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 *Strengthening National Systems to Improve Governance and Management of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Conserved Areas and Territories Project* (otherwise known as the Philippine ICCA Project) (PIMS #5389).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Table 1. Project Summary Table				
Project Title : Strengthening National Systems to Improve Governance and Management of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Conserved Areas and Territories (otherwise known as the Philippine ICCA Project) (PIMS #5389)				
GEF Project ID (PIMS #)	5389		**At Endorsement (US $ M)**	**By end August 2019 (US $ M)**
UNDP Project ID:	00096320	**GEF Financing:**	1,751,484.00	
Country:	Philippines	**UNDP**	1,000,000.00	
Region:	Asia	**Government:**	3,369,852.00	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	**Other (NGOs, LGUs, communities)**	655,387.00	
Operational Program:	GEF-5 Strategic Program:	**Total Co-financing:**	5,025,239.00	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	**Total Project Cost:**	6,776,723.00	
Other Partners Involved:	Civil Society Organizations	**ProDoc Signature:** September 29, 2015 **Date Project began:** September 29, 2015		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	August 28, 2918	**Proposed (Approved):**

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to strengthen the conservation, protection and management of key biodiversity sites in the Philippines by institutionalizing ICCAs as a sustainable addition to the national PA estate. This shall be achieved through two major interventions: (i) policy harmonization and implementation; and (ii) capacity building and effective governance of ICCAs.

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[1] 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, Philippine ICCA Project Team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser and key stakeholders.

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 Project Board
- Officials of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)
- Officials of the DENR Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects Service (DENR-FASPS)
- Officials of the Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB)
- Officials of the National Commission on the Indigenous Peoples (NCIP)
- GEF Operational Focal Point
- Staff/Consultants of Philippine ICCA Project
- Officials and Staff of the Local Responsible Partners
- Officials and Staff of the UNDP Country Office
- Officers and Staff of National Government Agencies (HLURB, DILG, NEDA, DA-BFAR)
- Officers and Staff of Local Government Units
- Members of the Regional Inter-Agency Committee (RIAC)
- Steering Committee Members of the Philippine ICCA Consortium
- Leaders and Elders from the Philippine ICCA Project sites and other ICCs/IPs communities

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

---

[1] For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

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**
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan implementation	
Overall quality of M&E	
2. IA& EA Execution:	
Implementing Agency execution (UNDP)	
Executing Agency execution (DENR-BMB)	
Overall quality of project implementation / execution	
3. Outcomes:	
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall quality of project outcomes	
4. Sustainability:	
Financial resources	
Socio-economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability	
5. Impact:	
Environmental status improvement	
Environmental stress reduction	
Progress towards stress/status change	
OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS	

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	Planned	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.[2]

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-ISD Unit. 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 37 days spread over 3 months from 01 February to 31 May 2019 according to the following plan:

---

[2] 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

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation of Inception Report	2 days	15 February 2018
Evaluation Mission	20 days - 10 days review of documents and reports - 10 days field visit to project sites	29 March 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	30 April 2018
Final Report	5 days	31 May 2019

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
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within **3** weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, Project Manager, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	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 that will be engaged separately. 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, development studies/ management, environmental science, environment & natural resources management, social anthropology, or any related course
- Minimum ten (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 globally, and if possible, in the Philippines or in Southeast Asian countries
- 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, and participatory/inclusive governance

- Demonstrated experience in implementation and/or evaluation of capacity-building efforts in developing countries, in the area of biodiversity conservation

- Experience in handling and resolving issues related to gender and indigenous peoples

- Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills required for both consultants
- Fluency in the Filipino language, knowledge of Ilocano or Visayan 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'

Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

This is a fixed out-put based contract price regardless of extension of the herein specific duration. The consultant will be paid an all-inclusive lump sum amount (i.e. professional fees, transportation/travel to and from country of origin if residing outside the Philippines, subsistence allowance during the entire stay in Manila not exceeding the UN prescribed DSA daily rate, 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 draft Terminal Evaluation Report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final Terminal Evaluation Report

CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION PROCESS

Offers will be evaluated based on combined scoring method – where the Technical Proposal will be evaluated based on qualifications in the CV and brief description of previous work. The Technical evaluation and is weighted a max. of 70%.

The Financial Proposal that will be evaluated through submission of the Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the IC including Financial Proposal Template and combined with the price offer will be weighted a max of 30%;

For the evaluation of the Technical Proposal, the selection of the successful consultant must be based in the following qualifications (with the appropriate obtainable points):

Fluency in the Filipino language, knowledge of Ilocano or Visayan is a must. UNDP may conduct an interview/discussion with shortlisted candidates during the selection process to ascertain the local language proficiency.

Criteria	Maximum Obtainable Points = 100
Education Master's Degree on sociology, development studies/ management, environmental science, environment & natural resources management, social anthropology, or any related course	10 points
Experience Minimum ten (5) years of relevant professional experience especially on results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies	15 points
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, and experience of working on GEF evaluations	10 points
Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area and familiarity with biodiversity conservation issues globally, and if possible, in the Philippines or in Southeast Asian countries	20 points
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, and participatory/inclusive governance	15 points
Demonstrated experience in implementation and/or evaluation of capacity-building efforts in developing countries, in the area of biodiversity conservation	10 points
Experience in handling and resolving issues related to gender and indigenous peoples. Consultants need to specify clearly on their past experience related to this requirement.	10 points
Language • Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills required for both consultants	10

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

PIMS 5389: Philippine ICCA Project

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7" align="center">REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK</td></tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2" align="center">Narrative Summary</td>
<td rowspan="2" align="center">Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)</td>
<td colspan="2" align="center">Baseline</td>
<td rowspan="2" align="center">End-of-Project Target (2019)</td>
<td rowspan="2" align="center">Means of Verification</td>
<td rowspan="2" align="center">Risks and Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">2015</td>
<td align="center">2017/ 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr><td colspan="7">PROJECT OBJECTIVE</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the conservation, protection, and management of key biodiversity sites in the Philippines by institutionalizing ICCAs as a sustainable addition to the national PA estate</td>
<td>Impact Indicator 1: Number of hectares of national PA estate as a result of institutionalizing ICCAs as an additional PA category in the Philippines</td>
<td>5,581,927 hectares</td>
<td align="center">---</td>
<td>5,681,917 hectares, or an increase by 1.7%</td>
<td>ICCA registry

BMB reports</td>
<td>Delays owing to identified Project risks may affect timely completion of ICCA processes within the timeframe of the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Indicator 2: Capacity scores of BMB, NCIP and Philippines ICCA Consortium illustrating institutional support to ICCAs</td>
<td>Baseline average scores in the capacity assessment scorecards in the following indicators:

BMB: 2.35
▪ Capacity for engagement: 2.53
▪ Capacity to monitor and evaluate: 2.94</td>
<td align="center">

---</td>
<td>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 said indicators:

BMB: 2.75
3.0

3.0</td>
<td>Capacity Assessment Scorecards</td>
<td>Inconsistent participation by agencies and organizations especially at regional and local levels (including lack of continuity in participating representatives)</td>
</tr>
</table>

		Baseline				
Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
		NCIP: 1.15 ▪ Capacity for engagement: 1.60 ▪ Capacity to monitor and evaluate: 0.67	--- ---	**NCIP: 2.20** 3.0 3.0		Inability of regional and local representatives of key stakeholders to agree on roles
		Phil. ICCA Consortium: 0.71 ▪ Capacity for engagement: 1.20 ▪ Capacity to generate, access, and use of info and knowledge: 1.17	--- --- ---	At least an average increase in 5 capacity results by 1 to 1.5 for the Philippine ICCA Consortium with a high score of 1 to 2 in these indicators: **1.63** 3.0 3.0		

REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK						
Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
		2015	**2017/ 2018**			
	Impact Indicator 3: IRRF Sub-indicator 1.1.3.A.1.1: Extent to which institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity (BD) and ecosystems	---	Very partially	Largely	Policies and procedures enacted by DENR, NCIP and relevant agencies	
OUTCOME 1: POLICY HARMONIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION						
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	Outcome Indicator 1.1: Number of years to officially recognize an ICCA	Average of 3.5 years from community orientation and mobilization to completion of CCP	---	Reduced to 3 years as measured for the 10 targeted sites	Project reports	Agency leaders, who may be new given an expected new national administration, will need time to study ICCA concerns
	Outcome Indicator 1.2: Percentage of CADTs and ADSDPPs that clearly identify and map ICCAs	---	16.67%	100%	Project reports NCIP reports ICCA Registry	The project time frame is not congruent with the 3-year legislative cycle

		REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK				
Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
		2015	**2017/ 2018**			
						Lawmakers may be preoccupied with electoral campaigns
	Outcome Indicator 1.3: Number of LGUs where ICCAs are fully integrated into CLUPs	0	---	2 LGUs	CLUPs Project reports	Changes in local leadership following elections may mean changes in priorities and support by LGUs
	Outcome Indicator 1.4: Management effectiveness of NIPAS PAs overlapping with Philippine ICCA Project sites	Baseline METT Scores of: 1. Bataan Natural Park: 53% 2. Subic Bay Protected Area 3. Mt. Pulag National Park	--- 59% 65% (2018)	63% 69% 75%	METT scorecards	Disagreement among PAMB members on the role of IP communities and recognition of ICCAs within PAs

REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK						
Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
		2015	**2017/ 2018**			
Output 1.1 POLICY ISSUANCE ADDRESSING GAPS IN RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING ICCAs Relevant policy issuances between NCIP, DENR-BMB, BFAR and FMB 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						
Activity 1.1.1 Creation of an Interagency Working Group (IWG) composed of NCIP, DENR BMB and FMB, and DA-BFAR and representatives from the Philippine ICCA	IWG created and is functional	0	---	1	Official issuance creating the IWG	
	IWG meetings convened regularly	0	---	(TBD)	Minutes of meetings	
Activity 1.1.2 Development of a more specific set of guidelines encompassing the entire ICCA process	Comprehensive policy study that looks into gaps and inconsistencies in policy content as well as policy implementation issues of all relevant policies that will affect ICCA recognition conducted	0	---	1 Study conducted and report on findings completed	Report on the findings of the study	
	Policy brief of the Study that discusses the context and importance of the policy issue, the critique of policy options and policy recommendations developed	0	---	1	Policy brief	

REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
			2015	**2017/ 2018**			
Activity 1.1.3	Issuance of a joint DENR and NCIP policy guidelines on ICCA	Draft joint policy guidelines on ICCA developed	0	---	1	Draft guidelines	
		Number of consultations and reviews undertaken	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
		Final version of the draft joint policy guidelines on ICCA completed and submitted to DENR and NCIP En Banc for approval	0	---	1	Final draft guidelines	
Output 1.2 ENHANCED ICCA BILL (HOUSE BILL 115) Support to advocacy for and consensus on the ICCA Bill							
Activity 1.2.1	Support for increasing critical mass and create champions in the Senate and House of Representatives to lobby/push for the passage of the ICCA Bill	No. of activities to discuss, review/ critique and enhance the ICCA Bill conducted	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
		Bill sponsorship in HOR secured	1 Cong. Baguilat: HB 4219 (Mar 2014)	---	1 Secured	Legislative document record (HoR and Senate online)	

Narrative Summary		Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Baseline		End-of-Project Target (2019)	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			2015	2017/ 2018			
REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							
		Bill sponsorship in Senate secured	1 Sen. Legarda: SB 2580 (Jan 2015)	---	1 Secured	Letter of request from Bukluran to champion the ICCA	
Activity 1.2.2	Provision of policy and technical inputs to the bill sponsors, particularly the lessons and experiences from implementation, to strengthen the case of the proposed legislation	No. of technical inputs to bill sponsor/s in HoR provided	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
		No. of technical inputs to bill sponsor/s in Senate provided	0	---	(TBD)		
Activity 1.2.3	Provision of support to the technical working groups (TWGs) and to the active participation of IP representatives to the Senate and Congressional activities	No. and types of support to TWGs in HoR provided	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
		No. and types of support to TWGs in Senate provided	0	---	(TBD)		
		No. and types of support to IP representatives to HoR activities provided	0	---	(TBD)		
		No. and types of support to IP representatives to Senate activities provided	0	---	(TBD)		

REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
			2015	**2017/ 2018**			
Activity 1.2.4	Provision of support to the Committees handling the bill in both houses in the review and stakeholder consultations, as well as advocacy in the discussions of the proposed ICCA Bill	No. and types of support to <u>Committee in HoR</u> provided	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
		No. and types of support to Committee in Senate provided	0	---	(TBD)		
		ICCA Bill enhanced and submitted to HoR and Senate	17th Congress: HoR: HB 115 as filed by Cong. Baguilat, First Regular Session, 30 Jun 2016 Senate: SB 1185 filed by Sen. Legarda, First Regular Session, 4 Oct 2016	---	Enhanced ICCA Bill Submissions to: 1. HoR 2. Senate	Enhanced ICCA Bill Official transmittals to HoR and Senate Project reports/ documentations	
Activity 1.2.5	Provision of technical support to ensure the complementation of the ICCA Bill and the E-NIPAS Bill	No. of technical support provided	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	

	REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK						
			Baseline				
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Output 1.3	**REVISED ADSDPP GUIDELINES (COUNTERPART OF NCIP)**						
	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						
Activity 1.3.1	Enhancement of NCIP's guidelines in the formulation of ADSDPPs relevant to IP rights-based biodiversity conservation	Ecological framework integrated into the NCIP ADSDPP guidelines	Existing guidelines: 1	---	1 Enhanced version	Enhanced ADSDPP guidelines	
Activity 1.3.2	Support for the development of the manual of operations so that the procedures for ICCA documentation, mapping, and registration are incorporated	Final version of the draft manual of operations of the revised ADSDPP guidelines completed and submitted to NCIP En Banc for approval	Existing manual: 1	---	1 Enhanced version	Final draft of the manual	
Output 1.4	**ENHANCED CLUP GUIDELINES**						
	Land use planning guidelines of LGUs are enhanced to incorporate the identified ICCAs						
Activity 1.4.1	Support for the process documentation in at least 2 LGUs (Santa Fe, Nueva Vizcaya; Magpet, North Cotabato; and, Morong, Bataan) in the project sites	CLUP process documentation conducted	0	---	2	Process documentation report/s	

			Baseline				
REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Activity 1.4.2	Development of a guideline for mainstreaming ICCA in spatial (CLUP) and development plans of LGUs	Final version of the draft guidelines on interfacing ICCAs in CLUP completed and submitted to HLURB and DENR for approval	0	---	1	Final draft guidelines	
Output 1.5 GUIDELINES RECOGNIZING ICCAs IN PAs Implementing guidelines and procedures for NIPAS PA management planning and zoning that incorporate identification, mapping, documentation, and traditional governance systems in ICCAs							
Activity 1.5.1	Review of the draft Sourcebook and draft technical bulletin to develop the policy guidelines	Desk review conducted; report prepared and presented to stakeholders for review and comments	0	---	1	Report on the results/findings of the desk review	
Activity 1.5.2	Case study on ICCA PA overlaps	Mini-case study conducted; report prepared and presented to stakeholders for discussion/ review and comments	0	---	1	Mini-case study report	
		Policy Brief on ICCA Recognition and Protected Areas completed	0	---	1	Policy brief	

		REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK					
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
			2015	**2017/ 2018**			
Activity 1.5.3	Development of the guidelines for documentaton, mapping, delineation, and recognition of ICCA in areas overlapping with Pas	Final version of the draft guidelines for the documentation, mapping, delineation, and recognition of ICCAs and ICCAs that overlap with NIPAS areas completed and submitted to DENR and NCIP En Banc for approval	0	---	1	Final draft guidelines	
Activity 1.5.4	Consultations and discussion with concerned stakeholders on the proposed policy guidelines and E-NIPAS Bill	No. of activities conducted	(TBD)	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
		Incorporation of ICCA Recognition into the E-NIPAS Bill	0	---	1		
OUTCOME 2: CAPACITY BUILDING AND EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE OF ICCAs							
Capacity of key stakeholders for the effective governance and management of ICCAs strengthened		Ind-OC 2.1: Number of ICCs rating assistance from the National ICCA Consortium as satisfactory	---	TBD (2018)	10 ICC/IP communities	Satisfactory rating reports	Lack of mutual understanding with the NCIP re Philippine ICCA Consortium roles and responsibilities in relation to ICCAs

		Baseline		End-of-Project Target (2019)	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**			
						Gatekeeping attitude arises Failure to reach out to networks beyond KASAPI Inconsistent participation by Consortium members
	Ind-OC 2.2: Hectares of ICCAs 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		118,848 hectares of ICCAs within KBAs are recognized and registered Target per site (in hectares): 1. Tinoc, Ifugao – TBD 2. Mt. Taungay, Kalinga – 2,369 3. Ikalahan/ Kalanguya CADT, N.Vizcaya – 16,000 4. Egongot CADT, Aurora – 15,000	Copy of 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

		Baseline		End-of-Project	Means of	Risks and
Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**Target (2019)**	**Verification**	**Assumptions**
		5. Kanawan, Bataan – 15,665 6. Balabac, Palawan – 34,200 7. AGMIHICU CADT 054, Bukidnon – 10,000 8. Magpet, N. Cotabato – 13,000 9. Sote, Surigao del Sur – 4,000 10. Esperanza, Agusan del Sur – 8,997				
	Ind-OC 2.3: Capacity scores of ICCs in three areas (information generation, implementation and M&E)	**Information generation** 1. Egongot CADT 4.0 2. Esperanza 4.0 3. Mt. Apo 4.33 **Implementation** 1. Kanawan 2.6 2. Ikalahan/ Kalanguya CADT 3.2 3. Balabac 1.6 **Monitoring** 1. Tinoc 3.0		4.25 4.5 5.0 4.0 4.0 2.0 3.5	Capacity Assessment Scorecards	(Same as previous)

| | | 2. Sote | 4.0 | 4.5 | | |

REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK						
Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
		2015	**2017/ 2018**			
		3. AGMIHICU CADT 054	2.8	3.5		
		4. Mt. Taungay	2.5	3.5		
	Ind-OC 2.4: National ICCA Registry is established	None	---	Policy guidelines formulated Platform established and functional	Enabling policy creating the 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
	Ind-OC 2.5: Management effectiveness of 10 ICCAs	1. Mt. Taungay – 52.0	---	72.0	METT Scorecards	
		2. Tinoc	TBD	TBD		
		3. Ikalahan/ Kalanguya CADT – 60.0	---	80.0		
		4. Kanawan – 53.0	---	63.0		
		5. Egongot CADT	32.0 (2018)	52.0		
		6. Balabac – 29.0	---	49.0		
		7. AGMIHICU CADT 054 – 48.0	---	68.0		
		8. Mt. Apo – 77.0	---	97.0		
		9. Sote	34.0	54.0		
		10. Esperanza – 43.0	---	63.0		

					Baseline				

REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
			2015	**2017/ 2018**			
Output 2.1 ICCA DOCUMENTATION, DECLARATION, AND REGISTRATION Regional networks of at least 10 ICCAs representing the country's ethnographic regions are identified, documented, mapped, recognized and registered at UNEP-WCMC							
Activity 2.1.1	Community mobilization and preparatory activities implemented	ICCA Project launched in target sites	0	---	10	Project reports/ documentations	
		Community resolution adopting the project issued by the ICC	0	---	10	Community resolutions	
		Regional Inter-agency Committee (RIAC) meeting regularly attended by the ICC reps and LRP	0	---	10	RIAC minutes of meetings Project reports/ documentations	
		Certificate of Pre-condition (CP) secured from NCIP	0	---	10	CPs	
Activity 2.1.2	Conduct of ICCA documentation capacity development program	Local Research/Planning Teams (LR/PTs) formed	0	---	10	List of LR/PT members	
		LR/PT trained on ICCA Documentation	Training for LRPs: 0	---	10	Project reports/ documentations	

		REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK					
			Baseline		End-of-Project	Means of	Risks and
	Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	2015	2017/ 2018	Target (2019)	Verification	Assumptions
			Site-level trainings: 0	---	10		
Activity 2.1.3	Conduct of ICCA documentation proper:						
	a. Community profiling	Data gathering conducted and community profile completed	0	---	10	Community profiles	
	b. Resource inventory (RI)	Actual RI conducted	0	---	10	Project reports/ documentations	
		RI report completed	0	---	10	RI reports	
	c. IKSP documentation on traditional resource management	IKSP research and documentation activities conducted	0	---	10	Project reports/ documentations	
		IKSP documentation report completed	0	---	10	IKSP reports	
	d. Participatory community mapping	3D map updated or constructed	(TBD)	---	10	Project reports/ documentations	
		Thematic maps produced	0	---	10	Sets of thematic maps	
		ICCA boundaries delineated	0	---	118,848 hectares of ICCA	ICCA maps	

	REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK						
	Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
			2015	**2017/ 2018**			
						Project reports/ documentations	
		ICCA maps produced	0	---	10	ICCA maps	
	e. Finalization, packaging, and printing of the ICCA documentation report	Final ICCA documentation report completed	0	---	10	ICCA Documentation Reports	
	f. ICCA declaration by the IP community/ICC	Community ICCA declaration issued	0	---	10	Copy of the official ICCA declaration	
Activity 2.1.4	ICCA case documentation for the registration with UNEP-WCMC	ICCA case documentation completed	---	10*	10 new	Case documentations	
		ICCA case documentation submitted online	---	10*	10 new	UNEP-WCMC Registry	
Activity 2.1.5	Recognition and registration at the UNEP-WCMC of at least 10 additional ICCAs	FPIC requirements completed and filed	---	---	10	Proof of filing	
		ICCAs officially registered with UNEP-WCMC	---	10*	10 new	Proof of registration Acknowledgment from UNEP-WCMC	

* Based on UNEP-WCMC

			Baseline				
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							

			Baseline				
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Output 2.2 DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLANS (CCPs) At least 10 CCPs, with relevant business plan sections incorporated, are developed and implemented to support ICCAs, and mainstreamed into ADSDPPs and LGUs CLUPs and investment plans							
Activity 2.2.1	Development/Formulation of 10 Community Conservation Plans (CCPs)	TCAT conducted to identify and assess threats to ICCA and provide bases for the response plan	TCAT: 0	---	10	TCAT results	
		CCP workshop with ICC conducted	0	---	10	Project reports/ documentations	
		CCPs formulated	0	---	10	CCPs	
Activity 2.2.2	Support for the mainstreaming of CCPs into local plans	Integration of the CCP into the local plan lobbied with the LGU	0	---	10	ICC resolution or formal request to LGU	
		CCP, in whole or in part, integrated into the CLUP or other local plans	0	---	2 LGUs	Local plans	
Activity 2.2.3	Training and coaching sessions to develop capacities of key resource persons from the community to present their CCPs/ ADSDPPs to the LGUs, agencies, and other interest groups, and to articulate the support needed	Key resources persons identified to represent their ICC in various venues/bodies for support to CCPs	0	---	2 Sites	List of ICC key resource persons	

27

REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							
			Baseline				
	Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Activity 2.2.4	Support to the implementation of priority activities and biodiversity-friendly livelihood activities	BDFEs implemented in project sites	(TBD)	---	10	Project reports/ documentations	
		BDFE trainings conducted	0	---	10		
Activity 2.2.5	Resource mobilization activities with potential partners to support implementation of activities identified in the CCPs/ ADSDPPs, to include funding organizations such as FPE, PTFCF, and LGUs, as well as technical assistance from agencies such as:	No. of project proposals for further support to ICCA produced and submitted to funding agencies	0	---	At least 1 per site	Project proposals Transmittal/Proof of submission	
		No. of project proposals approved by funding agencies	0	---	(TBD)	Approval letter or any similar document	
	a. DENR - for reforestation and agroforestry activities, enforcement and training and Deputization of Natural Resources Enforcement Officers	No. of technical assistance accessed from DENR	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
	b. NCIP - for processing and award of CADTs and resolution of conflicts with other tribes, and FPICs for development projects	No. of technical assistance accessed from NCIP	0	---	(TBD)		

	Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Baseline		End-of-Project Target (2019)	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			2015	2017/ 2018			
	c. Department of Tourism (DoT) - for tourism related activities and training	No. of technical assistance accessed from DoT	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
	d. Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) - for additional livelihood support, skills training, product development, and linking with the larger markets	No. of technical assistance accessed from DTI	0	---	(TBD)		
Output 2.3	**STRENGTHENED CAPACITIES OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES IN ALL REGIONS TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO ICCAs** Capacities of NCIP, DENR, PAWB, FMB, BFAR in all regions are strengthened to provide technical support to ICCAs						
Activity 2.3.1	Development of capacities of key government agencies (NCIP, BMB and FMB of DENR, BFAR) toward the recognition of the 10 ICCAs: a. For NCIP at all levels - basic course on biodiversity and hands-on training on the principles, systems and procedures in the identification, documentation and mapping of ICCAs	Training on ICCA Documentation for NCIP conducted	0	---	1 ICCA orientation for NCIP and DENR 1 In-depth training	Project reports/ documentations	

	Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Baseline		End-of-Project Target (2019)	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			2015	2017/ 2018			
	b. For DENR, particularly the BMB and FMB and its counterparts in the field operations offices, shall include understanding and appreciation of the various systems, processes and procedures involved in the management and protection ancestral domains as well as cultural sensitivity and resource use conflicts, among others	Training on ICCA Documentation for DENR conducted	0	---	1 In-depth training	Project reports/ documentations	
	c. Trainings and capacity building sessions among NCIP and DENR along with other agencies and organizations to provide opportunities for interaction, partnership and coordinative actions for the effective management of ICCAs	Regional DENR ICCA plans formulated	0	---	7 regions	Regional plans	
Activity 2.3.2	Capacity building and sensitizing the LGUs on the traditional governance of ICCAs during the process of mainstreaming ICCA in CLUPs	Orientation for LGUs on ICCA and the Philippine ICCA Project	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	

	Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Baseline		End-of-Project Target (2019)	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			2015	2017/ 2018			
Output 2.4 STRENGTHENED CAPACITIES OF THE PHILIPPINE ICCA CONSORTIUM Capacity of Philippine ICCA Consortium developed to serve as the mechanism for exchange, advocacy and legal support to ICCAs in distress							
Activity 2.4.1	Capacity building of the Consortium towards becoming an acknowledged consultative body, advocacy arm and resource hub for ICCA documentation, mapping, recognition and registration, and a body to facilitate legal support when necessary	Consortium formally registered with SEC	0	---	1	SEC registration	
Activity 2.4.2	Capacity building of the Consortium on M&E (macro and project site levels), project development, policies, DRRM, and resource mobilization	Number of trainings provided/conducted	0	---	1. Policies 2. Strategic planning/project development 3. Resource mobilization 4. DRRM	Project reports/ documentations	
		Project proposal developed	0	---	1	Project proposal	
Activity 2.4.3	Monitoring of the Consortium's performance based on the outputs of the training on basic organizational development to firm up its structure, functions, policies and procedures implemented by the 2-year-old Consortium's ad hoc secretariat	ICCs' satisfaction with the services of the Consortium assessed	---	0	10 sites	Community satisfaction scorecard	

		REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK						
	Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
			2015	**2017/ 2018**			
Activity 2.4.4	Capacity building for support for the Consortium members through their participation in advocacy activities associated with Component 1, such as:						
	a. Advocacy efforts for the ICCA bill	No. of activities such as policy dialogues, RTDs, ICCA Bill hearings, IP presentations organized or attended by the Consortium	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
		No. of Consortium/ Bukluran statements prepared	0	---	(TBD)	Bukluran statements	
	b. Mentoring on the understanding and preparation of inputs for the working papers and other information materials	IP positions on ICCA articulated in the Enhanced ICCA Bill	0	---	IP inputs incorporated in the Final Enhanced ICCA Bill	Minutes of minutes in HoR Spot reports of HoR Proceedings Matrices on the enhancements to the Bill Enhanced ICCA Bill	

		Baseline				
		REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK				
Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
c. Presentation skills	No. of Bukluran presentations in various forums to gather support for ICCA and the passage of the ICCA Bill	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
	No. and types of support generated for the ICCA Bill	0	---	(TBD)	Statement of support from other stakeholders Funding assistance Legal opinions supportive of the Enhanced ICCA Bill Lobby efforts conducted by other groups/ orgs in support of the Enhanced ICCA Bill Other similar bases	

		Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Baseline		End-of-Project Target (2019)	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							
Narrative Summary			2015	2017/ 2018			
Activity 2.4.5	Support for the (Mt. Kitanglad) School for Living Traditions in a video-documentation activity undertaken by the IPs themselves as a form for IP-led documentation for ICCA recognition	IP participatory video completed	0	---	1	Video	
		Process documentation conducted and report completed	0	---	1	Process documentation report	
Activity 2.4.6	Formulation by the Consortium of a 5-year strategy and action plan that includes prospects for resource mobilization by the end of the Project	Strategy and action plan from 2018-2022 formulated by the Consortium Steering Community for approval by the General Assembly	0	---	1	5-year plan	
		Convening of the General Assembly supported	0	---	1	Project report/ documentation	
Output 2.5 STRENGTHENED CAPACITIES OF ICCs TO DOCUMENT AND ADDRESS THREATS TO ICCAs Capacities of ICCs in the network of at least 10 ICCAs are strengthened to document, map, plan and implement actions to address the identified threats							
Activity 2.5.1	Support to ICCA communities in addressing identified ICCA threats	Training program implemented for ICCs on addressing threats to ICCA	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	

			Baseline				
REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK							
Narrative Summary		**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**2015**	**2017/ 2018**	**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Activity 2.5.2	Capacity building on networking and resource moblization	No. of ICCs trained	0	(TBD)		Project reports/ documentations	
Activity 2.5.3	Conduct of paralegal training to complement and improve the ICCs' traditional governance system	No. of paralegal trainings conducted for ICCs	0	---	10 ICCs	Project reports/ documentations	
		Paralegal point person designated per ICC	0	---	At least 1 per site	List of point person/s	
Activity 2.5.4	Documentation of best practice examples on preserving traditional governance systems, such as those in Mt. Kitanglad, and Ikalahan site in Imugan	Videos on ICCA completed	0	---	(TBD)	Videos	
Activity 2.5.5	Organizing of cross visits to foster peer to peer learning of techniques and approaches in effectively addressing external threats	No. of cross visits conducted	0	---	(TBD)	Project reports/ documentations	
Output 2.6 INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE ICCA NATIONAL REGISTRY A National Registry of ICCAs is established, supported by an appropriate system for validation, monitoring, and access by the public							
Activity 2.6.1	Institutionalization of the ICCA national registry through a joint administrative order issued by DENR and the NCIP spelling out	Final version of the draft joint policy issuance on the institutionalization of th ICCA national registry completed	0	---	1	Final draft of the joint policy	

	REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK						
	Narrative Summary	**Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)**	**Baseline**		**End-of-Project Target (2019)**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
			2015	**2017/ 2018**			
	the registration requirements (i.e., documentation), the process to be followed and the administrative arrangements in order to operationalize the same	and submitted to DENR and NCIP En Banc for approval					
Activity 2.6.2	Institutionalization of the ICCA national registry through a joint administrative order issued by DENR and the NCIP spelling out the registration requirements (i.e., documentation), the process to be followed and the administrative arrangements in order to operationalize the same	ICCA national registry platform established	0	---	1	Online registry platform	
		Roll-out activity conducted for Bukluran and ICCs, and other stakeholders concerned	0	---	1	Project report/ documentation	
		National Registry Steering Committee composed of BMB, NCIP and Bukluran representatives formed	0	---	1	Issuance creating the Committee Minutes of meetings	

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS AND PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER GEF-PHILIPPINE ICCA PROJECT

LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS[3]

The evaluation will include the review of the following documents:

- Project Document
- Annual Work Plans (AWPs) (2016,2017,2018, and 2019)
- APRs and PIRs (2016, 2017,2018, and 2019)
- Consolidated Quarterly Progress Reports
- Site-level Quarterly Progress Reports
- Mid- and Year-end Assessment Reports

PROJECT BRIEF

The Philippines is among the 18 megadiverse countries in the world owing to its exceptionally rich flora and fauna of more than 52,100 species. It ranks among the few top countries with high concentration of bird, amphibian, reptilian, terrestrial mammalian, floral, tree, mangrove, insect, fish, and coral species. It is known to hold more diverse life forms per square kilometer than any other country.

There are 5.12 million hectares of KBAs that need to be placed under effective management, however, the expansion of conservation coverage through the NIPAS entails years to process before they are legislated. The current protected area system covers only 52% of the KBAs which has suffered from lack of funding and resources, and severe lack of manpower compared to its non-megadiverse Asian neighbors.

Given such, there is growing recognition of the need to diversify the governance system of protected areas to include other forms of conservation measures such as those that are managed by the indigenous peoples (IPs) or ICCA. The Philippines piloted ICCA in 2011 through the Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project (NewCAPP) implemented by BMB-DENR with assistance from GEF-UNDP. With its NewCAPP experience, the country gained international recognition as a leader in documentation, mapping and recognitions of ICCAs and in protecting the rights of IPs. The IPs have strong bonds with their ancestral domains, and their practices have conserved KBAs for millennia. It is worth to note that 91 out of 128 KBAs (or 76%) are found within their territories.

The Philippine ICCA Project is the country's second initiative on ICCA, with institutionalization as it focus for this cycle. It is aligned with GEF-5's Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, specifically Strategic Objective 1, "To improve the sustainability of protected area systems" through Outcome 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. It aims to contribute to the Aichi targets of the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), specifically on the following:

Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes

Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological

---

[3] This list will be updated before TE as more documents become available.

resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all levels

The Project's overall objective is to **strengthen the conservation, protection and management of key biodiversity sites in the country through institutionalizing the ICCA as a sustainable addition to the national protected area (PA) estate.** It has two Outcome Areas and the following national targets:

Target Impact Indicators:

1. Number of hectares of national PA estate as a result of institutionalizing ICCAs as an additional PA category in the Philippines increased from 5,581,927 to 5,681,917 hectares, or increased by 1.7%

2. Capacity scores of BMB, NCIP and Philippines ICCA Consortium illustrating institutional support to ICCAs:

   - 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 (a) capacity for engagement and (b) capacity to monitor and evaluate

   - 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 (a) capacity for engagement and (b) capacity to generate, access, and use of info and knowledge

3. IRRF Sub-indicator 1.1.3.A.1.1: Extent to which institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity (BD) and ecosystems increased from *very partially* to *largely*

Outcome 1: Policy Harmonization and Implementation - 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

Target Outcome Indicators

1.1 Number of years to officially recognize an ICCA reduced from an average of 3.5 to 3 years from community orientation and mobilization to completion of CCP, as measured from the 10 targeted sites

1.2 Percentage of CADTs and ADSDPPs that clearly identify and map ICCAs increased from 16.67% to 100%

1.3 Number of LGUs where ICCAs are integrated into CLUPs increased from 0 to 2

1.4 Management effectiveness of NIPAS PAs overlapping with Philippine ICCA Project site increased by at least 10% in the following PAs:
   - Mt. Pulag National Park from 65% to 75%
   - Bataan Natural Park from 53% to 63%
   - Subic Bay Protected Area from 59% to 69%

Target Output Indicators

Output 1.1   Relevant policy issuances between NCIP, DENR-BMB, BFAR and FMB 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

Output 1.2   Support to advocacy for and consensus on the ICCA Bill

Output 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 (an NCIP counterpart)

Output 1.4   Land use planning guidelines of LGUs are enhanced to incorporate the identified ICCAs

Output 1.5   Implementing guidelines and procedures for NIPAS PA management planning and zoning that incorporate identification, mapping, documentation, and traditional governance systems in ICCAs

Outcome 2: Capacity Building and Effective Governance of ICCAs - capacity of key stakeholders for the effective governance and management of ICCAs strengthened

Target Outcome Indicators

2.1   Number of ICCs rating assistance from the National ICCA Consortium as satisfactory

2.2   Hectares of ICCAs recognized in the national PA system increased from 9,297 to 118,848 hectares

2.3   Capacity scores of ICCs in three areas: (a) information generation, (b) implementation, and (c) monitoring and evaluation increased in all project sites

2.4   National ICCA Registry is established – platform established and functional; policy guidelines formulated

2.5   Management effectiveness of 10 ICCAs – increased METT scores of at least 10% for existing PAs (Kanawan and Mt. Pulag), and 20% in eight other project sites

Target Output Indicators

Output 2.1   Regional networks of at least 10 ICCAs representing the country's ethnographic regions are identified, documented, mapped, recognized and registered at UNEP-WCMC

Output 2.2   At least 10 Community Conservation Plans (CCPs), with relevant business plan sections incorporated, are developed and implemented to support ICCAs, and mainstreamed into ADSDPPs and LGUs CLUPs and investment plans

Output 2.3   Capacities of NCIP, DENR, PAWB, FMB, BFAR in all regions are strengthened to provide technical support to ICCAs

Output 2.4   Capacity of the Philippine ICCA Consortium developed to serve as the mechanism for exchange, advocacy and legal support to ICCAs in distress

Output 2.5   Capacities of ICCs in the network of at least 10 ICCAs are strengthened to document, map, plan and implement actions to address the identified threats

Output 2.6   A National Registry of ICCAs is established, supported by an appropriate system for validation, monitoring, and access by the public

The Project commenced in September 2015 and will end in August 2019. It is implemented in ancestral domains of 10 indigenous cultural communities in 7 ethnographical regions in the Philippines specifically in the provinces of Kalinga, Ifugao, Aurora, Bataan, Palawan, Nueva Vizcaya in Luzon, and Bukidnon, North Cotabato, Surigao del Sur, and Agusan del Sur in Mindanao. It is managed by the Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB, formerly PAWB) which has established a Project Management Unit (PMU) to implement the project and coordinate the work of partners at site level.

LIST OF ICCA-FUNDED PROJECTS

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party (LRP)	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
LUZON:				
1. Mt. Taungay Tinglayan, Kalinga	ICC: Tongrayan ▪ LACHAW ▪ Sallong Women's Association	Mandiga Community Center, Inc. (MCCI) *Contact Person/s:* Jeorge Manisem Program Officer Capt St., Purok 04 Bulno Centro Tabuk City, Kalinga ajhatmanisem@gmail.com 0947-9797120	Add 2,369 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Increase the capacity score of the ICC from 2.5 to 3.5 in the area of M&E Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 52% to 72%, or by at least 20% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. ICCA Documentation Report presenting both the outcome and the process of describing and documenting the ICCA at Mt. Taungay - 1 b. ICCA maps on current land use and land cover, projected land use, and other thematic and analytic maps necessary in the preparation of the CCP - 1 set c. Resource Inventory (RI) Report - 1 d. Indigenous Knowledge, Systems and Practices (IKSP) Documentation Report - 1 e. Community Conservation Plan (CCP) - 1 f. Registration of the ICCA with the UNEP-WCMC – 1	4,692,632

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			g. Documentation of the community ICCA declaration-1	
			h. Production of IEC materials about the ICCA at Mt. Taungay – at least 1	
			i. Documentation Report on the implementation of the priority livelihood development initiatives identified in the CCP - 1	
			j. Copies of local plans and policies that incorporate the CCP in whole or in part – at least 1	
			k. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies to further support the ICCA initiatives - at least one	
			l. Copy of the Certificate of Pre-Condition issued by NCIP - 1	
			m. Progress reports describing implementation status and accomplishments of: (1) ICCA Documentation (IKSP, RI and community mapping), (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Inception Activity and other community activities, (5) endorsement from concerned barangays and municipalities, and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations, assemblies and other community activities to support the recognition of the ICCA, (7) production of IEC materials about the ICCA at Mt. Taungay, (8) application	

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			for an NCIP Certificate of Pre-condition for the Project, and (9) formulation of CCP – 1 per quarter n. Project Terminal Report presenting the details and level of accomplishments in relation to the expressed objectives of the project, and indicating the completion of all activities specified in the WFP and the achievement of all the expected outputs and deliverables – 1	
2. Mt. Pulag Tinoc, Ifugao	ICC: Kalanguya Kalanguya Indigenous Peoples of Tinoc	Philippine Association for Intercultural Development, Inc. (PAFID) *Contact Person/s:* David de Vera Executive Director 71 Malakas St. Diliman, Quezon City devera.dave @gmail.com (02) 927-4580 with Koalisyon ng Katutubong Samahan ng Pilipinas (KASAPI) Giovanni B. Reyes Project Coordinator Poblacion East Lagawe, Ifugao shangrila. northwind@gmail .com 0916-2447297	Add x no. of hectares of ICCA to the PA system Identify and map ICCA clearly in the CADT and the ADSDPP Increase the capacity score of the ICC from 3 to 5 in the area of M&E Increase the management effectiveness of NIPAS PA Mt. Pulag National Park from 65% to 75%, or by at least 10% Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA by at least 10% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. 1 ICCA Case Documentation (process documentation and evidence) including copies of the following: - ICCA map – 1 set - RI – 1 - IKSP documentation – 1 - CCP – 1 - ICCA Registration – 1 - Community Declaration of the ICCA – 1 b. Documentation of CCP implementation – 1	4,692,632

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			c. Copies of local plans and policies that interface ICCA – at least 1 d. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies - at least 1 e. Progress reports containing the delivery of the following outputs: (1) progress of the ICCA documentation, (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Community Launching and other community activities, (5) endorsements from concerned barangays and municipalities and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations and assemblies and other concerns for consideration in the recognition of the ICCA, (7) IEC materials produced, (8) Certification of Pre-condition issued by the NCIP, and (9) threat response plan – 1 per quarter f. Annual Progress Report indicating completion of all activities specified in the 2018 AWFP and achievement of all expected outputs/ deliverables - 1	
3. Ikalahan/ Kalanguya CADT Aritao and Sta. Fe, Nueva Vizcaya Carranglan, Nueva Ecija	ICC: Ikalahan/ Kalanguya Kalahan CADT Federation	Kalahan Educational Foundation (KEF) *Contact Person/s:* Samuel Balinhawang Executive Director	Add 16,000 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Identify and map ICCA clearly in the CADT and the ADSDPP Increase the capacity score of the ICC from 3.2 to 4 in the area of implementation	4,692,632

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
		Imugan, Sta. Fe Nueva Vizcaya sambalinhawang @yahoo.com 0915-9914233	Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 60% to 80%, or by at least 20% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. ICCA Documentation Report presenting both the outcome and the process of describing and documenting the ICCA at the Ikalahan/Kalanguya CADT - 1 b. ICCA maps on current land use and land cover, projected land use, and other thematic and analytic maps necessary in the preparation of the CCP – 1 set c. RI Report - 1 d. IKSP Documentation Report - 1 e. CCP - 1 f. Registration of the ICCA with the UNEP-WCMC - 1 g. Documentation of the community ICCA declaration - 1 h. Production of IEC material/s about the ICCA at the Ikalahan/Kalanguya CADT – at least 1 i. Documentation Report on the implementation of the priority livelihood development initiatives identified in the CCP - 1 j. Copies of local plans and policies that incorporate the CCP in whole or in part – at least 1	

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			k. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies to further support the ICCA initiatives – at least 1	
			l. Copy of the Certificate of Pre-Condition issued by NCIP - 1	
			m. Progress reports describing the implementation status and accomplishments of: (1) ICCA Documentation (IKSP, RI and community mapping), (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Inception Activity and other community activities, (5) endorsement from concerned barangays and municipalities, and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations, assemblies and other community activities to support the recognition of the ICCA, (7) production of IEC materials about the ICCA at the Ikalahan/Kalanguya CADT, and (8) application for an NCIP Certificate of Pre-condition for the Project – 1 per quarter	
			n. Project Terminal Report presenting the details and level of accomplishments in relation to the expressed objectives of the project, and indicating the completion of all activities specified in the WFP and the achievement of all the expected outputs and deliverables – 1	

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
4. Egongot CADT Dipaculao & Maria Aurora, Aurora	ICC: Egongot Provincial Federation of Egongot Tribe in Aurora (PFETA)	Daluhay Daloy ng Buhay, Inc. (DALUHAY) *Contact Person/s:* Dr. Marivic Pajaro Executive Director Brgy. Sabang, Baler, Aurora marivic.pajaro @gmail.com 0918-3590580	Add 15,000 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Identify and map ICCA clearly in the CADT and the ADSDPP Increase the capacity score of the ICC from 4 to 4.25 in the area of information generation Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 32% to 52%, or by at least 20% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. ICCA Documentation Report presenting both the outcome and the process of describing and documenting the ICCA at the Egongot CADT – 1 b. ICCA maps on current land use and land cover, projected land use, and other thematic and analytic maps necessary in the preparation of the CCP – 1 set c. RI Report – 1 d. IKSP Documentation Report – 1 e. CCP – 1 f. Registration of the ICCA with the UNEP-WCMC – 1 g. Documentation of the community ICCA declaration – 1 h. Production of IEC materials about the ICCA at the Egongot CADT – at least 1	4,699,632

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			i. Documentation Report on the implementation of the priority livelihood development initiatives identified in the CCP - 1	
			j. Copies of local plans and policies that incorporate the CCP in whole or in part - at least 1	
			k. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies to further support the ICCA initiatives - 1	
			l. Copy of the Certificate of Pre-Condition issued by NCIP - 1	
			m. Progress reports describing implementation status and accomplishments of: (1) ICCA Documentation (IKSP, RI and community mapping), (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Inception Activity and other community activities, (5) endorsement from concerned barangays and municipalities, and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations, assemblies and other community activities to support the recognition of the ICCA, (7) production of IEC materials about the ICCA at the Egongot CADT, (8) application for an NCIP Certificate of Pre-condition for the Project, and (9) formulation of CCP – 1 per quarter	

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			n. Project Terminal Report presenting the details and level of accomplishments in relation to the expressed objectives of the project, and indicating the completion of all activities specified in the WFP and the achievement of all the expected outputs and deliverables – 1	
5. Kanawan	ICC: Magbukun Ayta Samahang Magbukun ng Kanawan (SMK)	PAFID Dave de Vera Executive Director with Subic Indigenous Peoples Assistance Group (SIPAG) *Contact Person/s:* Betty Fielder Executive Director Kanawan, Morong, Bataan betty_fielder @yahoo.com 0920-4287444	Add 15,665 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Identify and map ICCA clearly in the CADT and the ADSDPP Increase the capacity score of the ICC from 2.6 to 4 in the area of implementation Increase the management effectiveness of NIPAS PAs by at least 10%: 1. Bataan Natural Park from 53% to 75%, and 2. Subic Bay Protected Area from 59% to 69% Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 53% to 63%, or by at least 10% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. 1 ICCA Case Documentation (process documentation and evidence) including copies of the following: - ICCA map – 1 set - RI - 1 - IKSP documentation - 1 - CCP - 1 - ICCA Registration - 1 - Community Declaration of the ICCA - 1 b. Documentation of CCP implementation – 1	4,692,632

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			c. Copies of local plans and policies that interface ICCA - t least 1	
			d. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies - at least 1	
			e. Progress reports containing the delivery of the following outputs: (1) progress of the ICCA documentation, (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Community Launching and other community activities, (5) endorsements from concerned barangays and municipalities and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations and assemblies and other concerns for consideration in the recognition of the ICCA, (7) IEC materials produced, (8) Certification of Pre-condition issued by the NCIP, and (9) threat response plan - 1 per quarter	
			f. Annual Progress Report indicating completion of all activities specified in the 2018 AWFP and achievement of all expected outputs/ deliverables – 1	
6. Balabac	ICC: Molbog Molbog Indigenous Cultural Community Association, Inc. (MICCAI)	PAFID *Contact Person/s:* Dave de Vera Executive Director and	Add 34,200 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Increase the capacity score of the ICC from 1.6 to 2 in the area of implementation	4,650,136

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
		Habiron Bacar Project Manager ICCA-Balabac 0909-1077927 0921-3759027	Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 29% to 49%, or by at least 20% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. 1 ICCA Case Documentation (process documentation and evidence) including copies of the following: - ICCA map – 1 set - RI - 1 - IKSP documentation - 1 - CCP - 1 - ICCA Registration - 1 - Community Declaration of the ICCA - 1 b. Documentation of CCP implementation - 1 c. Copies of local plans and policies that interface ICCA – at least 1 d. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies – at least 1 e. Progress reports containing the delivery of the following outputs: (1) progress of the ICCA documentation, (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Community Launching and other community activities, (5) endorsements from concerned barangays and municipalities and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community	

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			consultations and assemblies and other concerns for consideration in the recognition of the ICCA, (7) IEC materials produced, (8) Certification of Pre-condition issued by the NCIP, and (9) threat response plan - 1 f. Annual Progress Report indicating completion of all activities specified in the 2018 AWFP and achievement of all expected outputs/ deliverables – 1	
MINDANAO:				
7. AGMIHICU CADT 054	ICC: Agtulawon Mintapod Higaonon Cumadon (AGMIHICU) Agtulawon, Mintapod, Higaonon, Cumadon ang Indigenous Peoples Organization ng AGMIHICU CADT 054	Non-Timber Forest Product - Exchange Programme Phiippines (NTFP-EP) *Contact Person/s:* Ruth Canlas Executive Director 92-A Masikap Ext. St. Brgy. Central Diliman, Quezon City ruth.canlas@ntfp.org ruthpcanlas @yahoo.com (02) 967 6127	Add 10,000 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Identify and map ICCA clearly in the CADT and the ADSDPP Increase in capacity score of the ICC from 2.75 to 3.5 in the area of M&E Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 48% to 68%, or by at least 20% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. ICCA Documentation Report presenting both the outcome and the process of describing and documenting the ICCA at the AGMIHICU CADT 054 - 1 b. ICCA maps on current land use and land cover, projected land use, and other thematic and analytic maps necessary in the preparation of the CCP - 1 c. RI Report - 1 d. IKSP Documentation Report - 1	4,671,500

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			e. CCP - 1	
			f. Registration of the ICCA with the UNEP-WCMC - 1	
			g. Documentation of the community ICCA declaration - 1	
			h. Production of IEC materials about the ICCA at the AGMIHICU CADT 054 – at least 1	
			i. Documentation Report on the implementation of the priority livelihood development initiatives identified in the CCP	
			j. Copies of local plans and policies that incorporate the CCP in whole or in part – at least 1	
			k. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies to further support the ICCA initiatives - at least 1	
			l. Copy of the Certificate of Pre-Condition issued by NCIP - 1	
			m. Progress reports describing implementation status and accomplishments of: (1) ICCA Documentation (IKSP, RI and community mapping), (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Inception Activity and other community activities, (5) endorsement from concerned barangays and municipalities, and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations, assemblies and	

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			other community activities to support the recognition of the ICCA, (7) production of IEC materials about the ICCA at the AGMIHICU CADT 054, (8) application for an NCIP Certificate of Pre-condition for the Project, and (9) formulation of CCP – 1 per quarter n. Project Terminal Report presenting the details and level of accomplishments in relation to the expressed objectives of the project, and indicating the completion of all activities specified in the WFP and the achievement of all the expected outputs and deliverables - 1	
8. Mt. Apo	ICC: Ovu Manuvu Magpet Pusaka Impon Conservation Association of Don Panaca, Imamaling, Manobo, Manobisa, and Amabel (MAGPICA-DIMMA)	Philippine Eagle Foundation, Inc. (PEF) *Contact Person/s:* Dennis Joseph I. Salvador Executive Director Jayson Ibanez Research and Conservation Director ibanez.jayson@ gmail.com Malagos, Baguio District, Davao City	Add 13,000 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Identify and map ICCA clearly in the CADT and the ADSDPP Increase in capacity score of the ICC from 4.33 to 5 in the area of information generation Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 77% to 97%, or by at least 20% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. ICCA Documentation Report presenting both the outcome and the process of describing and documenting the ICCA at Mt. Apo – 1	4,892,632

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
		info@ philippineeagle foundation.org (082) 3241860	b. ICCA maps on current land use and land cover, projected land use, and other thematic and analytic maps necessary in the preparation of the CCP - 1 set	
			c. RI Report - 1	
			d. IKSP Documentation Report - 1	
			e. CCP - 1	
			f. Registration of the ICCA with the UNEP-WCMC - 1	
			g. Documentation of the community ICCA declaration - 1	
			h. Production of IEC materials about the ICCA at Mt. Apo – at least 1	
			i. Documentation Report on the implementation of the priority livelihood development initiatives identified in the CCP	
			j. Copies of local plans and policies that incorporate the CCP in whole or in part – at least 1	
			k. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies to further support the ICCA initiatives – at least 1	
			l. Copy of the Certificate of Pre-Condition issued by NCIP - 1	
			m. Assistance to community extension	

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			n. Progress reports describing implementation status and accomplishments of: (1) ICCA Documentation (IKSP, RI and community mapping), (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Inception Activity and other community activities, (5) endorsement from concerned barangays and municipalities, and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations, assemblies and other community activities to support the recognition of the ICCA, (7) production of IEC materials about the ICCA at Mt. Apo, (8) application for an NCIP Certificate of Pre-condition for the Project, and (9) formulation of CCP – 1 per quarter o. Project Terminal Report presenting the details and level of accomplishments in relation to the expressed objectives of the project, and indicating the completion of all activities specified in the WFP and the achievement of all the expected outputs and deliverables - 1	
9. South Diwata-Bislig KBA	ICC: Manobo Manobo Tribal Council of Sote (MATRICOSO)	PAFID Rino Bersalona Area Coordinator for Mindanao rinobersalona @yahoo.com 0998-2912192	Add 4,000 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Increase the capacity score of the ICC from 4 to 4.5 in the area of M&E Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 34% to 54%, or by at least 20%	4,692,636

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. 1 ICCA Case Documentation (process documentation and evidence) including copies of the following: - ICCA map - 1 set - RI - 1 - IKSP documentation - 1 - CCP – 1 - ICCA Registration – 1 - Community Declaration of the ICCA - 1 b. Documentation of CCP implementation - 1 c. Copies of local plans and policies that interface ICCA – at least 1 d. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies – at least 1 e. Progress reports containing the delivery of the following outputs: (1) progress of the ICCA documentation, (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Community Launching and other community activities, (5) endorsements from concerned barangays and municipalities and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations and assemblies and other concerns for consideration in the recognition of the ICCA, (7) IEC materials produced, (8) Certification of Pre-condition issued by the NCIP, and (9) threat response plan – 1 per quarter	

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			f. Annual Progress Report indicating completion of all activities specified in the 2018 AWFP and achievement of all expected outputs/ deliverables – 1	
10. Mt. Diwata	ICC: Agusan Manobo Mahagkot Kiluntudan Tag-ebo Organization (MAKITA)	PAFID Rino Bersalona	Add 8,997 hectares of ICCA to the PA system Increase the capacity score of the ICC from 4 to 4.5 in the area of information generation Increase the management effectiveness of the ICCA from 43% to 63%, or by at least 20% Implement activities and generate the following outputs: a. 1 ICCA Case Documentation (process documentation and evidence) including copies of the following: - ICCA map – 1 set - RI - 1 - IKSP documentation - 1 - CCP - 1 - ICCA Registration - 1 - Community Declaration of the ICCA - 1 b. Documentation of CCP implementation - 1 c. Copies of local plans and policies that interface ICCA – at least 1 d. Development and submission of project proposals to donor agencies – at least 1	4,692,632

Project Site	Indigenous Cultural Community (ICC)/ Organization	Local Responsible Party	Project Commitments	Allocation (In PhP)
			e. Progress reports containing the delivery of the following outputs: (1) progress of the ICCA documentation, (2) RIAC meetings, (3) coordination and training activities with partners and stakeholders, (4) documentation of the Community Launching and other community activities, (5) endorsements from concerned barangays and municipalities and other stakeholders through Resolutions, (6) documentation of community consultations and assemblies and other concerns for consideration in the recognition of the ICCA, (7) IEC materials produced, (8) Certification of Pre-condition issued by the NCIP, and (9) threat response plan – 1 per quarter f. Annual Progress Report indicating completion of all activities specified in the 2018 AWFP and achievement of all expected outputs/ deliverables – 1	
			TOTAL	**47,069,696**

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
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?			
▪ Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international objectives? ▪ How does the project support the objectives of UNCBD, especially the Aichi Targets? ▪ Does the project support other international conventions, such as the UNFCCC?	▪ UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design ▪ Level of implementation of UNCBD in the Philippines and contribution of the project ▪ Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design ▪ Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument	▪ Project documents ▪ National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally ▪ UNCBD and other international convention websites	▪ Documents analyses ▪ Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners
▪ Is the project relevant to GEF biodiversity focal area? ▪ How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities?	▪ Existence of clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area	▪ Project documents ▪ GEF focal areas strategies and documents	▪ Documents analyses ▪ GEF website ▪ Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners
▪ Is the project relevant to the Philippines' environment and sustainable development objectives? ▪ How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Philippines? ▪ Is the project country-driven? ▪ What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? ▪ What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? ▪ Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in	▪ Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives ▪ Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies ▪ Appreciation from national and local stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities ▪ Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process	▪ Project documents ▪ National policies and strategies, e.g., Philippine Development Plan, Philippine Biodiversity Strategic and Action Plan ▪ Key project partners	▪ Documents analyses ▪ Interviews with UNDP, relevant national and local government officials and other partners

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?	▪ Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria		
▪ Is the project relevant to the country programme of the UNDP? ▪ Does the project contribute to UNDAF? ▪ Does the project contribute to the Country Programme Document of UNDP in the Philippines? ▪ To what extent does the project contribute to the fulfilment of the objectives of UNDAF and the CPD?	▪ Degree to which the project supports the objectives and targets of UNDAF and the CPD	▪ Project document ▪ UNDAF and CPD ▪ UNDP CO	▪ Documents analyses ▪ Interviews with UNDP
▪ Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels? ▪ How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? ▪ Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? ▪ Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?	▪ Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders ▪ Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation	▪ Project partners and stakeholders ▪ Needs assessment studies ▪ Project documents	▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews with relevant stakeholders
▪ Is the project internally coherent in its design? ▪ 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.)? ▪ Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	▪ Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic ▪ Level of coherence between project deign and project implementation approach	▪ Program and project documents ▪ Key project stakeholders	▪ Document analysis ▪ Key interviews
▪ How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	▪ Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to	▪ Documents from other donor supported activities ▪ Other donor representatives	▪ Documents analyses

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
▪ Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? ▪ How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? ▪ Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?	other donor programming nationally and regionally	▪ Project documents	▪ Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders ▪
▪ Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? ▪ Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?		▪ Data collected throughout evaluation	▪ Data analysis
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
▪ Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? ▪ To what extent have the project targets been achieved? ▪ To what extent have the project failed to achieve its targets? ▪ To what factors can be attributed the achievement and/or non-achievement of the targets?	▪ See indicators in project document results framework and log frame	▪ Project documents ▪ Project team and relevant stakeholders ▪ Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports	▪ Documents analysis ▪ Interviews with project team ▪ Interviews with relevant stakeholders
▪ How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? ▪ How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? ▪ What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? ▪ Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?	▪ Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design ▪ Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues ▪ Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	▪ Project documents ▪ UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders	▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
▪ What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? ▪ What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? ▪ 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?		▪ Data collected throughout evaluation	▪ Data analysis
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
▪ Was project support provided in an efficient way? ▪ Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? ▪ Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? ▪ Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? ▪ Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? ▪ Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) ▪ Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?	▪ Availability and quality of financial and progress reports ▪ Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided ▪ Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures ▪ Planned vs. actual funds leveraged ▪ Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations ▪ Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost ▪ Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) ▪ Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency	▪ Project documents and evaluations, e.g., MTR, audit reports, spot check reports ▪ UNDP Project team	▪ Document analysis ▪ Key interviews
▪ Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?	▪ Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives		

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
▪ Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? ▪ How was results-based management used during project implementation?			
▪ How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? ▪ To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? ▪ Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? ▪ What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? ▪ Which methods were successful or not and why?	▪ Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners ▪ Examples of supported partnerships ▪ Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained ▪ Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized	▪ Project documents and evaluations ▪ Project partners and relevant stakeholders	▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
▪ Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? ▪ Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? ▪ Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? ▪ Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?	▪ Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts ▪ Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity	▪ Project documents and evaluations ▪ UNDP ▪ Beneficiaries	▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
▪ What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? ▪ What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? ▪ How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures	▪ Lessons on efficiency drawn from the project	▪ Data collected throughout evaluation	▪ Data analysis

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
and procedures, partnership arrangements etc.)? ■ What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
■ Are the outputs and outcomes of the project likely to be sustainable? ■ Is there a realistic sustainability plan? ■ Do project achievements show potential for sustainability, replication, scaling up?	■ Potential for sustainability of project results	■ Project documents and reports ■ Sustainability plan ■ Data collected throughout evaluation	■ Documents analyses ■ Interviews with CPMU, UNDP, BMB and other national government partners, grantees, local governments, other stakeholders
■ Do the financial, institutional, policy, social, economic, cultural and environmental conditions pose risk/s to the sustainability of project results? ■ Are the risks manageable? ■ Does the sustainability plan address the risks? ■ What opportunities are available that can help sustainability of project gains? ■ How can these opportunities be used or optimized for sustainability?	■ Manageability of risks ■ Availability of opportunities ■ Potential of opportunities to boost sustainability of project results	■ Project documents and reports ■ Sustainability plan ■ Data collected throughout evaluation	■ Documents analyses ■ Interviews with CPMU, UNDP, BMB and other national government partners, grantees, local governments, other stakeholders
■ What lessons can guide the design and implementation of the next phase, if any, of ICCA in the Philippines?		■ Project documents and reports ■ Sustainability plan ■ Data collected throughout evaluation	■ Documents analyses ■ Interviews with PMU, UNDP, BMB and other national government partners, Local Responsible Parties, IP partners, and other stakeholders
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
■ Has the project effected significant improvement in the governance of protected areas?	■ Degree in which participatory governance has been affected and effected by the project	■ Data collected throughout evaluation	■ Documents analyses ■ Interviews

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
▪ Has the project affected national and local policies and practice with regard to biodiversity conservation?			
▪ Has the project changed the lives of affected community members in a positive way? ▪ Has the project positively affected women, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups socially, politically, economically and culturally? ▪ Has the project adversely affected women, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups socially, politically, economically and culturally?	▪ Positive impacts of the project on affected women, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups ▪ Negative impacts of the project on affected women, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups	▪ Data collected throughout evaluation	▪ Documents analyses ▪ Interviews

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings	Impact Ratings:
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	4: Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3: Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2: Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1: Unlikely (U): severe risks	2: Relevant (R) 1: Not relevant (NR)	3: Significant (S) 2: Minimal (M) 1: Negligible (N)

Additional ratings where relevant:
    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[4]

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: _____

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[5]

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[6])

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[7])

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)

---

[5]The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

[6] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[7] 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)

<div style="border:1px solid">

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

</div>

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 Philippine ICCA Project (UNDP *PIMS #* 5389).

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