

TERMS OF REFERENCE

UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review (National)

Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF-Small Grants Programme (SGP-5) in the Philippines

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF-Small Grants Programme (SGP-5) in the Philippines* (PIMS# 4517) implemented through the UNDP and the Biodiversity Management Bureau of the DENR, which is to be undertaken in 2016. The project started on the Project Document signature date and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The GEF Small Grants Programme (GEF SGP) is a GEF Corporate Programme implemented by UNDP to provide financial and technical support to communities and civil society organizations (CSOs) to meet the overall objective of “Global environmental benefits secured through community-based initiatives and actions”. Launched in 1992 with 33 participating countries and now at 130, GEF SGP is rooted in the conviction that community-driven sustainable development initiatives that support innovative livelihoods and local empowerment can generate and maintain global environmental benefits.

The Philippines was one of the pilot countries of the Small Grants Programme (SGP) and was introduced to Philippine NGOs and CBOs in 1992. The SGP is a grant facility for NGOs and CBOs in support of their community-based resource management initiatives. The programme provides grants of up to USD 50,000 directly to local communities, including indigenous people, community-based organizations and other non-governmental groups for projects in GEF focal areas. Since its inception, it has funded 293 projects amounting to USD 9,451,453. Through more than two decades and four operational phases of grant giving its list of grantees now comprises over 200 civil society organizations (CSOs) from all over the country whose concerns cover GEF’s main focal themes.

For the first four operational phases of the SGP in the Philippines, 70% of SGP funds was accessed by CSOs to pursue projects in the Biodiversity Conservation focal area of GEF-UNDP, while one 30% was geared towards other focal areas (16% multi-focal area; 13% climate change; 1% POPs projects). The biodiversity conservation focal area is the main focus for the Fifth Operational Phase (SGP-5) of the GEF Small Grants Programme in the Philippines..

In 2008, the GEF approved an “upgrading” policy that stipulated that SGP Country Programs with more than 15 years of operations and over USD 6.0 million in grant disbursements would receive their funding through country-led STAR allocations i.e. as a Full-Size Project. These countries represent some of the most mature, experienced, and successful SGP Country Programmes, with the most developed civil society networks and multistakeholder partnerships. The SGP Philippines Country Programme upgraded during the GEF Fifth Operational Phase (together with Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Mexico, Kenya, Pakistan).

The GEF approved the Fifth Operational Phase the Small Grants Programme in the Philippines (SGP-5 project) amounting to USD 4.5 million in June 2012. The Project Document was signed by NEDA, UNDP and DENR in June

2013. SGP-5 supports community-based biodiversity conservation initiatives in three priority sites: Palawan, Samar Island (Samar, Northern Samar and Eastern Samar), and Sierra Madre Mountain Range (Laguna, Rizal, Quezon, Bulacan, Nueva Ecija, Nueva Vizcaya, Aurora, Quirino, Isabela and Cagayan).

SGP-5 aims to (1) improve the sustainability of protected areas through community actions by building effective models for community-based governance; (2) mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the management of production landscapes and seascapes by local communities; and, (3) increase the capacity of SGP partner NGOs, POs and CBOs to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions. Individual small grant projects under SGP-5 will contribute concrete outputs to the achievement of the following outcomes:

Component 1: Community-based actions improve the sustainability of protected areas¹

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

Component 2: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors (PLS)²

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

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

Component 3: Cross-cutting Capacity Development and Knowledge Management

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

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

The Project is being managed by the Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB, formerly PAWB) which has established a Project Management Unit (PMU) to implement certain outputs and coordinate the work of partners in pilot sites.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports

¹ This component will help to support the development and implementation of community-based protected area models as a complementary form of PA management to NIPAS.

² This component will support community initiatives in understanding and consequently integrating the principles, practices, and strategies of biodiversity conservation in the community's economic production activities.

including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach³ ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF Operational Focal Point, UNDP Country Office, PAWB and PMU, UNDP-GEF Global Coordinator for the SGP Upgrading Country Programs based in New York and key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.⁴ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct a field mission to Manila and selected project sites. Annex A is the list of SGP Projects in its 3 priority sites – Palawan, Sierra Madre and Samar.

Interviews will be held with the government Implementing Partner (IP) – BMB of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR); as well as other agencies (National Commission on Indigenous Peoples); grantee NGOs; local government units; local and indigenous peoples' communities; relevant consultants and other partner organizations. The MTR consultant will also hold discussions with major donor organizations with on-going and planned initiatives in the sector such as but not limited to GIZ's Protected Areas Management Enhancement (PAME) Project, USAID's Biodiversity and Watersheds Improved for Stronger Economy and Ecosystems Resilience Project (B+WISER), USAID's Ecosystems Improved for Sustainable Fisheries (ECOFISH), the Philippine Government's National Greening Program and Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Rehabilitation Program (CMERP) (both of DENR) and People's Survival Fund (of the Climate Change Commission), UNDP's Marine Key Biodiversity Areas (MKBA) Project, BIOFIN and ICCA projects.

Taking into account the landscape approach of the Philippines SGP Country Program, and building on the experience of UNDP's COMDEKS community-based landscape planning approach, the Upgrading Country Programs in OP6 are adopting a community-based landscape approach as their core programming framework, building the capacities of community organizations to take collective action for adaptive landscape management for social and ecological resilience. GEF funding in OP6 will provide small grants to NGOs and community organizations to develop landscape management strategies and implement community projects in pursuit of strategic landscape level outcomes related to ecosystem services and biodiversity, sustainable productions systems and food security, sustainable livelihoods, and landscape governance. Funding will also be available for initiatives to build the organizational capacities of specific community groups as well as landscape level organizations to plan and manage complex initiatives and test, evaluate and disseminate community level innovations. The Mid-Term Review should provide recommendations on potential linkages with the community-based landscape management approach piloted by the COMDEKS Programme and currently being replicated by the portfolio of OP6 Upgrading Country Programmes.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

³ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

⁴ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁵	Baseline Level ⁶	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁷	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁸	Achievement Rating ⁹	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**Management Arrangements:**

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

⁵ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁶ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁷ If available

⁸ Colour code this column only

⁹ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.¹⁰

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

¹⁰ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF-Small Grants Programme (SGP-5) in the Philippines

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6.

TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *10 weeks* starting 15 November 2016, and shall not exceed four (4) months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
21 October 2016	Application closes
14 November 2016	Select MTR Team
Within 1 week after contract signing	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
2 weeks after contract signing	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission

15 days (3 weeks)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
1 day	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
10 days	Preparing draft report
2 days	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
2 days	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
1 day	Presentation to the Project Steering Committee
15 March 2017	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Philippines.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The team expert who will be the national consultant will have the following profile/competencies:

- An effective evaluator with demonstrated experience in conducting international development evaluations; prior experience in GEF Project evaluations would be an advantage;
- Demonstrated strong knowledge of Monitoring and Evaluation methods for development projects; knowledge of UNDP's results-based management orientation and practices;
- Familiarity with biodiversity conservation issues in the Philippines,
- Knowledge and experience in community-based and CSO-initiative biodiversity conservation and management initiatives in the Philippines;
- Demonstrated experience with implementation and/or evaluation of capacity-building efforts in developing countries, in the area of biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management.
- Fluency in the English language and excellent oral and written communication skills.

The National Consultant should have an advanced degree in environmental management, community development, development economics or any related courses. He/she should have a minimum of least 10 years' experience in the implementation of protected area management, PA system wide planning and monitoring, capacity building for PA management, and PA financing sustainability.

The National Consultant will primarily support the International Consultant who plays the Team Leader in the conduct of the evaluation mission. He/she is expected to do the tasks but not limited to the following:

1. Assist the team leader and provide inputs in the preparation of the MTE Inception Report and Mid-term Evaluation Report;
2. Assist in the conduct of the evaluation mission especially in the gathering and analysis of data and information;
3. Provide the national context in the analysis of SGP's results and accomplishments;
4. Provide recommendations for improvement considering the national context where SGP operates;

The Evaluation Team is expected to discuss among themselves their detailed division of work and should be clearly articulated in the MTE Inception Report.

The National Consultant will report to the Team Leader (International Consultant). The UNDP CO and CPMU will provide support to the development of the evaluation work plan in consultation with key project partners. The project team (PMU) will serve as the reference group for the evaluation and ensure the monitoring of satisfactory completion of evaluation deliverables.

CPMU will provide office space and access to office services such as, internet and printing. Evaluator/s should provide their own computer and communications equipment.

In consultation with the Evaluation Team and as requested, the CPMU personnel will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. The team will also assist in organizing any briefing de-briefing meetings including coordination of stakeholders' input in the evaluation draft report.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Consultants will be contracted by UNDP and remunerated according to the reviewed and accepted financial proposal. The contract will be output-based and payment issued only upon delivery of satisfactory outputs/milestones.

Table 6. Payment Schedule

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

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://www.undp.org.ph.jobs>) . Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions.

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

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

TOR Annex A

LIST OF SGP-FUNDED PROJECTS

Proponent Details	Project Title	Project Site	Project Commitments	Grant Amount
Priority Site: Samar Island				
Site Hub: Center for Empowerment and Resource Development, Inc. (CERD) Address: 117-D Kamuning Road, Quezon City Contact Person: Julio Galvez Tan Managing Trustee +639209000234 jujut@gmail.com	Samar Island Hub and Learning Center for Biodiversity Conservation	Samar Island	7,500 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community land/seascape plan that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	146,311.28
Eastern Visayas Partnership for Rural Development, Inc. (EVPRD) Address: PCA Compound, UEP Zone 3, Catarman 6400 Northern Samar, Philippines Contact Person: MR. GREGORIO O. SARMIENTO Project Coordinator evprd2004@yahoo.com; egegsarmiento@yahoo.com	Creating A Model on Social Fencing for SINP through Establishment of Organized Production and Marketing System for Abaca and other CBFM Products	Brgy. Cablangan, Mondragon, Northern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model 300 hectares of community-managed area 40 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community/CBFM plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 1 community engaged in BDFE (abaca)	50,000.00
Nortehanon Access Center, Inc. (NAC) Address: Nortehanon Access Center, Inc. (NAC) Lot 8, Block 10, University Homes, Catarman, Northern Samar Contact Person: MS. MAYBELLE M. CAMPS BOD Chairperson camps.maybelle@gmail.com/09273256156	Enhanced Sustainable Rice Production Techniques: An Approach To Biodiversity Conservation	Municipalities of Catarman, Mondragon and Bobon Northern Samar	12 hectares of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management arrangements 1 community produces and markets 4 biodiversity-friendly agricultural products (rice/ palay, salted egg, balut, palay seeds)	43,151.63
Green Mindanao, Inc. Address: Old Phase 1, Block 6 Lot 14, Xavier Height Subdivision Upper Balulang, Cagayan De Oro City Contact Person: MR. GLICETO O. DAGONDON Executive Director butch_dagondon@yahoo.com; 09209134922	Basey Nipa Community Conservation Project	Basey, Eastern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model 50 hectares of community-managed area 100 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community land/seascape plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	51,195.65

			1 community engaged in BDFE (nipa)	
<p>Pasay, Kinis and Bangus Producers Association (PAKIBA)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Brgy. P. Tingzon, San Jose, Northern Samar</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. EDITH A. VILLOCERO President c/o CERD: cerd@cerd.ph; 09999195530; 091620194208</p>	Community Based Mangrove Management and Protection for Sustainable Utilization	Brgys. Tingzon and Bagong Sabang in San Jose, Northern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model 1 community-managed area management of 450 hectares of mangroves 2 communities engaged in BDFE	22,336.95
<p>Lakas at Pagkakaisa ng Asosasyon sa San Pedro (LAPAS)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Brgy. San Pedro, Biri Northern Samar</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Ricardo Albario LAPAS President 09217811745</p>	Increase Fish Catch to Increase Income Through Protection and Rehabilitation of the Coastal and Marine Resource	Brgys. McArthur, Kauswagan and San Pedro, Biri, Northern Samar	3 community-based/co-management model 1 community-managed area management of 564 hectares of mangroves 3 communities engaged in BDFE	22,488.04
<p>NSEP-UEP</p> <p><i>Address:</i> CESA Office, University of Eastern Philippines, University Town, Northern Samar</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MYRNA NICOL OGOC, PhD Chairperson/CEO myrna_uep@yahoo.com; 093990774757</p>	Coastal Ecosystems Biodiversity Enhancement Project	Biri, Northern Samar: Kauswagan, Poblacion, Pio del Pilar Lavezares, Northern Samar: Borobaybay and Villaflores Rosario, Northern Samar: Jamoog and Vizcaya San Jose, Northern Samar: Dao and Geratag	1 community-based/co-management model 5 community-managed areas 40% METT increase in 1 community PA 1 communities engaged in BDFE	32,608.69
<p>Sentro Ha Pagpauswag Ha Panginabuhì, Inc. (SPPI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> National Highway, Brgy. Cawayan, Catarman, Northern Samar</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Ms. JOELYN SOLDEVILLA-BIAG Executive Director sppi07@yahoo.com; 09258474337; 09778214419</p>	Building Capacities on Biodiversity: Strengthening the Samar Island Seaweeds Value Chain Network	Biri, Lavezares, Rosario, San Jose, San Antonio, Capul, Mondragon and Laoang, Northern Samar	8 communities engaged in BDFE	39,134.78
<p>Samar Center for Rural Education and Development, Inc. (SACRED)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Guevarra Apartment, Room 1, Brgy. Dalakit, Catarman, Northern Samar</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i></p>	Upper Caynaga Community-based Upland Resource Development & Management Project	Brgy. Upper Caynaga, Lope de Vega, Northern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model 1 community-managed area management of 50 hectares of mangroves 1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and	44,540.21

MR. RAUL C. DE LEON Executive Director sacred1990ngo@yahoo.com; 055 5009953; 09274976621			ecosystem services valuation 1 community engaged in BDFE	
Cansangaya Fishermen's Association (CFA) <i>Address:</i> Brgy. Cansangaya, Can-avid, Eastern Samar <i>Contact Person:</i> MR. RAUL R. PRENSICA President dan_alura@yahoo.com; 09193600071	Cansangaya Marine Protected Area, Can-avid, Eastern Samar	Brgy. Cansangaya, Can-avid, Eastern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model 1 community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA management of 50 hectares of mangroves, seagrass and coral reef area 1 community engaged in BDFE	17,391.30
Balocawe Fishermen's Association <i>Address:</i> Oras, Balocawe, Eastern Samar <i>Contact Person:</i> Joecris Amid Association President 09283914935 dalosasalvador@yahoo.com	Fish Sanctuary and Coral Restoration	Oras, Eastern Samar, Philippines	1 community-based/co-management model 1 community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA 4,738 hectares of managed landscapes	16,304.34
Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP) <i>Address:</i> PSDC Bldg., Magallanes cor. Real Streets, Intramuros, Manila <i>Contact Person:</i> MR. RAFAEL C. LOPA Executive Director pbsp@pbsp.org.ph; 02 2325270	San Jorge Forest Reserve Protection Through Coffee Production	Barangay San Jose, Barangay Sung-an, Barangay Mercedes municipality in Eastern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model 2 community-managed areas management of 5 hectares of mangroves 10 hectares of managed landscapes 2 communities engaged in BDFE	32,608.69
Guiuan Development Foundation, Inc. (GDFI) <i>Address:</i> Guimbaolibot Ave., Guiuan, Eastern Samar <i>Contact Person:</i> PROF. MARGARITA T. DELA CRUZ Executive Director cruzmarge2003@yahoo.com; 09189295852/09173211942	Lawaan Integrated Ecosystems Conservation Project	Lawaan, Eastern Samar	1 community-based/co-management model 2 community-managed areas 1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 7696.16 hectares of managed seascapes/ 13,826 hectares of managed landscapes management of 132 hectares of corals and 275 hectares of mangroves 3 communities engaged in BDFE	102,097.82
Priority Site: Sierra Madre Mountain Range				
Site Hub, for Lower Sierra Madre: Tanggol Kalikasan (TK)	Strengthening the Networks of Lower Sierra Madre CSOs for	Provinces of Nueva Ecija, Aurora,	At least 1 community-managed protected or conservation area	133,695.65

<p>Address: M-02 CRM III Bldg., 106 Kamias Road, Quezon City</p> <p>Contact Person: RAMON GRIMALDO President 02 3760842 c/o gene1631@gmail.com</p>	Biodiversity Conservation and Management	Bulacan, Rizal, Laguna, and Quezon	enhanced encompassing at least 5,000 hectares 1,000 trained to use SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms; 5 replication projects; 25% increase in co-financing; 1 partnership with LGU launched M&E System; grantees trained on M&E; 80% of project holders adopt/adapt SGP M&E framework	
<p>Site Hub, for Upper Sierra Madre: The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement, Inc. (PRRM)</p> <p>Address: 56 Mother Ignacia Avenue corner Dr. Lazcano St., Brgy. Paligsahan, Quezon City</p> <p>Contact Person: MR. ISAGANI R. SERRANO President info@prrm.org, iserrano@prrm.org; (+632) 3724989</p>	Strengthening the CSO Partners of GEF-SGP in Upper Sierra Madre	Provinces of Nueva Vizcaya, Cagayan, Isabela and Quirino	creation of 1 CSO-based network 7 communities engaged in BDFE (organic agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products) 150 farmers trained on sustainable agriculture technologies; CSOs trained on biodiversity management, sustainable agriculture, social entrepreneurship, disaster risk reduction and management	130,434.47
<p>Tanim Kalikasan (TanimK)</p> <p>Address: M04 CRM III Building 106 Kamias Road, Quezon City 1102 Philippines</p> <p>Contact Person: MR. ESTACIO S. LIM, JR. Executive DirectorJayslim41@gmail.com</p>	Community-based Alternative Livelihood Initiatives in Southern Sierra Madre	SIERRA MADRE General Nakar	7,086 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community engaged in BDFE (coffee)	49,992.68
<p>Sustainable Environment for Rural Development Association (SERD)</p> <p>Address: Project Development Office, Quirino State University, Andres Bonifacio, Diffun, Quirino</p> <p>Contact Person: MS. ELIZABETH T. CARIG Executive Director Sustainable Environment for Rural Development Association, Inc. serd_quirino@yahoo.com</p>	R2R (Ridge to River) Management of Natural Resources: A Showcase Project for Watershed Management and Biodiversity conservation in Quirino Province	SIERRA MADRE Barangays Eden and Dibibi, Cabarroquis, Quirino	1 community-based/co-management model 3,953 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA	49,853.66

<p>Kalahan Educational Foundation, Inc. (KEF)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Imugan, Sta. Fe, Nueva Vizcaya</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. MOISES O. PINDOG Chairman of the Board kalahanef@gmail.com; sammybalinhawang@yahoo.com</p>	<p>ICCA and Community Enterprise Development Project in Cluster 1 of the Ikalahan/Kalanguya Ancestral Domain</p>	<p>SIERRA MADRE Brgys. Bacneng, Barabac, Imugan, Malico, Sta. Rosa and Unib, Municipality of Sta. Fe, Nueva Vizcaya</p>	<p>3,000 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community ICCA 100,000 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community plan incorporating ICCAs 3 communities engaged in BDFE (mushroom, sweets, ecotourism)</p>	<p>50,000.00</p>
<p>Community Forestry Foundation, Inc. (CFFQI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Capitol Hills, Brgy. San Marcos, Cabarroguis, Quirino</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> For. Bernardo A. Faraon Executive Director cffqi_ngo2003@yahoo.com/ 0935-803-4567/0936-495-3723</p>	<p>Integrated Micro-Watershed Enhancement Project Within Critical Slopes Of The Cagayan River Basin In Quirino Province</p>	<p>SIERRA MADRE Nagtipunan, Quirino</p>	<p>100 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p>	<p>44,634.15</p>
<p>DALUHAY Daloy ng Buhay, Inc.</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Sitio Tibag, Purok 5, Brgy. Sabang, Baler, Aurora</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MARIVIC G. PAJARO, Ph.D Philippine Coordinator daluhay@gmail.com/ 09127806338/09358100981</p>	<p>Synergistic and Ecocentric Capacitation of Sierra Madre's Indigenous and Artisanal Communities</p>	<p>Aurora Province, Municipalities of Casiguran, Maria Aurora, Baler, San Luis and Dingalan</p>	<p>7 community-based/co-management model 26,535 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 9 community PAs/MPAs protection of 25 hectares of mangroves 139,691 hectares of managed landscapes (ancestral domain) 9 community land/seascape plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 4 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	<p>130,434.78</p>
<p>Friends of Environment for Development and Sustainability, Inc. (FRENDs)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 56B Quezon St., DDM, Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. TERESITA SERMONIA-ACOSTA Executive Director friends1_99@yahoo.com/ 09209546491</p>	<p>Co-Managing Sierra Madre's Palali Mountain Range As Local Conservation Area for Biodiversity Conservation and Ecosystem Services</p>	<p>SIERRA MADRE Bambang, Bayombong, Kasibu and Quezon, Nueva Vizcaya</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model 43,359 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA 20,000 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community land/seascape plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 4 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	<p>148,817.07</p>

<p>Sitio Maguli Marginal Farmers and Producers Cooperative (SMMFPC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Antagan 1st, Tumauni, Isabela</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. SAMUEL A. DIVINA BOD Chairman samanakatuwa@gmail.com/ 09289888009; 09178349215</p>	<p>Restoration of Degraded Forestlands and Biodiversity within the Tumauni Watershed Forest Reserve</p>	<p>Tumauni Watershed Forest Reserve (TWFR) Brgy. Antagan 1st, Tumauni, Isabela</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model 30 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA</p>	41,220.10
<p>Tribal Center for Development Foundation, Inc. (TCD)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 86 Gomez St., Barangay Poblacion 39, Infanta, Quezon</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. CONCHITA CALZADO Executive Director tribalcenterdev@yahoo.com;sagibin_katutubo@yahoo.com; sagibin_ln@yahoo.com; (042) 535-2453 09995567958; 09284891841; 09466275433</p>	<p>Bantay Lupang Ninuno: Towards Strengthening the Dumagat-Remontado Indigenous Communities Conserved Area in Mts. Irid-Angelo, Barangay Lumutan, General Nakar, Quezon, Region 4-A, Philippines</p>	<p>Mts. Irid-Angelo, Barangay Lumutan, General Nakar, Quezon, Region 4-A</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model 2,60 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA 1 community land-use plan or ancestral domain plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 1 community engaged in BDFE (almaciga resin)</p>	43,478.26
<p>Marine Environment and Resources Foundation, Inc. (MERF)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Administration Office, Ground Floor, The Marine Science Institute Velasquez St., U.P. Diliman, Quezon City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> DR. GIL S. JACINTO President admin@merf.org.ph; 4333645 mirasanchez@yahoo.com; 5867484</p>	<p>Initiating Bioregional Community-Based Biodiversity Conservation on the Benham Rise Seamount</p>	<p>Northern Philippine Sea Bioregion – Batanes, Cagayan, Isabela, Aurora, Quezon, Camarines Sur, Camarines Norte, Catanduanes, Albay and Sorsogon</p>	<p>1 community-based/co-management model (initiated by at least 7 PLGUs/SUCs) Formation of a cadre of future leaders in the BBS-NPS region on Tropical Marine Ecosystems Management (TMEM)</p>	43,478.26
<p>Bagong Lumad Artists Foundation, Inc. (BLAFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 11 Sta. Lucia Street, Rosalia Compound, TandangSora, QC</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Mr. Joey Ayala President +6324567665 +632456 7665 joeyayala@blafi.org, pauline@blafi.org</p>	<p>SiningBayan Social Artistry: Sierra Madre-North Philippine Sea Diversity and Protected Areas Enhancement</p>	<p>Cagayan, Isabela, Aurora, Quezon, Quirino, Nueva Vizcaya and Catanduanes</p>		32,608.69

<p>Save Sierra Madre Network Alliance, Inc. (SSMNA)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Room 232, St. Anthony Blvd., Cambridge St. cor. Aurora Blvd., Cubao, Quezon City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Fr. PEDRO MONTALLANA Chairperson and Acting Executive Director savesierram@yahoo.com; 912 0224</p>	<p>Conserving and protecting the Sierra Madre Mountain Range through collective actions and sustainable community practices</p>	<p>The community sites are located at Sitios Sari, Baykuran, Cablao, and Maktang all in the municipality of General Nakar, Quezon Province; Brgy. Paltic, Dinagalan in Aurora Province; Brgy. Sto. Cristo, Norzagaray, Bulacan; Palaui Island in Cagayan; Sito Binbin in Carranglan, Nueva Ecija; and, Brgy. Dingading, San Guillermo, Isabela province.</p>	<p>9 community-based/co-management models 4 community-managed areas 9 community plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 5 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	84,782.60
<p>Save Sierra Madre Environmental Society, Inc. (SSMESI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Pondohan ng mga Dumagat, Sitio Suha, Brgy. San Mateo, Norzagaray, Bulacan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> BRO.MARTIN FRANCISCO, BMSP Executive Director bro_martinf@yahoo.com; 09175503182</p>	<p>Enhancing the capacity of the Dumagat Tribe for the Protection of the Philippine Eagle and the conservation of Angat Watershed and Forest Reserve</p>	<p>Within the municipalities of Dona Remedios Trinidad, Norzagaray, San Jose Del Monte, Bulacan</p>	<p>10,000 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p>	39,130.43
<p>Earth Day Network, Philippines, Inc. (EDNP)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Suite D3, 3rd Floor, Agcor Building, 335 Katipunan Ave., Brgy. Loyola Heights, Quezon City 1108 Philippines</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Mr. Ryan Vita Executive Director (632) 239-0729; (632) 239-0729 secretariat@earthdayphilippines.org</p>	<p>Protecting Biodiversity Through Developing Community-based Sustainable Use of Natural Resources</p>	<p>Daraitan, Tanay, Rizal</p>	<p>15 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community engaged in BDFE</p>	28,260.86
<p>UP Los Banos Foundation, Inc. (UPLBFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> UPLBFI Bldg., A.P. Aglibut Ave., UPLB, Los Banos, Laguna 4031</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Dr. Casiano S. Abrigo, Jr. Executive Director 09217122591</p>	<p>Organic Farming as a Sustainable Approach to Biodiversity Conservation in Ecologically Vulnerable Areas.</p>	<p>Brgy. Daraitan, Tanay, Rizal</p>	<p>3 communities engaged in BDFE</p>	35,869.56

cs_abrigo@yahoo.com				
<p>Gabriela Masipag Farmers Multi-Purpose Cooperative (GMFMPC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Gabriela, Diffun, Quirino</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Antonio Agnapan Chairman 09214174224 antonioagnapan@rocketmail.com</p>	Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management	Brgy. Gabriela, Diffun, Quirino	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>1 community-managed area</p> <p>management of 100 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>1 community engaged in BDFE</p>	17,934.78
Priority Site: Palawan				
<p>Palawan NGO Network, Inc. (PNNI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Manalo Extension cor. Gabinete Road, Brgy. Bancao-Bancao Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> ATTY. ROBERT A. CHAN Executive Director pnnipal@gmail.com/ 048 4335525</p>	Palawan Envi-KATaLoG: Environmental Knowledge Archives Translated for Local Governance	The entire province of Palawan as an environmental knowledge hub	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>2,000 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>protection of 2,000 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>700,000 hectares of ECAN managed by communities through law enforcement</p>	146,341.46
<p>Palawan Center for Appropriate Rural Technology, Inc. (PCART)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> <i>Unit 2, Zanzibar Bldg., Rizal Ave., Puerto Princesa City</i></p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. LAURENCE J. PADILLA Executive Director Palawan Center for Appropriate Rural Technology, Inc. biofarm@gmail.com; oyen.padilla@gmail.com</p>	Protecting Endangered Species Along Barbacan River and its Mangrove Areas	PALAWAN Seven (7) Barangays north of Roxas, Palawan	<p>2 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>5,400 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>40% METT increase in 1 community PA</p> <p>protection of 1747 hectares of mangroves</p> <p>8 communities engaged in ecotourism</p>	50,004.88
<p>Abaroan Small Farmers Association, Inc. (ASFA)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Barangay Abaroan, Roxas, 5304 Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. ERNESTO D. SILVANO President asfaroxas@gmail.com</p>	Toward Sustainable Management of Tutud Watershed and the whole CBFM in Abaroan, Roxas, Palawan	PALAWAN Brgy. Abaroan in Roxas	<p>1 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>3,953 hectares of community-managed area</p>	25,332.93
<p>Institute for the Development of Educational and Ecological Alternatives, Inc. (IDEAS)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Sitio Sabsaban, Tabon, Quezon, 5304 Palawan</p>	Enhancing Indigenous Food Plant Biodiversity Conservation and Promotion for Community Food Security	PALAWAN Southern Palawan – Selected Communities as Pilot sites within Mt. Mantalingahan Protected landscape, Malanut Watershed, and Victoria Anepahan	<p>3 community-based/co-management model</p> <p>5900 hectares of community-managed area</p> <p>3 community plans that incorporate biodiversity</p>	48,780.40

<p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. ROGER V. GARINGA Executive Director ideaspalawan@yahoo.com.ph; rvgaringa@gmail.com</p>		Range within the administrative jurisdiction of the municipality of Quezon in the province of Palawan	and ecosystem services valuation 1 community engaged in BDFE (indigenous food plants)	
<p>Kalipunan ng Pundasyon ng mga Tagbanua (SARAGPUNTA)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Brgy. 1, Poblacion, Coron, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Rodolfo Aguilar Chairperson 09475599237</p>	Programa ng Pagpapatibay ng Pangangalaga ng Lupain at Karagatan ng Tribung Tagbanua	Labing apat (14) na komunidad sa Municipalidad ng Coron, Busuanga at Culion, Palawan	4 community-based/co-management model 10,000 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA 90,108 hectares of managed landscapes 2 ADSDPPs	117,315.21
<p>Community Centred Conservation (C3) Philippines, Inc.</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Salvacion, Busuanga, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. REYNANTE V. RAMILO Programme Coordinator rey@c-3.org.uk/ +63 998 4951 972</p>	Establishment of Dugong Sanctuary in Busuanga, Palawan: Strengthening Community Participation and Enhancement of Conservation Benefits	Barangay Quezon, Cheey and Calait, Busuanga, Palawan	1 community-based/co-management model 50 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA protection of 300 hectares seagrass beds and 200 hectares of mangroves 1 community engaged in BDFE	43,086.95
<p>Philippines Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Inc. (PBCFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> c/o Negros Forest Ecological Foundation, Inc., South Capitol Road, Bacolod City, Negros Occidental</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> RAFAEL COSCOLLUELA President lmjpaguntalan@pbcfi.org.ph/ 034-4358209</p>	Developing Local Biodiversity Conservation Strategies in Globally Important Areas: Busuanga Island	Barangays Cheey, Bogtong and New Busuanga	1 community-based/co-management model 1,000 hectares of community-managed area	48,780.48
<p>Palawan Conservation Corps, Inc. (PCC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 3rd Floor, City Coliseum, Brgy. San Pedro, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. CHERRY F. DE DIOS Executive Director palcorps1999@gmail.com/ 048-4349854</p>	Expansion of the Conservation Scope of PPSRNP (PA and WHS) in adjacent communities through the establishment of Community-Conserved Areas (CCAs) for Habitat Protection and Biodiversity Conservation	PALAWAN Brgys. Macarascas, Bahile, Babuyan, Tanabag and Binduyan in Puerto Princesa City, Palawan	2 community-based/co-management model 1,500 hectares of community-managed area	50,000.00
Palawan State University – Center for Strategic Policy and Governance (PSU-CSPG)	Empowering Men and Women for Biodiversity	Magsaysay, Palawan	7,597 hectares of managed landscapes	161,595.60

<p><i>Address:</i> G/F Medical Building, Palawan State University Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> PROF. MARILYN G. PABLICO Vice Chair, Board of Incorporators and Trustees cspgpsu@yahoo.com/ 048-4348752</p>	Conservation in Magsaysay, Palawan		1 community land/seascape plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 4 communities engaged in BDFE (cashew, lato, ecotourism, salt)	
<p>Maliliit na Mangingisda ng Caramay Multi-Purpose Cooperative (MMCPC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Caramay, Roxas, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. MEDARDO C. CAPUNO Chairman mmcpc_coop@yahoo.com/ 09296756605</p>	Conserving and Protecting an Island Bay through Networking of MPAs	Green Island Bay, Roxas Palawan	7 community-based/co-management model 252 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 10 MPAs/MPA Network protection of 500 hectares of mangroves 118,951 hectares of managed landscapes	43,478.26
<p>Bono-Bono Gintong Butil Multi-Purpose Cooperative</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Bono-Bono, Bataraza, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. LEONY P. BALIGUAT Chairman bonobonogintongbutil@yahoo.com.ph; +63 920 977 1884</p>	Improving the Coastal Resource Management of San Antonio Bay	Coastal Barangays in San Antonio Bay Bgy. Bono-Bono, Bataraza, Palawan	1 community-based/co-management model 23,345.21 hectares of community-managed area 40% METT increase in 1 community PA/MPA protection of 1,000 hectares of mangroves 3 communities engaged in BDFE (crab fattening, sea cucumber culture, organic farming, nipa products 150 managers on MPA and biodiversity management; 35 bantay-dagat members trained and deputized	44,565.21
<p>Sabang Mangrove Paddle Boat Tour Guide Association Inc. (SMPBTGAI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Sitio Sabang, Brgy. Cabayugan, Puerto Princesa City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. NESTOR C. ELIJAN President miCam1221@yahoo.com; bethmclang@yahoo.com.ph; 09277113637; 09201048287</p>	Sustaining economic growth for Indigenous Cultural Communities (ICCs) through an improved environment, natural resources and biodiversity management in ancestral domains and the Puerto Princesa Subterranean National Park (PPRSNP)	Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park, Western Coast of Palawan, Philippines	1 community-based/co-management model 100 hectares of IP production landscapes 5 communities engaged in BDFE	130,4334.78
<p>Sabang Sea Ferry Multipurpose Cooperative (SSFMPPC)</p>	Promoting Biodiversity and Ecological Integrity of	Communities within Puerto Princesa Subterranean River	7 community-based/co-management model	130,4334.78

<p><i>Address:</i> Sitio Sabang, Brgy. Cabayugan, Puerto Princesa City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MS. TERESITA C. AUSTRIA BOD Chairperson Ssfsc06@yaoo.com/ tesscaustria@yahoo.com; bethmclang@yahoo.com.ph; 0917 585 1980</p>	PPSRNP Through Community-Based Livelihood Enterprises	National Park and its environs including Ulugan Bay	22,000 hectares of community-managed area 20% METT increase in 1 community PA 4,400 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 7 communities engaged in BDFE	
<p>Culion Foundation, Inc. (CFI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> Room 507, Evekal Building, A. Arnaiz Avenue, Legaspi Village, Makati City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. EUGENIO M. CACCAM, JR. Executive Director culionfoundation@gmail.com; 02 812 2170</p>	Achieving Economies of Scale in the Value Chain through Transformation and Consolidation of Biodiversity-Friendly Products in the Calamianes Group of Islands, Palawan	Municipalities of Busuanga, Coron and Culion in Palawan	10 communities engaged in BDFE (mat-weaving, honeybee production, cashew nuts production, dried squid/fish processing, sea cucumber processing)	94,884.78
<p>Candis III Marketing Cooperative (C3MC)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> C3MC, Bacungan, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> MR. JOEL M. GERMINA Chairman dsaligumba@yahoo.com; +63 907 674 3003</p>	Improving Lives of Upland Dwellers thru the Implementation of Functional Community Based Forest Management	CBFM area of Candis III Marketing Cooperative. Bacungan Watershed connecting Irawan Watershed, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan.	1 community-based/co- management model 463 hectares of community-managed area (watershed) 1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation 1 community engaged in BDFE (wood and rattan crafts) At least 50 (est.) participants on Handicraft, souvenir items, wood and rattan craft –making; 4 forest wardens deputized; training conducted on financial management and marketing.	44,343.47
<p>Non-Timber Forest Products – Exchange Programme (NTEP-EP)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 92-A Masikap Extension, Central Diliman, Quezon City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Ms. RUTH CANLAS Executive Director rpcanlas@yahoo.com; 02 426 2757</p>	Enhancing capacities of Indigenous, cultural and local communities as co- managers of VAMR through engagement in biodiversity friendly and sustainable economic activities	Victoria-Anepaan Mountain Ranges (VAMR) Areas in the Municipalities of Aborlan, Narra, and Quezon in Southern Palawan, Philippines	4 communities engaged in BDFE	43,976.08

<p>Katala Foundation, Inc.</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 3rd Floor, JMV Bldg., National Highway, Bgy. Santa Monica, Puerto Princesa City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Indira Dayang L. Widmann Chief Executive Officer +63 48 4347693 ldlacerna@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Community-based wildlife warden scheme</p>		<p>1 community-based/co-management model 16,000 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community engaged in BDFE</p>	
<p>Palawan Katutubo Mission (PKM-AVPPI)</p> <p><i>Address:</i> PKM-AVPPI, Chancery Office, Apostolic Vicariate of Puerto Princesa, # 14 Taft St., Puerto Princesa City (5300), Palawan, Philippines</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Rev. Fr. Armando R. Limsa Executive Director 09154337334/09394942976 armanlimsa@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' towards Environmental Protection and Conservation of Biodiversity in the Victoria Anepaan Mountain Ranges (VAMR), Palawan Province</p>	<p>Municipalities of Aborlan and Narra, Palawan Province</p>	<p>3 community-based/co-management models 1 community-managed area 20,000 hectares of ICCA and 200 hectares of community-managed area (watershed) management of 200 hectares of mangroves 1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p>	<p>43,478.26</p>
<p>The Samdhana Institute</p> <p><i>Address:</i> 32F Kalambaguhan St., 9000 Cagayan de Oro City</p> <p><i>Contact Person:</i> Joan U Jamisolamin Grant Manager - Regional Office +63-88-851-9238 +63-88-851-9238 cristi@samdhana.org, joan@samdhana.org</p>	<p>Capacitating Tagbanua Women and Youth as Ancestral Domian Caretakers and Conservation Leaders</p>	<p>Decabobo-San Nicolas-Decalachao-San Jose Ancestral Domain, Municipality of Coron, Palawan</p>	<p>18,368.37 hectares of managed landscapes 1 community land-use plan that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation</p>	<p>39,130.43</p>

TOR ANNEX B**LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS¹¹**

The evaluation will use the following methods for data collection:

Document Review

The evaluation will include the review of the following documents:

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

Key Informant Interviews

The evaluation will include interviews with key stakeholders:

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

¹¹ This list will be updated before MTE as more documents become available.

TOR ANNEX C

PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

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

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

OUTCOME 1: Effective models for community-based governance of protected areas are demonstrated.				
<p>Output 1.1 : Model community management systems for PAs</p> <p>Indicators : Number of community managed or co-managed PA models operational in project areas</p> <p>Baseline : No specific community co-management models identified in target areas, although NewCAPP is introducing ICCA in Mt. Irid in Gen. Nakar, Quezon. In addition, NewCAPP has established and continues to document various typologies of ICCAs and Local Government Conservation Areas (LGU-LCAs) in various parts of the country, albeit all are outside SGP-5's priority areas. Several Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) have been established and are managed by local communities and local governments within the priority sites, but there is no actual count thereof.</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
At least 10 community management or co-management models established and operational.		At least 2 community management or co-management models established	At least 5 (+2) community management or co-management models established	At least 3 (+2+5) community management or co-management models established
		At least 5 community management or co-management models in process	At least 3 community management or co-management models in process	
	A continuing call for proposals is made with two cutoff dates.	4 cutoff dates for proposals	4 cutoff dates for proposals	1 cutoff date for proposals
<p>Output 1.2 : New or enhanced community-based PAs</p> <p>Indicators : Number of hectares protected through community PAs</p> <p>Baseline : Individual small community protection initiatives in existence in some local communities, but no comprehensive data available. There are around 72 NIPAS sites in the priority sites covering more than 2.8M hectares of land and water bodies. However, there is no data on community protection efforts.</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>

At least ten community Protected Areas established or enhanced encompassing at least 100,000 hectares.		At least 3 PAs established (30,000 has)	At least 5 (+3) PAs established (50,000 has)	At least 2 (+3+5) PAs established (20,000 has)
		At least 5 more PAs in process of establishment	At least 2 more PAs in process of establishment	
	A continuing call for proposals is made with two cutoff dates.	4 cutoff dates for proposals	4 cutoff dates for proposals	1 cutoff date for proposals
<p>Output 1.3 : Degraded habitats within PA restored and rehabilitated by communities to promote the recovery of threatened species and ecosystem services Indicators : a) % increase in METT; b) Number of hectares of mangroves rehabilitated or protected. Baseline : Relevant METT indicators and baseline scores to be decided prior to each relevant grant inception. The Protected Area Management Enhancement Project of GIZ recently caused the conduct of METT in 60 PAs all over the the country, but the data are still under review. There is also no comprehensive data on hectares of mangroves rehabilitated or protected.</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
40% increase in relevant dimensions of management effectiveness in target PAs, as measured by the METT.		At least 4 PAs have achieved 20% increase in relevant METT indicators	At least 4 PAs have achieved 40% increase in relevant METT indicators	At least 10 PAs have achieved 40% increase in relevant METT indicators
		At least 10 more PAs have baseline METT	At least 6 more PAs have achieved 20% increase in relevant METT indicators	At least 4 more PAs have achieved 20% increase in relevant METT indicators
			At least 5 more PAs have baseline METT	
	A continuing call for proposals is made with two cutoff dates.	4 cutoff dates for proposals	4 calls for proposals are made	At least 1 call for proposals made
1,000 hectares of mangrove and/or seagrass areas within the 100,000 ha community-managed protected or conserved areas are rehabilitated or protected		At least 200 has of mangroves and/or seagrass areas are rehabilitated or protected	At least 500 hectares more (+200 has) of mangroves and/or seagrass areas are rehabilitated or protected	At least 300 hectares more (+200+500 has) of mangroves and/or seagrass areas are rehabilitated or protected
		At least 400 has of mangroves are in the process of rehabilitation	At least 300 has of mangroves are in the process of rehabilitation	

	A continuing call for proposals is made with two cutoff dates.	4 cutoff dates for proposals	4 cutoff dates for proposals	1 cutoff date for proposals
OUTCOME 2: Community-managed landscapes and seascapes explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation objectives				
<p>Output 2.1 : Protected landscapes and/or seascapes established</p> <p>Indicators : Number of hectares under improved community “mainstreamed” management within protected landscapes and seascapes, reducing threats to BD from slash and burn farming, over-harvesting of timber, and destructive fishing.</p> <p>Baseline : Zero – no hectareage is under improved community-mainstreamed management in priority sites.</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
400,000 hectares of production landscapes and/or seascapes are under community management or co-management arrangements, mainstreaming biodiversity conservation objectives, thereby reducing threats to biodiversity		At least 125,000 has within PLS are under improved community management	At least 200,000 has (+125,000 has) within PLS are under improved community management	At least 75,000 has (+125,000+200,000 has) within PLS are under improved community management
		Improved community management is in the process of being mainstreamed in at least 150,000 has of PLS	Improved community management is in the process of being mainstreamed in at least 50,000 has of PLS	
	A continuing call for proposals is made with two cutoff dates.	4 cutoff dates for proposals	4 cutoff dates for proposals	1 cutoff date for proposals
<p>Output 2.2 : Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plans (ADSDPPs) and/or community-level land-use plans integrate BD conservation objectives.</p> <p>Output 2.3 : Community-level total economic value (TEV) studies highlight value of ecosystem services.</p> <p>Indicators : Number of community-based land use plans or Ancestral Domain plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations</p> <p>Baseline : Although all LGUs have their respective CLUPs, there is no data as to land use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation. There are also 107 ADSDPPs formulated across the country covering only 9% of the total 1,071 ancestral domains nationwide. There is also no data as to the incorporation of biodiversity and ecosystem services valuations in these ADSDPPs.</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
At least 30 community-based land use plans or ancestral domain plans incorporate biodiversity		At least 10 community mechanisms for landscape/seascape level biodiversity management and coordination are in place	At least 15 (+10) community mechanisms for landscape/seascape level biodiversity management and coordination are in place	At least 5 (+10+15) community mechanisms for landscape/seascape level biodiversity management and coordination are in place

and ecosystem services valuations.		At least 10 plans are in the process of integrating BD conservation objectives	At 3 plans are in the process of integrating BD conservation objectives	
	A continuing call for proposals is made with two cutoff dates.	4 cutoff dates for proposals	4 cutoff dates for proposals	1 cutoff date for proposals
OUTCOME 3: Alternative biodiversity friendly agriculture, fisheries and forestry products produced and marketed by 30 communities				
<p>Output 3.1 : Strengthened community capacity for certification</p> <p>Indicators : Number of biodiversity-friendly products produced and marketed by communities.</p> <p>Baseline : There are no records bearing out the biodiversity-friendly products of local communities</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
30 communities produce and market biodiversity-friendly agriculture, fisheries, forestry and ecotourism products.		Handbook on biodiversity-friendly production and certification published, based on BPP studies.	At least 10 more (+3) community regulations are in place.	At least 17 more (+3+10) community regulations are in place.
		At least 3 communities produce biodiversity friendly products		
		At least 15 more communities are drafting regulations.	At least 15 more communities are drafting regulations.	
OUTCOME 4: Increased capacity of GEF-SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions.				
<p>Output 4.1 : Training mechanisms developed for peer-to-peer learning.</p> <p>Indicators : Number of community-level resource users and managers who are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.</p> <p>Baseline : None amongst grantees to be selected (grants are generally awarded to grantees who have not previously benefitted from GEF-SGP capacity support)</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
At least 4,000 community-level resource users and managers are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership	A framework for developing a cross-cutting program is prepared	A cross-cutting training program for partner organizations and community-level resource users and managers is prepared by site-level hubs with the help of resource persons.		

platforms, and are actively using these tools.		At least 1,500 community-level resource users and managers are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.	At least 2,000 more community-level resource users and managers are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.	At least 500 more community-level resource users and managers are trained to use the GEF-SGP knowledge networking and partnership platforms, and are actively using these tools.
		Training manuals on knowledge networking and partnership platforms prepared		
<p>Output 4.2 : Guidelines, best practice notes and improved biodiversity conservation approaches developed and demonstrated.</p> <p>Indicators : Number of new grants that replicate approaches</p> <p>Baseline : None</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
Replication of conservation and sustainable use approaches in at least 30 new grants by year 4	No output for Year 1.	Guidelines for best practices adopted.	10 new grants replicate good practices.	20 new grants aim to replicate best practices.
		At least 5 best practices are initially identified by SGP partners per site	4 site-based (Palawan, Samar Island, Upper Sierra Madre, Lower Sierra Madre) partners' conference conducted.	4 site-based (Palawan, Samar Island, Upper Sierra Madre, Lower Sierra Madre) partners' conference conducted.
		At least 10 best practices are identified and recognized by SGP partners as such	1 National GEF-SGP partners' convention conducted.	1 National GEF-SGP partners' convention conducted
			1 video production on best practices	1 video production on best practices
				1 publication (book) on best practices
		1 comic book publication on at least 5 best practices	1 comic book publication on at least 5 more best practices	1 comic book publication on at least 5 more best practices

<p>Output 4.3 : New knowledge networking and partnership platforms for inter-community knowledge sharing.</p> <p>Indicators : % increase in the amount of co-funding for the Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3</p> <p>Baseline : Minimum of 1:1 co-funding for grants</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
50% increase in amount of co-funding for Philippines GEF-SGP by year 3	SGP website created, populated and updated	SGP website maintained and populated	SGP website maintained and populated	SGP website maintained and populated
		SGP database is created, populated and updated	SGP database is maintained	SGP database is maintained
	At least one SGP account/page is created in a social networking site with at least 150 subscribers	Social networking account is maintained with 400 subscribers	Social networking account is maintained with 600 subscribers	Social; networking account is maintained with 700 subscribers
		20% increase in co-financing is achieved	30% increase (50% total) in co-financing is achieved	50% increase in co-financing is maintained
<p>Output 4.4 : Strategic partnerships among community groups, private sector, and academia for long term sustainability planning. Indicators : Number of governors who launch community-based partnerships by year 4</p> <p>Baseline : None reported in priority sites.</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
Community-based partnership initiatives launched by at least 4 LGUs by end of year 4		At least one community-based partnership initiative is launched by at least one governor in a priority site.	At least two community-based partnership initiatives are launched by at least one governor in a priority site.	At least one community-based partnership initiative is launched by at least one governor in a priority site.
OUTCOME 5: Enhanced capacities of GEF-SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects and environmental trends.				
<p>Output 5.1 : Training programme on identification and tracking of indicators, and project participatory monitoring.</p> <p>Indicators : a) Number of GEF-SGP grantees participating in monitoring and evaluation training; b) % increase in knowledge before/after training</p> <p>Baseline : No M&E framework for SGP Philippines and grantees not yet trained.</p>				
<i>End of Project Targets</i>	<i>2014 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2015 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2016 Targets/Deliverables</i>	<i>2017 Targets/Deliverables</i>
SGP Philippines M&E framework is established		M&E manual for community implementation prepared.		

		Measures on knowledge in M&E are established.		
All project grantees, except Planning Grant recipients, are trained on GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, improving 30% in level of knowledge on fundamentals of M&E		Baseline on knowledge of M&E fundamentals of at least 30 more grantees is established.	Baseline on knowledge of M&E fundamentals of at least 40 more grantees is established.	Baseline on knowledge of M&E fundamentals of at least 10 more grantees is established.
		At least 30 more grantees are trained on doing M&E.	At least 40 more grantees are trained on doing M&E.	At least 10 more grantees are trained on doing M&E.
		At least 30 grantees have improved knowledge on M&E fundamentals by 30%.	At least 40 more grantees have improved knowledge on M&E fundamentals by 30%.	At least 10 more grantees have improved knowledge on M&E fundamentals by 30%.
At least 80% of projects, except Planning Grants, adopt/adapt and implement GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols, and improve on the quality and accuracy of project monitoring reports, as assessed by progress reports		At least 80% of grantees from among those given adopt/adapt GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols	At least 80% of grantees from among those given adopt/adapt GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols	At least 80% of grantees from among those given adopt/adapt GEF-SGP M&E framework and protocols
		At least 60% of those that adopt/adapt GEF-SGP M&E framework show improvement on the quality and accuracy in project monitoring reports	At least 70% of those that adopt/adapt GEF-SGP M&E framework show improvement on the quality and accuracy in project monitoring reports	At least 80% of those that adopt/adapt GEF-SGP M&E framework show improvement on the quality and accuracy in project monitoring reports

TOR ANNEX D: EVALUATION QUESTIONS¹²

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?				
<i>Example</i> Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?	How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD? Does the project support other international conventions, such as the UNFCCC and the UNDRIP?	UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design Level of implementation of UNCBD in the Philippines, Program of Work on Protected Areas and contribution of the project Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design	Project documents National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally UNCBD and other international convention web sites	Documents analyses Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners
Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduction in threats to biodiversity in KBAs, and/or improved ecological status?				

¹² The Consultants are encouraged to develop more specific evaluation questions in the course of preparing the Inception Report

TOR ANNEX E: OBLIGATORY RATING SCALES

Rating Scales		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings	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) Impact Ratings: 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N) Additional ratings
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

ANNEX F: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT 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 Form¹³**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: _____

¹³ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

TOR ANNEX G

EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹⁴

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

Executive Summary

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

Acronyms and Abbreviations

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual¹⁵)

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 rated¹⁶)

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks

¹⁴ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹⁶ 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.

- 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)
- 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

ANNEX H: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by**UNDP County Office**

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annex I**CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP
SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS**

Co Financing Types/Sources	IA Own Financing (Million US \$)		Government (Million US \$)		Other Sources ¹⁷ (Million US \$)		Total Financing (Million US \$)		Total Disbursement (Million US \$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Equity										
In Kind										
Non grant instruments ¹⁸										
Other Types										
TOTAL										

¹⁷ Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, etc. Specify each and explain “Other sources” of co-financing when possible.

¹⁸ Describe “Non-grant instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.)