> <li>Key project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP, relevant national and local government officials and other partners</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process</li> <li>• Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project relevant to the country programme of the UNDP?</li> <li>• Does the project contribute to UNDAF?</li> <li>• Does the project contribute to the Country Programme Document of UNDP in the Philippines?</li> <li>• To what extent does the project contribute to the fulfilment of the objectives of UNDAF and the CPD?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree to which the project supports the objectives and targets of UNDAF and the CPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project document</li> <li>• UNDAF and CPD</li> <li>• UNDP CO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analyses</li> <li>• Interviews with UNDP</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?</li> <li>▪ How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>▪ Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>▪ Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project partners and stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Needs assessment studies</li> <li>▪ Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the project internally coherent in its design?</li> <li>▪ Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?</li> <li>▪ Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> <li>▪ Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Program and project documents</li> <li>▪ Key project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Key interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?</li> <li>▪ Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</li> <li>▪ How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</li> <li>▪ Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documents from other donor supported activities</li> <li>▪ Other donor representatives</li> <li>▪ Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documents analyses</li> <li>▪ Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?</li> <li>▪ Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data analysis</li> </ul>

## Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</li> <li>To what extent have the project targets been achieved?</li> <li>To what extent have the project failed to achieve its targets?</li> <li>To what factors can be attributed the achievement and/or non-achievement of the targets?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See indicators in project document results framework and log frame</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project team and relevant stakeholders</li> <li>Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project team</li> <li>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</li> <li>How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> <li>What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</li> <li>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</li> <li>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</li> <li>Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?</li> <li>What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</li> <li>What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>

## Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was project support provided in an efficient way?</li> <li>Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?</li> <li>Did the leveraging of funds (co- financing) happen as planned?</li> <li>Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</li> <li>How was results-based management used during project implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</li> <li>Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</li> <li>Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</li> <li>Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and evaluations, e.g., MTR, audit reports, spot check reports</li> <li>UNDP Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Key interviews</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?</li> <li>To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?</li> <li>Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?</li> <li>What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</li> <li>Which methods were successful or not and why?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</li> <li>Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> <li>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</li> <li>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</li> <li>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</li> <li>Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</li> <li>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>UNDP</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?</li> <li>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</li> <li>How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnership arrangements etc.)?</li> <li>What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons on efficiency drawn from the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the outputs and outcomes of the project likely to be sustainable?</li> <li>Is there a realistic sustainability plan?</li> <li>Do project achievements show potential for sustainability, replication, scaling up?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for sustainability of project results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and reports</li> <li>Sustainability plan</li> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with CPMU, UNDP, BMB and other national government partners, grantees, local governments, other stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the financial, institutional, policy, social, economic, cultural and environmental conditions pose risk/s to the sustainability of project results?</li> <li>Are the risks manageable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manageability of risks</li> <li>Availability of opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and reports</li> <li>Sustainability plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with CPMU, UNDP, BMB</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the sustainability plan address the risks?</li> <li>What opportunities are available that can help sustainability of project gains?</li> <li>How can these opportunities be used or optimized for sustainability?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential of opportunities to boost sustainability of project results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>and other national government partners, grantees, local governments, other stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons can guide the design and implementation of the next phase, if any, of SGP in the Philippines?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and reports</li> <li>Sustainability plan</li> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with CPMU, UNDP, BMB and other national government partners, grantees, local governments, other stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project effected significant improvement in the governance of protected areas?</li> <li>Has the project affected national and local policies and practice with regard to biodiversity conservation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree in which participatory governance has been affected and effected by the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project changed the lives of affected community members in a positive way?</li> <li>Has the project positively affected women, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups socially, politically, economically and culturally?</li> <li>Has the project adversely affected women, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups socially, politically, economically and culturally?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positive impacts of the project on affected women, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups</li> <li>Negative impacts of the project on affected women, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

### Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>20</sup>

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at place on date

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>20</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>21</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>22</sup>)
- 1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
- 3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>23</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

---

<sup>21</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>22</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>23</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance(\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
-



## ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of The Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF – Small Grants Programme in the Philippines (UNDP PIMS #)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and by comment number (“#” column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	Evaluator response and actions taken