

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:	913		Review date: at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1359	GEF financing:	0.743270	N/A
Project Name:	Biodiversity Conservation and Management of the Bohol Islands Marine Triangle (BMTP)	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Philippines	Government:		
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	0.637611	0.603
Operational Program:	OP2	Total Project Cost:	1.380881	N/A
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Foundation for the Philippines Environment	Work Program date		N/A
		CEO Endorsement		12/05/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		03/15/2001
	Bohol Alliance of NGOs (BANGON)	Closing Date	Proposed: December 2005	Actual: June 2007
Prepared by: Anna	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 57 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 75 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 18 months
Author of TE: Michael D. Pido, Rodolfo Ferdin, and N. Quicho Jr.		TE completion date: 19 June 2007	TE submission date to GEF OE: 09/13/2007	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 3 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	HS	S	N/A	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	N/A	N/A	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No. Although the TE contains good analysis of outputs, it is missing ratings, and budget and expenditure figures.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the project document the overall goal of the project is to ensure that options and existence values of the globally significant Bohol Marine Triangle are conserved. There were no changes during implementation.

• **What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the TE the primary objective of the project is to enable the conservation of the biodiversity resources in the BMT through a more effective, equitable and sustainable planning, implementation, and monitoring and law enforcement of biodiversity conservation efforts.

According to the latest PIR a change was made to the objectives:

Outcome 8: Sustainable Livelihoods - Following the Mid-Term evaluation recommendations to separate distinctly from sustainable financing mechanism, sustainable livelihoods was an added outcome.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

• **What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?**

According to the TE the project has contributed to conserving the option and existence values of the globally significant Bohol Marine Triangle. This goal has been achieved as evidenced by the biological and physical parameters that have either stabilized or have increased beyond the 1999 baseline. These include:

- increased hard coral cover from 0.60% to 5.20%
- increased percentage of live coral ranging from 1% to 8%
- increased mangrove forest cover
- increased fish stocks/biomass within the project-assisted MPAs (claimed by the members of the MPA Management Teams and measured using the Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation System (BIOME) methodology)

The project has enabled the conservation of the biodiversity resources in the BMT through a more effective, equitable and sustainable planning, implementation, and monitoring and law enforcement of biodiversity conservation efforts.”

- increased the number of marine reserves to 14
- increased total area of MPA to 176 ha (900% increase)
- reduced the incidence of environment/resource destructive activities, particularly solid waste disposal and to a certain extent illegal fishing activities

The TE states outcomes by objectives (called outputs in the project brief)

For Output 1 (Institutional Strengthening), the expected CRM plans (barangay and municipal) were completed, and 14 MPAs were established and made operational including their corresponding Management Teams. For Output 2 (Policies and Enforcement), training and equipment support for law enforcement was provided, as well as local policies were improved. In the case of Output 3 (Research and Monitoring), all the baseline, the Participatory Resource Assessment (PCRA) and In-depth Resource Assessments, as well the studies related to the human dimension were completed. The BMT Valuation study deserves special mention, as it provides the policy and decision makers with the value of the BMT in terms of its monetary equivalent.

Output 4 (Environmental education and awareness building) was largely completed. These included communities' orientations, study or learning tours facilitated and development and distribution of the IEC materials. For Outcome 5 (Sustainable Financing Mechanism), the documents required were produced. Neither the user fee nor the trust fund system, however, was made operational. Outcome 6 (Ecosystem Rehabilitation) came up with the required rehabilitation plan. Actual rehabilitation was done for mangroves; physical infrastructure support was also provided for the MPA sites.

Outcome 7 (Integrated Master Planning) culminated with the crafting of a 10-Year plan. Instead of a Master Plan, though, the consensus was to craft instead a BMT-wide CRM plan covering the three municipalities. The BMT Management Council – also called PADAYON – is being strengthened as a functional and working management entity. For Outcome 8 (Sustainable Livelihood), some US\$20,000 was provided for livelihood activities to complement conservation efforts. Such fund was complimented with livelihood training and demonstration programs. An eco-tourism plan is also being developed with multi-sectoral participation.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

A Relevance

Rating: 5

The TE does not discuss relevance per se, but the project's outcomes are consistent with OP2: Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems. Development of MPAs, a Coastal Resource Management Plan, and alternative livelihoods are in line with OP2. According to the TE, generally, the project results contributed to the desired outcomes of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) and the Philippine Agenda 21.

B Effectiveness

Rating: 5

Results are commensurate with the objectives stated in the project brief. According to the TE, the BMT project can be assessed as relatively successful, given that most of the 27 deliverables within its 8 outputs were largely accomplished as intended. The only deliverable rated as marginally unsatisfactory pertains to the elimination of the 'damaging activities, such as sand mining and disposal of untreated waste eliminated by year 4.'

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: 4

The project suffered some implementation delays due to a vague organizational structure (see 4.2.C below). According to the TE these management problems caused some delays and glitches in project implementation that the BMTP had to be extended for another year-and-a-half. Despite its extension, it has not been able to hit all its targets. Concerning cost-effectiveness, expenditures on study tours and cross visits were on the higher side compared to benefits and project deliverables.

4.1.2 Impacts

The BMT project reports very positive results of increased coral, mangrove and fish stocks based on the 2006 BIOME survey. The TE recommends that a study be undertaken using independent assessments to verify the results. An informal interview with an Earth Watch researcher who conducted research in the MPAs indicated that the fish density/biomass in some sanctuaries may have decreased compared with the 2004 levels.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

A Financial resources

Rating: 3

According to the TE, provincial and municipal governments are expected to provide additional cash and staff contribution to the PADAYON. Further, both shall expedite the operationalization of the user fee system, while the private sector is encouraged to provide in-kind and/or in-cash contribution to sustain the operation of PADAYON. The private sector is called upon to support PADAYON through funding and program implementation. Moreover, the sector may also assist in various conservation initiatives, such as awareness campaign.

People's Organizations may take advantage of the capacity building endeavors they gained from the BMT project. They may start strengthening themselves financially by starting to develop and to submit their independent project proposals.

B Socio political

Rating: 3

According to the TE, establishing the PADAYON as multi-sectoral management body is a unique contribution of the project. It has produced local conservation champions coming from the politicians, government bureaucrats and local communities but it still needs continued financial and technical support as a fledgling organization.

C Institutional framework and governance

Rating: 3

According to the TE the project was managed by FPE which contracted the Bohol Alliance of Non-Government Organizations (BANGON) to be the implementer on the ground. FPE acted as fund manager, monitor and consolidator of reports. It appeared that BANGON, as a network, was not yet fully equipped to implement a complex project as the BMTP. Thus, in 2005, community mobilization work was transferred to the newly-created and project-initiated PADAYON BMT Management Council. However, as a fledgling organization itself, PADAYON is similarly unprepared to take on the multi-component BMTP. To address this concern, FPE has engaged the services of consultants to fill in the gaps of PADAYON, while at the same time building the capacity of the latter to take on the whole gamut of the BMTP's management work. These difficulties may have hampered the pace of project implementation. Nevertheless, it has proven the capacity of the project management to resolve management and relationship issues amicably (which resulted in a smooth "changing of guards") and adapt to changing conditions.

Establishing the PADAYON as multi-sectoral management body is a unique contribution of the project. The impending closure of the project is untimely as far as PADAYON is concerned. There is a need for continued financial and technical support to the fledgling organization. The project has produced local champions in the grassroots, the business sector and the local governments. Among the PO members, Mr.

Victor Rondez is now a resource person about the BIOME, and was invited by the Project SeaHorse and the FISH Project that are operating in Danajon reef. With or without a formal structure, a social movement is in the offing in BMT.	
D Environmental	Rating: UA
No environmental risks are discussed in the TE.	

4.3 Catalytic role

<p>a. Production of a public good</p> <p>Following the MTE recommendation, the program of education and awareness building was improved from being generic into strategic. According to the TE a BMT-wide communication plan was formulated and implemented, but a thematic IEC strategy was applied geographically based on the issues confronting each municipality. The change in emphasis of the IEC resulted in stronger stakeholder collaboration for the BMT's resource management. As a result of the tailor-fitted information and education strategies, the annual Stakeholders' Forum and the BMT's "Pyesta sa Dagat " further informed the public on the gains and accomplishments of the Project. Intensified training of the fish wardens and the surveillance patrolling likewise reduced the incidence of damaging activities to the marine environment. Further, the BMT was also able to leverage funds from the Coastal Fisheries Resources Conservation Project of the WWF and the USAID, which were also operating in Panglao that synergized the IEC activities.</p>
<p>b. Demonstration</p> <p>According to the TE, the Project's Resource Assessment by the SUML has been used by different projects and researches. BMT-wide and per municipality ecotourism appraisal and planning was facilitated by the project. This is considered to be a landmark accomplishment for ecotourism for Bohol. It will be replicated by the FOCAS projects (PACAP funded).</p>
<p>c. Replication</p> <p>According to the TE, research carried out by the Project was replicated by the MACOTAPADA Management Council. Also, technical assistance was sought by the Municipality of Dauis to help establish another MPA.</p>
<p>d. Scaling up</p> <p>Relevant policies, resolutions, ordinances in the three municipalities were reviewed. According to the TE, policy dialogues were conducted resulting in improved policies. More judicious implementation of such policies resulted in the reduction of resource-destructive and other illegal activities. Their impacts are most noticeable in sand mining and waste disposal activities, but not in marine fisheries. Policy implementation has been facilitated given that the PADAYON functions also as a policy recommending body for the three BMT municipalities.</p>

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

A. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): 5
<p>The project brief states that a participatory M&E system that aims to maximize the involvement of project stakeholders in the process will be used. The PMO will monitor the project based on indicators in the logical framework.</p> <p>The indicators are SMART. Progress of the project will be assessed quarterly and a more in depth review will be conducted annually. The M&E plan also includes a baseline, process an impact evaluation studies. The baseline had already been conducted during project formulation.</p>	
B. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): 5
<p>According to the TE a monitoring system for MPAs was installed using the FPE's Biological Monitoring Evaluation System (BIOME). A bi-annual monitoring and updating using a method called BIOME was done by the MPA management teams. Community members were also trained to participate in the monitoring of MPAs. A mid-term evaluation of the BMT project was carried out in May 2004.</p>	
<p>C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? The TE does not provide information on budgeting for M&E. The project brief budget does not have a separate line for M&E. M&E activities could have been financed from several lines, including Monitoring & Information Systems, and Project Administration.</p>	
<p>C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? The TE does not provide information on budgeting or expenditures for M&E.</p>	
<p>C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? Yes. The biodiversity monitoring system could be considered a good practice. According to the TE, a bi-annual monitoring and updating using a method called BIOME was done by the MPA management teams. The term BIOME was coined and modified by the FPE, which is generally patterned after FPE's own biodiversity monitoring systems (BMS) but integrated with a social perspective. The modifications were introduced by Silliman University. Through lecture and actual field monitoring, community members who are part of the MPA Management Team were</p>	

able to assist/conduct biophysical monitoring both inside and outside the MPAs. The BIOME methodology and the experience of MPA managers could be a good case study, although the FPE launched BIOME as a monitoring tool for all its site-focused projects, yet only the BMTP utilized and sustained this method.

4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?

The TE lists 12 lessons of which the following could be considered a good practice or approach to avoid.

Provide a venue for enhanced partner collaboration - The project provided an avenue for the NGOs to work together. In the past, the NGOs either worked on their own, or competed with each other, both in project development and implementation. As such, BANGON became the umbrella of six Bohol-based NGOs in working together to attain common objectives. The project also became a catalyst for the NGOs to work together with the LGUs. In the past, NGOs were mostly antagonistic with the government bodies. In turn, the LGUs regard them with suspicion. The BMTP was able to forge partnerships with different projects operating in the area. All Projects became partners leading to better synergy of conservation efforts. The partners also utilized the baselines of the BMTP. Hence, enhanced institutional partnership will be a project legacy.

Collaboration among the NGO's could have been improved if the division of project components had been based on NGO's strengths or areas of specialization rather than on geographically and NGO's areas of political influence.

Recognize "marginalized" stakeholders -The recognition of marginalized stakeholders can be important for project success. The Badjao, an indigenous people group, were not recognized as stakeholders in the project design nor in the early phase project implementation. Through the BMTP, however, they were acknowledged and efforts were made to include them as project partners. Specific needs analyses were undertaken for this group. As a project spin-off, a project proposal about a pro-literacy program for Badjaos was approved – thru the BMTP intercession – to improve the flight of the Badjaos. A profile of the Badjao community was the initial output, which could become a reference for several project proposals.

Local communities may be relied upon as MPA monitors - If properly trained, community members could be relied upon to undertake M&E of MPA sites. A monitoring system for MPAs was installed using the FPE's Biological Monitoring Evaluation System (BIOME), with some appropriate modifications introduced by SUML. Through lectures and actual field monitoring, community members who are part of the MPAMT were able to assist/conduct biophysical monitoring both inside and outside MPAs. Hence, the community members can now assess broadly the conditions of the coral reefs and associated fisheries. The BIOME methodology and the experience of MPA managers could be a good case study. Although the FPE launched BIOME as a monitoring tool for all its site-focused projects, only the BMTP utilized and sustained this method methodology.

Livelihood components must have clear linkages to conservation - To make a meaningful contribution to conservation, alternative livelihood benefits must accrue to those who will lose their access to resources. Traditional hunters of whale sharks, manta rays, dolphins and other marine wildlife were the ones who lost their livelihoods in the BMT area, but the main beneficiaries of the livelihood assistance provided by the BMTP through the BANGON, however, were not necessarily the hunters. Furthermore, the links of these livelihoods to conservation must be explicit and well know. In the BMTP, to what extent these livelihoods: (1) reduce resource utilization, or (2) minimize environmental degradation was not very clear.

Reorient the "output requirements" of study tours - Study tours and/or cross visits are among the fastest modes to learn new things or assimilate new information pertaining to resource management. These are legitimate project activities being encouraged by UNDP, GEF and other donors for learning from experiences in other countries and other sites in the Philippines. Moreover, they become unique avenues for bonding and building inter-personal relationships. These types of activities, however, can be very costly due to the high transport and accommodation requirements amounting to some US\$63,000 or 9% of the total project budget. Therefore, the outputs need not only be learning and/or knowledge acquisition but applications, as appropriate. Those who will participate in the trips must be made aware that they will come up with specific deliverables after such trips, e.g. make a report or recommendations about their subject areas. For example, about PhP200,000 (US\$8,000) was spent in exposure trips to learn about the user fee system in the Philippines. As such, the participants could have been tasked not only to report their learning, but actually participate in the development of the proposed user fees as either a resource person or an advocate in the legitimization process. In such manner, the activity becomes more of a professional

endeavor, and not simply a learning experience.

List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE makes numerous recommendations addressed to seven specific organizations or management entities. These are the: FPE, PADAYON, UNDP/GEF, municipal/provincial governments, private sector, NGOs, and POs.

The FPE is recommended primarily to: (1) orchestrate stakeholder meetings to re-engineer the PADAYON; (2) develop a technical paper of the project experiences and lessons in MPA management; (3) lead national discussions on critical coastal resource management topics; and (4) implement project closure activities covered by Tripartite Review (TPR) meetings.

For the PADAYON, the recommendations are to: (1) review the PADAYON's organizational structure and mechanisms; (2) expedite the establishment of sustainable financing mechanisms; (3); elicit more active participation from the private sector and other project entities (4); federate the 14 existing MPAs into an MPA network; (5) work for professionalization of marine law enforcers; and (6) review the rights and rules system of MPAs.

In the case of the UNDP/GEF, it is encouraged to undertake a study of the selected BMT areas using independent assessments. Moreover, it is anticipated to engage consultants in detailed documentation of lessons learned in CRM/MPA management of the BMT areas.

The provincial and municipal governments are expected to provide additional cash and staff contribution to the PADAYON. Further, both shall expedite the operationalization of the user fee system, while the private sector is encouraged to provide in-kind and/or in-cash contribution to sustain the operation of PADAYON.

The private sector is called upon to support PADAYON through funding and program implementation. Moreover, the sector may also assist in various conservation initiatives, such as awareness campaign.

The POs must continue enhancing organizational capacity, and may take advantage of the capacity building endeavors they gained from the BMT project. The NGOs are still expected to provide technical support to the PADAYON.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.

The project was visited for the Country Portfolio Evaluation and Capacity Development Evaluation in March 2006:

The Biodiversity Conservation and Management of the Bohol Islands Marine Triangle (BMT) project was designed to ensure the protection of significant coastal and marine ecosystems in an area spanning the islands of Panglao, Balicasag and Pamilacan in Bohol Province in central Philippines. Rather than managing conservation efforts within the National Integrated Protected Areas System, it was managed by a body consisting of local communities, NGO's, and local government representatives. The Foundation for Philippine Environment executed the project in partnership with the Bohol Alliance of NGOs. The Padayon BMT Management Council, an NGO established in 2002, has taken over activities since project completion in June 2007.

The objective of the project was to ensure conservation of the BMT's biodiversity resources through more effective, equitable and sustainable planning, monitoring, and enforcement of biodiversity conservation efforts. Capacity development was central to the project's approach. An integrated coastal zone management planning system to strengthen government and community institutions guided the process. Various trainings, workshops and study tours were undertaken to increase skills in management, species inventory, monitoring and evaluation, and law enforcement. The project carried out intensive education and awareness building activities to secure participation of different stakeholders within and outside the project sites. The project worked with communities to assist them in establishing effective marine protected areas (MPAs) and implementing sustainable harvest schemes for coastal resources. Promotion of alternative livelihoods played a key role after the midterm review of the project.

As a result of project activities, the percentage of coral cover and mangrove forests has increased. Biodiversity monitoring by the community showed a relative increase of fish stocks within the MPAs established and managed under the project. The project provided an avenue for NGOs to work as partners and in collaboration with local government units. A 10-year coastal resource management plan has been crafted that reflects the vision of all stakeholders. The results of training in alternative livelihoods have not been as positive. This is partly because the goal of economic development was not sufficiently integrated with the goal of conservation. Beneficiaries were not necessarily those who lost access to marine resources, but often people who were able to supplement their household's total income. The linkage between conservation and livelihoods promoted by the project such as raising livestock, handicrafts, and ecotourism, were not clear. Also, the financial sustainability of such activities as a valid alternative livelihood is ambiguous. For example, the ecotourism activities of the Pamilacan Island Dolphin and Whale Watching Organization were impressive, but the financial sustainability is doubtful.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Yes.	5
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Yes.	5
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes.	5
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes.	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Detailed information on cofinancing was not provided.	3
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes.	5

4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<p>Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>According to the TE the PMO was able to leverage/mobilize additional resources in terms of technical assistance and co-financing. To date, some US\$ US\$0.603 million were generated by the PMO that included contribution from the following sources: World Wildlife Fund-Philippines, Louis Berger, CCEF, resort operators and diveshop owners, among others.</p>
<p>Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>According to the TE management problems caused some delays and glitches in project implementation that the BMTP had to be extended for another year-and-a-half.</p> <p>Project management mode changed in an almost revolutionary fashion due to pressing realities and as a means to transition from an interventionist arrangement to a locally-managed effort. The project is managed by FPE as its executing agency. As such, project implementation is under the direct oversight of its Executive Director, while the Visayas Regional Unit provides technical and monitoring support on a periodic basis. As committed in the project document, the FPE set up the BMTP's PMO on field to ensure that the activities agreed upon are implemented as scheduled by the responsible parties. Recognizing that the FPE is a funding and not an implementing institution, the latter launched a search for the appropriate NGO to be the main implementing agent.</p> <p>After a year-long search and given institutional realities at the time, it was decided that BANGON would be the NGO that was most suited for the job. BANGON is a consortium of 16 developmental NGOs in Bohol. Six of them possess various expertise that, when put together, offer huge potential for project success: BIDEF and PROCESS have enviable track record in CRM; FCBFI has been developing microfinance programs in coastal and other areas; ELAC is acknowledged as a leading public interest environmental law organization; Feed the Children has a long record of involvement in social work; and BFI is known for community organizing work.</p>

BANGON was contracted by FPE in April 2002 to be the implementing arm of the project, along with other NGOs and institutions. It was provided in the contract that the work will be distributed by BANGON among its qualified member NGOs. However, instead of dividing the job in accordance with their thematic expertise, the member NGOs divided the project geographically. Logically, it resulted in some NGOs performing tasks beyond their expertise which could have been done better by other partner NGOs. In 2003, when Mary Ann Tercero joined the PMO as Project Coordinator, she initiated the conduct of a Community Organizing Assessment to evaluate the level of progress in that area of work. The assessment done by the Tambuyog Development Center showed the some works of BANGON members did not fulfill the standards stipulated in the contractual agreement. This resulted in a sort of 'strained' relationship between BANGON and PMO that in late 2005, a mediated negotiation was found in order. The dispute management process led to the changing of guards, so to speak. By 2006, a transition took place where BANGON phased out from project management to give way to the newly-organized PADAYON. A depiction of the institutional arrangement between the PMO and BANGON in 2003, and between the PMO in PADAYON in 2005 can be found in Annexes 4 and 5, respectively.

The evaluators see this as a problem in project design. As the FPE should have known at the first instance that it is not in a position to be the project implementer, it should have already partnered with a local NGO to do so. Otherwise, it should have started with the establishment or enabling of a local implementer.

What happened between FPE-PMO and BANGON may have been unfortunate, but it is a rich source of lessons that cannot be overemphasized. First, BANGON was then a young network of NGOs. It was struggling in coming to terms with its own development. More importantly, its member-NGOs have their own thrusts and survival interests. When put together, clashes of interests resulted in competition or otherwise unhealthy relations among them, particularly during the project's earlier phase. It was even admitted that among the BMT partners in BANGON, there was a sharp divide among its members based on principles, work ethics and politics. Rosalinda Paredes, BANGON President at that time, said that BANGON was not ready to take on a project as complex in design as BMTP especially because it (BANGON) was still a work in progress. However, she pointed out that the FPE and the UNDP knew of their situation. A good orientation at the onset, defining roles, studying the capacities of the project staff of each NGO at the start could have been a better approach, she said.

Indeed, there seemed to have been miscommunication between FPE and BANGON, as the MTE pointed out the issue on whether the partnership between the two was a "co-management of the project" or a "co-management of resources". A review of the contract between FPE and BANGON suggests that the TORs were not explicit about the co-management arrangement. With PADAYON coming in late into the game, FPE/PMO as executing agency is facing a huge challenge, i.e., equipping PADAYON with technical and financial sustainability skills to ensure the continuation of the conservation and development gains of the project.

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes: X	No:
---------------	------------

Explain: The BMT project reports very positive results of increased coral, mangrove and fish stocks based on the 2006 BIOME survey. As the TE recommends, a study should be undertake using independent assessments to verify the results. An informal interview with an Earth Watch researcher who conducted research in the MPAs indicated that the fish density/biomass in some sanctuaries may have decreased compared with the 2004 levels.

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

MSP brief, PIR 2006, site visit for the Evaluation of GEF Capacity Development Activities