

**CONSOLIDATED
PARTICIPATORY FINAL REVIEW AND EVALUATION
(PFRE)**

**MOUNT ISAROG INTEGRATED CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (MIICDP)**

AND

**SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF MOUNT ISAROG'S TERRITORIES
(SUMMIT)**

**Spike Millington
Errol Gatumbato
Salve Narvadez**

May 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations	page 1
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	6
Findings, Lessons Learned and Recommendations	8
DAC Evaluation Report Summary	34
Project Ratings Summary	35
Financial Planning Co-Financing Matrix	36
Annex 1 Terms of Reference for PFRE	
Annex 2 Logframe with Latest Status Report	
Annex 3 Process Documentation, including Stakeholder Workshops (CD)	

List of Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADSDPP	Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan
AIP	Annual Investment Plan
ANIS	Anduyog Isarog
ANR	Assisted Natural Regeneration
ARB	Agrarian Reform Beneficiary
BDP	Barangay Development Plan
BMS	Biodiversity Monitoring System
BURDFI	Bicol Upland Resources Development Foundation
CADC	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claim
CADT	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title
CARD	Center for Agricultural and Rural Development
CBBMG	Community Based Biodiversity Monitoring Group
CBO	Community Based Organization
CENRO	Community Environment and Natural Resources Office
CLOA	Certificate of Land Occupancy Award
CRMP	Community Resource Management Plan
CSI	Community Sustainability Indicator
CWA	Comaguinking Womens Association
DA	Department of Agriculture
DLR	Department of Land Reform (formerly Dept. of Agrarian Reform)
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development
EC	European Commission
ER	Expected Result
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FT	Facilitator Team
FR	Forest Ranger
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GMP	General Management Plan
ICDP	Integrated Conservation and Development Project
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IP	Indigenous People
IPAF	Integrated Protected Area Trust Fund
IPRA	Indigenous Peoples Rights Act
KQI	Key Questions and Issues
LGA	Local Government Agency
LGU	Local Government Unit
LIVECOR	Livelihood Corporation
LRA	Land Registration Authority
LTS	Land Tenure Security
MIG	Mount Isarog Guardian
MIICDP	Mount Isarog Integrated Conservation and Development Project

SUMMIT/MIICDP Participatory Final Review and Evaluation

MINP	Mount Isarog National Park
MNWD	Metro Naga Water District
MSO	Member Savings Operation
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
MTR	Mid-Term Review
MUZ	Multiple Use Zone
NCIP	National Commission of Indigenous Peoples
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NTFP	Non Timber Forest Products
NIPAP	National Integrated Protected Area Project
NIPAS	National Integrated Protected Areas System
NTM	Non-Tenured Migrant
OIC	Officer In Charge
OPM	Organized Production and Marketing
PACBRMA	Protected Area Community Based Resource Management Agreement
PAMB	Protected Area Management Board
PA	Protected Area
PAO	Protected Area Office
PASu	Protected Area Superintendent
PCARRD	Philippine Center for Agriculture, Forestry Resources Research and Development
PENRO	Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office
PFRE	Participatory Final Review and Evaluation
PMO	Project Management Office
PO	Peoples' Organization
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
QTM	Qualified Tenured Migrant
RBA	Rights Based Approach
RUA	Resource Use Assessment
SO	Specific Objective
SMEDI	Small and Medium Enterprise Development Institute
SPHI	Samahang Pangkalikasan ng Harubay, Inc.
SRPAO	Survey and Registration of Protected Area Occupants
SUMMIT	Sustainable Management of Mount Isarog's Territories
SUZ	Sustainable Use Zone
TESDA	Technical Education and Skills Development Authority
TM	Tenured Migrant
TOR	Terms of Reference
TRA	Threat Reduction Assessment
TRT	Threat Reduction Targeting
UCPB	United Coconut Planters Bank
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
ZAICO	Zepeda Agro-Industrial Corporation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mount Isarog Integrated Conservation and Development Project (MIICDP), financed by the European Commission (EC) and the UNDP/GEF-funded Sustainable Management of Mount Isarog Territories (SUMMIT) together constitute a co-funded integrated conservation and development project for Mt. Isarog Natural Park (MINP) in the province of Camarines Sur, Philippines. A Participatory Final Review and Evaluation (PFRE) of the project was undertaken from March 28 to May 4, 2005, the main purpose of which was to facilitate a process of social learning, capacity development and stakeholder mobilization through a participatory review of project assessment, lessons learned and recommendations. A three-person team, working with a multi-stakeholder workshop facilitation team, carried out a series of participatory workshops in seven communities surrounding MINP, as well as meeting with key organizations and individuals. The findings, lessons learned and recommendations of this report reflect the results of that process and have been validated by the multi-stakeholder group.

The project consists of six components

- ***institution building and capacity development***: to strengthen the capabilities of MINP's key stakeholders in community-based protected area management
- ***sustainable livelihoods***: to increase income-generating opportunities to decrease environmental pressure on the forest resources of the park;
- ***forest rehabilitation***: to rehabilitate/restore degraded areas of MINP;
- ***land tenure security***: to increase land tenure security in the adjacent communities to encourage investment in sustainable agriculture activities;
- ***biodiversity monitoring and socio-economic research***: to generate updated information on MINP's biodiversity and the socio-economic status of adjacent communities; and
- ***information, education and communication (IEC)***: to increase public awareness of the value of MINP and its conservation and the impact of human behavior on it.

Findings

1. The project design was very ambitious, given the scope of the objectives and activities and the limited time frame of four years. This should have been explicitly recognized in the project design, which should have either allocated more time (perhaps a two-phase project) or proposed a more limited set of targeted outcomes and an incremental implementation of related activities.
2. The project design is unclear about the goals and approach of the project, particularly the linkage between conservation of MINP and the development of sustainable livelihoods. This resulted in compartmentalization of the project rather than implementation of an integrated strategy.
3. The project should have built in a strategy for sustainability (institutional, financial and socio-economic) of project activities from the beginning and explicitly included a process for monitoring progress towards sustainability. Currently the sustainability of some project-supported institutions (e.g. PAMB and CBOs) is unclear, as is the continuation of some project-initiated activities (e.g. organic agriculture, biodiversity monitoring).

4. In terms of achieving its goal of conservation of MINP, the project has certainly laid the basis for improved conservation, notably through support to the mobilization and organization of community-based park guards and raising awareness of the values and importance of the park, as well as rules and regulations regarding its management.
5. In terms of sustainable livelihoods, the project has invested a great deal of effort in supporting the creation and building the capacity of CBOs for production, savings, credit and marketing and promoting organic farming. However, the impact has been limited because of the longer time frame needed to build effective organizational capacity and the poor linkage to threats to the park
6. A clear and realistic time-bound strategy and action plan for land tenure security was missing at the beginning of the project, but the project has scaled down its expectations and activities in light of the realities of dealing with this complex situation. Nevertheless the project has achieved some success in working with key partners on developing tenurial instruments. The project seems poised to move forward on these issues, only to run out of time, with no plan for sustaining and building on achievements so far.
7. The PAMB is showing signs of revitalization, although issues of representation, governance and operations remain.
8. The forest rehabilitation component has met its targets and provided the basis for an economically viable income generating activity that can be expanded, based on resource management agreements. This is perhaps an example of where the project was more realistic about what could be achieved and has moved incrementally to achieve it.
9. Given the lack of baseline data on forest cover and biodiversity, which made it difficult to assess project progress on conservation goals, the project deserves credit for introducing Threat Reduction Assessment (TRA) methodology as a monitoring tool. While the process could benefit from further validation and field-testing, it has also proven valuable as an awareness-raising tool.
10. The CARE PMO has worked diligently and efficiently to try to achieve project outputs. It has worked well with, and mobilized, different stakeholders and project efforts have generally been appreciated by most stakeholders, but significant concern still exists about how to build on project activities.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the General Management Plan (GMP) currently being revised in a participatory manner with project support provides the framework and baseline data for future actions related to MINP conservation. A degree of flexibility should be built into the GMP to enable it to adapt to changing circumstances and opportunities. The PAMB/PAO should work with appropriate implementing partners for the different programs of the GMP, including the development of specific resource request proposals.

2. The PAMB should develop a prioritized strategy and action plan based on the GMP which emphasizes co-management initiatives and fosters similar partnerships with a wide variety of organizations. Internal rules and regulations should be adopted that promote transparency, participation and flexibility. The Protected Area Office (PAO) of DENR, as currently constituted, does not have the capacity to carry out its park protection and management duties and act as secretariat to the PAMB (in more than the formal sense). There needs to be a considered prioritization of its role and actions based on a realistic assessment of what it can achieve. Encouragingly, DENR has committed to significantly increasing the staff and support to PAO, although formal approval is pending.
3. There needs to be a more concerted effort to engage LGUs, particularly at the municipal level to support various concerns in park management. This could include “counterpart schemes” to be supported by a legislative act or a resolution for budget allocation for certain projects to ensure sustained commitment of LGUs in the face of frequent turnover of elected officials
4. Community-based reforestation initiatives should continue to be monitored and then expanded to other degraded areas of MINP based on the successful model developed by the project. Particular attention should be paid to involving TMs in reforestation projects to generate livelihood opportunities and increase their participation in PA rehabilitation and management.
5. Pursue the mapping initiative involving responsible local government agencies in Ocampo as a starting point for future collaboration and an example of a process that could be developed in other municipalities. Build on the modest efforts to organize TMs to develop community resource management plans and eventual PACBRMAs in Lugsad and Harubay and seek to expand this elsewhere in MINP.
6. Develop a system for institutionalizing BMS/TRA results and activities that:
 - a. Identifies and gets commitments (including resources) from key groups, such as PAO, LGUs and MIGs/CBBMGs to carry out BMS/TRA on a regular basis, including integration of BMS/TRA into LGU development plans and ordinances;
 - b. Identifies how the results of BMS/TRA will be used in awareness raising, monitoring and policy development, as well as guiding GMP implementation;
 - c. Identifies a process of refining and adapting BMS/TRA to increase accuracy, relevance and usefulness as an adaptive management tool; and
 - d. Builds partnerships with organizations and individuals interested in biodiversity monitoring, e.g. academic groups, NGOs.
7. An external assessment of the CBOs and sustainable livelihoods should be undertaken to assess institutional viability and whether additional funds, strategically applied, will lead to viable CBOs and sustainable livelihood programs. Future programs should explicitly address the question of linkages to MINP conservation activities, and either pursue targeted activities towards reducing threats or acknowledge the weak links and pursue more traditional sustainable agriculture activities as an objective in its own right.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Project

The Mount Isarog Integrated Conservation and Development Project (MIICDP), financed by the European Commission (EC) and the UNDP/GEF-funded Sustainable Management of Mount Isarog Territories (SUMMIT) together constitute a co-funded integrated conservation and development project for Mt. Isarog Natural Park (MINP) in the province of Camarines Sur, Republic of the Philippines.

MINP covers 10,112 hectares, of which 47% is estimated to be forested. It supports a rich biodiversity, including many threatened and endemic species, which are primarily dependent on the remaining natural forest ecosystems. However, MINP's relatively small size and isolation has probably already resulted in the loss of a number of key species. MINP is also a critical watershed for the region, supplying drinking water to 15 of the 37 surrounding municipalities and irrigation water to 67,000 hectares of rice fields. The principal threats to MINP are considered to come from local populations practicing timber poaching, wildlife hunting, treasure hunting, collection of non-timber forest products and agricultural activities inside and outside the park, including slash-and-burn agriculture. Underlying threats include low incomes, lack of alternatives to destructive behaviors, insecure land tenure and lack of knowledge about conservation. It is estimated that 1400 individuals live inside the park with 10,000 individuals living in adjacent communities currently dependent on park resources. The majority of the poor farmers in the 23 barangays surrounding MINP are migrants who are tenants on land owned by wealthier landowners. Some communities consist of indigenous people, organized into tribal councils. Their ownership of ancestral lands is protected by the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) act and the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA). However, much of that land is also subject to ownership claims by private landowners.

The project aims to address these threats through a series of targeted strategies and activities. It has six components:

- ***institution building and capacity development***: to strengthen the capabilities of MINP's key stakeholders, notably the Protected Area Management Board (PAMB), communities/Local Government Units (LGU) and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in community-based protected area management
- ***sustainable livelihoods***: to increase income-generating opportunities to decrease environmental pressure on the forest resources of the park
- ***forest rehabilitation***: to rehabilitate/restore degraded areas of MINP
- **land tenure security**: to increase land tenure security in the adjacent communities to encourage investment in sustainable agriculture activities
- ***biodiversity monitoring and socio-economic research***: to generate updated information on MINP's biodiversity and the socio-economic status of adjacent communities for various stakeholders
- ***information, education and communication (IEC)***: to increase public awareness of the benefits of biodiversity conservation and access to information on MINP's value and the impact of human behavior on it

Funding for MIICDP/SUMMIT extended from 2000 to 2004, with an extension to mid-2005. Earlier, MINP was one of eight priority protected areas supported by the EC-funded National Integrated Protected Areas Programme (NIPAP) from 1995-2000. This programme provided institutional and technical support to the management of MINP, including the formulation of a General Management Plan (GMP). The EC requested CARE Philippines to design a follow-up project building on NIPAP experiences and focusing on the social and economic development of communities surrounding the park. This became the MIICDP, which began in 2000, with the UNDP-financed SUMMIT project initiated later, in 2001.

A MIICDP mid-term review (EC MTR) was held in 2002. This produced a modified project logframe, which has been used as the basis for monitoring and reporting ever since. Among other recommendations were the scaling down of land tenure security targets, integration of capacity building activities into all components, a focus on sustainable agriculture in the sustainable livelihood component, prioritizing support to the stronger CBOs to “pull” weaker ones along and strengthening of PMO. These recommendations were for the most part adopted by the project. The SUMMIT mid-term evaluation (UNDP MTE) was conducted in 2004 and identified flaws in the project design and strategy, including the poor design of the sustainable livelihood component. It also noted that destructive activities in MINP had largely declined by the beginning of the project. It recommended restructuring the Protected Area Management Board (PAMB), establishing a local inter-agency task force to expedite processing of tenurial instruments, implementing a landscape conservation approach in a designated *de facto* buffer zone, establishing a permanent mechanism for managing the MINP core zone and prohibiting those individuals threatening the park from receiving economic benefits under the project. The project did not fully embrace the findings and recommendations of the UNDP MTE. Both the EC MTR and the UNDP MTE recommended a second phase for the project.

B. The PFRE Process

An EC participatory final review in Aug-Sept 2004 had to be cancelled, leading to the agreement by EC and UNDP to conduct a single, consolidated Participatory Final Review and Evaluation (PFRE) from March 28 to May 4, 2005. A three person Facilitator Team (FT) worked closely with CARE staff and other stakeholders in carrying out the PFRE.

The main purpose of the PFRE was to facilitate a process of social learning, capacity development and stakeholder mobilization through a participatory review of project assessment, lessons learned and recommendations (see PFRE TOR – Annex 1). This was achieved through the development of a series of key questions and issues (KQIs), initially developed by the FT using a series of review criteria (including relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) and then expanded and validated during a stakeholder workshop on March 28. The FT subsequently developed a series of facilitatory techniques and participatory review tools with a team of workshop facilitators drawn from key stakeholder groups, including CARE, Local Government Units (LGUs), Government Agencies, academic institutions and community-based organizations (CBOs). From April 4-19, a series of workshops and meetings was held in seven barangays bordering MINP, using the participatory methods developed with the workshop facilitator teams, who also facilitated the workshops. Meetings were also held with key

organizations and individuals, and a modified SWOT analysis carried out with the CARE Project Management Office (PMO). Preliminary findings were then presented (by project component) in a stakeholder workshop on April 20-21, during which they were reviewed and validated. Subsequently, lessons learned, recommendations and draft action plans were developed by workshop participants. Findings, lessons learned and recommendations were generated from the process described in the previous section. The FT attempted to organize and consolidate the results of the stakeholder workshop, incorporate information from additional meetings and add findings, lessons learned and recommendations on the project design and project management. A draft PFRE report was subsequently prepared based on the outputs of the workshop. This was presented at another stakeholder workshop in Naga on May 3, as a result of which the report was endorsed by participants. Full process documentation, including the list of finalized KQIs and the detailed schedule is included on a CD accompanying this report.

II. PFRE FINDINGS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section is organized according to the following components:

- Project design and the implications for achievement of project objectives and outcomes;
- The six principal project components; and
- Project management.

Overall, despite constraints imposed by issues of project design that affected implementation, the implementing agency, CARE Philippines, through a concerted effort to involve stakeholders and on-the-ground activities, has succeeded in delivering an impressive array of outputs. These are documented in the status report section of the logframe (Annex 2). The challenge now is to assure the continued sustainability of project achievements and build on lessons learned and promising approaches to assure the conservation of Mount Isarog.

A. Project Design

i. Findings

1. Although both MIICDP and SUMMIT project documents refer to the Integrated Conservation and Development Project (ICDP) model as the basis of the project, there is in fact a significant difference in the project objectives as related to this model, which explicitly targets the conservation of the protected area and its biodiversity through identifying and addressing the principal threats to the protected area. The SUMMIT objective of “Biodiversity of MINP is protected and effectively and efficiently managed for sustainable use with full cooperation and collaboration of different stakeholders” is consistent with the ICDP model. However, the MIICDP objective “Biodiversity resources of MINP protected and sustainable livelihoods developed for those living around it” is actually two objectives, with no specific linkage or assigned priority among the two. Whereas the ICDP model identifies developing sustainable livelihoods as a strategy (among others) to address unsustainable resource use threatening the park, the MIICDP project document elevates this strategy to the level of a major objective. In theory, achieving sustainable livelihoods (increased household livelihood security), even

in the face of declining biodiversity, could be considered a successful project outcome in itself (e.g. a 50% success rate) since the two are not explicitly linked. In addition, the EC MTR recommended the “two-in-one” objective in the revised logframe, which has since been adopted by the project (although, as far as the FT is aware, the goal of SUMMIT has not been modified). The increased emphasis on sustainable livelihoods in MIICDP may reflect the fact that this project provides the bulk of the funding for the sustainable livelihoods and land tenure components. While this may seem an arcane point, it appears to have significantly affected the vision, philosophy and approach used during project implementation.

2. The logframe contains poorly articulated objectives and demonstrates poor logic in developing and linking outputs and outcomes and there is a lack of precision in defining outputs and indicators, the latter being in some cases incomplete and inappropriate in relation to objectives and outputs. This makes it difficult to assess whether the project has achieved its objective. For example, the indicators for the objective (see Annex 2), with the exception of reduction of threats, are not constructed in a manner to allow specific and accurate monitoring. Terms such as household security and access of tenure are not adequately defined, nor obviously measurable. This issue became clear during a long session with the CARE Project Management Office (PMO) reviewing the logframe and project results. It appears that significant project achievements may escape documentation if the logframe is used as a reporting framework (which it is). The project logframe with an updated status report for May 2005 is attached as Annex 2. The logframe has been used as a rather static template by the project to develop workplans. It was not used as an adaptive management tool to take account of increased information, lessons learned and changing priorities. The PMO acknowledges that it was insufficiently trained in logframe analysis. In the same manner, the logframe was not translated into an operational framework providing guidance on linking components and developing implementation strategies. Rather it has contributed to the compartmentalization of different project outputs.
3. The project in its inception stage already took note of lessons learned from other integrated conservation and development projects especially regarding the time frame required for achieving meaningful results. However, this appears not to have been considered in the designing of the project. The project was framed for a four-year implementation when in fact it has recognized that even five years is insufficient to establish true institutional and financial sustainability for biodiversity conservation since the first three years are most often required for organizational development and capacity building. Even though the project had a considerable base upon which to build, as a result of NIPAP and prior CARE activities, four years is clearly too ambitious a timeframe to achieve project objectives. While the PMO had assumed that the timeframe of the project may have considered previous initiatives undertaken in the area, the development of the project did not clearly illustrate this. As the UNDP MTE states “the consequence of trying to tackle all the major challenges in a relatively short time has been that multiple strategies have been implemented simultaneously. Project staff and resources have been spread too thinly in too many places, and at the same time unrealistic expectations have been created about the participation of people in the surrounding barangays. The project

has not been able to follow a sequential process of MINP strengthening, based on addressing those issues which are socially or politically (*or institutionally, based on existing capacity*) required to accomplish other objectives.”

4. Some of the project components, notably IEC, capacity building and, to a degree, biodiversity monitoring and socio-economic research, were more appropriately cross-cutting areas, that could effectively be integrated into other components. The EC MTR also recommended that capacity building be integrated into other components, and this is partially reflected in the logframe, which includes capacity building in each of the components, yet retains a stand-alone institution building/capacity development component (see below). It seems the pre-identified components of the project became the basis of developing the different objectives and outputs of the logframe instead of the other way around.
5. The project is implemented by a CARE PMO based in its own project office. The UNDP MTR notes, somewhat controversially, that this arrangement led to the PMO being perceived as “running not only the project, but MINP itself” with a consequent marginalization of DENR. While both the PMO and DENR have denied that this was the case, it was clear during the PFRE that many stakeholders view the project as a CARE initiative. This is probably not due to a perception of CARE “monopolization” but rather the fact that the partner agencies, such as DENR and LGUs have been part of the institutional landscape for a long time, whereas CARE is a recent arrival and has mobilized various technical experts on the ground in the specific context of the project. Local stakeholders also tend to see the visibility of PMO in most aspects of project implementation, sometimes in the absence of project partners such as DENR and LGUs and hence associate CARE with the resources required to undertake these activities.

In retrospect, there already existed a framework for implementing actions for the conservation of MINP and this is the General Management Plan (GMP). The GMP was developed in a participatory manner and contains a series of eight management programs and actions, as well as a five-year workplan detailing institutional responsibilities. The PAMB is ultimately responsible for assuring the implementation of the GMP, but it is clear that the programs can only be effectively implemented through partnerships with key organizations and groups, including community-based groups. Thus there was an opportunity for the project to work within this framework to foster and facilitate those critical partnerships required to achieve the goals of the programs and the GMP. At the same time this would serve to strengthen the PAMB and promote ownership of the GMP. In fact the SUMMIT project document notes “the interventions already identified in the SUMMIT project design were based on the strategies formulated in the GMP” (Annex 3.g of the project document). However, the GMP does not appear to have been used as the guiding document and the perception is that a parallel set of “project” objectives guided MIICDP/SUMMIT implementation.

It is interesting to note that the GMP did not receive a single mention in the UNDP MTE. In contrast the EC MTR acknowledges that “the project has been designed to contribute to the final formulation and subsequent implementation of the GMP” (p.3) but goes on to

cite serious flaws in the GMP “where issues of zoning, sustainable use of PA resources and participation by local stakeholders are poorly developed” (p.4). While this may be the case, the issue may be less one of technical shortcomings in the GMP, but rather the way the GMP is viewed and implemented. It is not intended to be a rigid blueprint but rather “a way forward for the PAMB which will, over the coming years, test, review and refine these strategies, perhaps even reject some altogether and, with the wisdom of practice, design new ones” (GMP Preface). It offers an opportunity to develop, and build capacity for, a more flexible adaptive management approach. In this sense, it represents an opportunity missed.

Given the lack of baseline data against which project accomplishments may be measured, especially in the areas of income level of the communities, changes in biodiversity concentration and forest cover, the GMP needs to include quantitative assessment of these factors. A crude way of doing this is by looking at the pre-project situation using NIPAP data and comparing with post project statistics. It is important to establish any improvements in these areas relative to project strategies in order to provide basis for the adoption or replication of strategies applied.

6. Both mid-term reviews recommended a second phase of the project, but there was little discussion of how the project would be re-oriented, apart from an increasing focus and capacitation of the Protected Area Office (PAO), with the PMO taking on a more technical advisory role. The EC MTR also recommended developing closer partnerships with municipalities. It appears that these recommendations were more an acknowledgement of the insufficient time allocated for project implementation than any suggestion to re-orient the project based on lessons learned.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. The design of a co-funded project needs close collaboration among donors and with the implementing agency(ies) to assure a common approach and goals, even if each donor contributes to different components and has different reporting criteria and requirements.
2. Implementing agencies and partners should be involved in logframe development and receive training in logframe analysis, including the use of the logframe as an adaptive management tool rather than a reporting format. Implicit and explicit hypotheses and assumptions should be built into the process and regularly monitored.
3. In areas where previous conservation projects have been implemented, it is important to revisit previous project documentation and lessons learned to serve as inputs. Careful evaluation of previous interventions may help to avoid similar weaknesses and/or to build on promising approaches and initiatives.
4. Project sustainability is more likely if activities are anchored in an existing approved strategic framework which already has clearly identified roles and responsibilities for different partners and stakeholders. The function of the project is then to support these partners and stakeholders in carrying out their designated roles and responsibilities.

B. Institution Building and Capacity Development

The objective of this component is to improve the capacities of MINP's key stakeholders in community-based resource governance. However, logframe indicators are limited to two key stakeholders, the PAMB and LGUs. Capacity building also figures prominently in the logframe Specific Objectives (SO) and Expected Results (ER), as follows:

- primary stakeholders to undertake ecologically sustainable livelihoods (SO 4);
- Community-based Organizations (CBOs) for community-based forestry management (ER 2.1);
- PAMB/PAO and key stakeholders to undertake and sustain IEC activities (ER 3.1);
- CBOs to sustain farm and off-farm support systems (ER 4.1);
- CBOs/primary stakeholders to implement natural resource management plans and agreements (ER 5.1); and
- PAO and concerned communities, through CBBMGs, to sustain BMS (ER 6.1).

This formulation presumably results from the recommendation of the EC MTR to integrate capacity building efforts into each component, leaving capacity building of PAMB (and through its planning processes, to LGUs) as the sole focus of this component. Whether capacity building activities are considered under a single component or spread through all components, the key is to develop a capacity building strategy and action plan that identifies the key stakeholders, targets specific capacity building strategies based on their objectives and mandates (ideally using needs assessments) and develops credible indicators for assessing whether capacity has increased and resulted in effective and appropriate actions. Clearly the capacity of some stakeholders in certain areas has increased as a result of project activities. However, it is very difficult to assess the degree to which increased capacity has met project expectations or contributed to achieving project objectives.

The project has identified the following institutions and mechanisms for PA management: (a) PAMB; (b) PAO; (c) Barangay, municipal/city and provincial LGUs; and (d) CBOs. The project facilitated assistance to these stakeholders according to the project outcomes and different components.

B1. PAMB

i. Findings

1. The project provided technical, logistical and financial support to the operations of the PAMB. In particular, the project supported (a) capacity building and organizational strengthening; (b) meetings of the different structures of the PAMB (en-banc, executive committee and technical committees); (c) generation of baseline information necessary for program and policy development; (d) management planning; and (e) PA gazetting. Based on these, the project was able to facilitate (a) reconstitution of the PAMB with defined working committees; (b) drafting of the revised internal rules and regulations; (c) review of the GMP; and (d) preparation of the draft bill for the PA. The PAMB has created six working committees (finance, livelihood, forest protection and law

enforcement, IEC, ecotourism, research and monitoring) and one technical working group. The committees are largely based on the eight programs of the GMP. The project provided short-term (six month) consultancies to four committees. The PMO directly supported the PAMB in the other two GMP programs, on regional integration and institutional organization and management. The PAMB further created the multi-sectoral body to validate the survey and registration of protected area occupants. In as much as the PAMB was effectively only reconstituted in February 2004 following the division of the PAMB as a result of different opinions on whether to approve a treasure hunting application in an area of MINP, most of its working committees have still to be reconvened to identify courses of actions. This organizational mechanism of the PAMB requires technical, logistical and financial support, and with the phasing out of the project, it faces challenges in sustaining its operations.

2. In terms of financial sustainability, the PAMB has in place an entrance fee system as a resource generation strategy. However, the Integrated Protected Area Fund (IPAF) currently stands at less than 50,000 pesos, barely covering the cost of its operations. With the assistance from the project, the PAMB commissioned the Makiling Center for Mountain Ecosystems (MCME) to conduct a Willingness to Pay Survey for the protection and conservation of MINP, leading to the development of a water users' fee as a potential funding source. The Research and Monitoring Committee initiated activities leading to the testing of the Water Users Fee (WUF) System. Consultations with water districts were held while recommended rate options were discussed within the PAMB. However, this does not guarantee that the PAMB will secure funding support for its operation after the project. It will require an intensive IEC campaign to support this initiative.
3. The "treasure hunting fiasco" in November 2002 resulted in a suspension of PAMB operations for almost two years, with no meetings conducted. The issue has polarized the PAMB, with members divided. However, the publicity surrounding this issue raised awareness of MINP and the need for its conservation and provided an opportunity to gain wider public support for the protection of MINP. The PAMB began functioning again in early 2004.
4. The project has supported PAMB in commissioning several valuable technical and policy studies relating to a Visitor Management System for MINP, Feasibility Study for Relocating Non-Tenured Migrants (NTM) outside MINP, Water User Fee System for MINP, Resource Use Assessment of Potential Buffer Zones in MINP and Site Compatibility Assessment for the Cultivation of Indigenous Tree Species in MINP.
5. Numerically, LGUs (barangay/municipal/city/provincial) dominate the present PAMB with 31 out of 38 members. Other members comprise representatives from IPs (2), NGOs/POs (2), other government agencies (2) and DENR (1). Despite this, attendance by LGU representatives is uneven, participation is variable and feedback to communities generally poor.

6. The project has supported a participatory process of revising the GMP. In addition, the project has helped PAMB develop a proposal for EC Small Grants funding, focused on institutional strengthening for the PAMB and LGUs, IEC and policy advocacy, forest protection and biodiversity monitoring. The PAMB would be the implementing agency and accountable for achieving the objectives laid out in the proposal.
7. The PAMB has not adequately explored the potential for co-management agreements to take some of the pressure off PAO operations. An example is a proposed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between DENR and the City of Naga on the co-management of the headwater portion of Naga City river watershed (within MINP) for watershed management and nature-based tourism. However, the PAMB has indicated its willingness to promote and pursue co-management initiatives in the future.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. Effective participation for multi-stakeholder organizations such as the PAMB requires common understanding of roles, responsibilities and processes and clear incentives for different stakeholder members to contribute and feel their interests are being represented by PAMB decisions and actions.
2. Projects need to focus on developing and supporting structures and mechanisms for the institutional and financial sustainability of PAMB from the beginning, rather than provide short-term support to day-to-day operations.

ii Recommendations

1. As the body responsible for overseeing the implementation of the GMP, the PAMB should develop a long-term strategy based on the GMP currently being developed for 2005-2010. This strategy should form an integral part of the final GMP and should focus on developing partnerships with identified organizations responsible for implementing the programs and activities laid out in the revised GMP.
2. The PAMB should prioritize the development of technical and financial sustainability mechanisms to assure the resources required to implement the GMP, including continued operation of the PAMB. This will involve the promotion of co-management agreements, environmental service fees, partnerships with private sector and non-governmental organizations and resource management agreements with local communities.
3. The PAMB should consider how best to reflect the concerns of its constituency of stakeholders interested in the conservation of MINP and remain flexible in adjusting its membership to reflect the views of different stakeholders, welcoming technical input and discussions through committees and meetings and promoting transparency, information sharing and open communication.

4. The PAMB should review, revise and approve the proposed co-management agreement with the City of Naga for the headwater area of MINP, originally submitted in 1998. It should actively promote such co-management agreements with other partners.
5. These recommendations should be reflected in the proposed PA bill for MINP. The PAMB should work seriously for the passage of the proposed bill, something it is committed to doing.
6. The PAMB needs to move forward on commissioned studies in translating the findings into actions such as policy and program development, as well as incorporating them into the revised GMP.

B2. Protected Area Office

i. Findings:

1. The DENR has already established the Protected Area Office (with designated Protected Area Superintendent (PASu) and assistant PASu) that provides secretariat work to the operations of the PAMB and administration of the PA;
2. While the PAO is essentially the secretariat of the PAMB, the PMO has provided back staffing and support systems that have been crucial to the overall operations of the PAMB during project implementation. With only six staff (PASu, Assistant PASu, three rangers and a clerk) from the PAO scheduled to remain at the end of the project and with limited funding from the DENR, secretariat functions to PAMB operations are likely to be affected.
3. The PASu and the assistant PASu are also assuming equally significant functions of the Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office (PENRO), which hinders full-time work in MINP. Given the considerable work needed to assure effective PA management, it is doubtful that these staff can realistically meet all the demands of PA management. While the DENR has committed to field additional personnel and to complement the operations from the Community Environment and Natural Resources Office (CENRO) covering the PA, the question of funding support remains given the limited annual allocation of the agency. The capacity of additional personnel in PA management is an issue in need of consideration.
4. The project has supported the hiring of six forest rangers to augment the operations of the PAO particularly in resource protection and law enforcement, but no clear operational framework and strategy has yet been formulated for this particular component of the project. The project at the very start should have considered strategies on how to develop other mechanisms for the sustainability of the PAO. Resource Management Agreements (RMA), co-management initiatives and others have been promoted to LGUs to sustain other PA activities, particularly reforestation and protection,

ii. Lessons Learned

1. Given its limited capacity, lack of resources, dependence on contracted personnel (through the project) and its mandate as both secretariat to the PAMB and the DENR operating unit for MINP management, the PAO is very stretched in trying to fulfill its many obligations.

iii. Recommendations

1. The PAO needs to be more specific about its role and what it can achieve with its limited resources. It should develop a strategy that prioritizes and focuses upon its key mandate to assure conservation of MINP and identifies opportunities to leverage key partners through co-management initiatives (e.g. MIGs for patrolling and monitoring, communities for reforestation activities) and other partnerships (academic institutions for information gathering and research, NGOs for IEC, etc)
2. The DENR needs to review the staffing and responsibilities of the PAO, including a focus on MINP, reducing or eliminating tasks unrelated to MINP management. A proposal to increase PAO staff from 6 to 16 has been advanced to the Secretary of DENR for consideration.
3. MINP should retain 75% of the Integrated Protected Areas Trust Fund (IPAF) for its operation, with the remaining 25% returning to the DENR central fund.

B3. LGUs

i. Findings

1. The project started appropriately in facilitating the barangay development planning. The Barangay Development Plans (BDPs) should have been used to guide project activities at the community level through coordination with barangay councils.
2. As originally envisioned, the project intended to facilitate integration of community concerns at the level of the PAMB. However, the mechanism on how to actually do this is not clear. Several CBOs and barangay councils indicated that they are not fully aware of what is happening with regard to the PAMB. In the same manner the PAMB is not always fully updated on community issues such as the issue of land tenure and relocation.
3. The intervention of the project at the level of municipal and provincial LGUs is not clear, as there are no available MOAs (except the reforestation agreements) to indicate that LGUs indeed integrated the PA concerns to their respective short and long-term development plans. Most LGUs have still to articulate what support they may be able to provide for the conservation of MINP. The barangay councils are supportive of the operations of MIGs and some have committed to provide minimal financial assistance.

4. The PAMB recognized the importance of LGUs in PA management by incorporating a provision that would make the governor a vice-chair of the PAMB.
5. There has been limited progress in incorporating conservation and land use planning in municipal and BDPs (MINP is considered outside these plans). While the BDPs offer actions on environment and natural resources management, most of the barangay Annual Investment Plans (AIP) cater to social services and infrastructures. Eight barangays have adopted sustainability indicators, but it is not clear how these are used in development planning.
6. Some LGUs have undertaken modest commitments to help sustainability of project activities, notably MIGs and to a lesser extent CBBMGs, as well as promulgating local ordinances in favor of biodiversity conservation. At municipal level, Naga City is example for others to emulate.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. Sustainability of PAMB membership is affected by change of political leadership, especially at the barangay level, requiring new members to develop adequate understanding and capacity.
2. Representation of the barangay on the PAMB does not necessarily lead to the institutionalization of the partnership between PAMB and barangay LGU. In the absence of clear and binding agreements, accountability and responsibilities are not clearly defined, understood nor internalized.
3. Barangay representatives do not always have the knowledge and capacity to fully participate in PAMB deliberations, to represent the community's concerns to the PAMB or to communicate to the Barangay Council and the community any developments from PAMB discussions and decisions.
4. Representation on the PAMB is limited to the barangay council because communities lack knowledge or interest
5. LGUs are often willing to extend financial assistance as long as they are provided with information on ongoing initiatives.

iii. Recommendations

1. The Barangay Council should enact a resolution designating a permanent representative to the PAMB with a term of five years and defined responsibilities and obligations (e.g. to report to the BDC). The Barangay Assembly and PAMB should recommend a representative, to be appointed by DENR. The PAMB should also issue a resolution to this effect.

2. There needs to be a more concerted effort to engage LGUs, particularly at the municipal level to support various concerns in park management. This could include “counterpart schemes” to be supported by a legislative act or a resolution for budget allocation for certain projects to ensure sustained commitment of LGUs regardless of who is elected or if there is a change in the officials.
3. The 2nd and 3rd district of Camarines Sur has jurisdiction over MINP, so the respective congressmen should be informed and lobbied to coordinate support for the park through budget allocations.

B4. Mount Isarog Guardians (MIGs)

i. Findings

1. MIGs have become an effective deterrent to illegal activities, particularly timber poaching, wildlife harvesting and slash-and-burn activities. Community initiatives related to MINP conservation, notably operations of the MIGs have gained wider acceptance with various levels of support already expressed by CBOs, LGUs, DENR and NGOs.
2. MIGs have been motivated to create their own organization and develop a strategy and action plan for their operations, including a financial plan.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. Integrating MIGs and MIG operations into barangay structures, such as the barangay development councils, promotes local acceptance and support that can enhance sustainability.

iii. Recommendation

1. The MIGs as an organization should be accredited to the barangay and municipal development councils.
2. The MIGs have been successful because of their commitment and, in part, spirit of volunteerism. While additional resources to support the MIGs is certainly justified, great care needs to be taken that this does not destroy this spirit of volunteerism or otherwise create tensions, both within the MIG organization and between MIGs and other community members.
3. MIGs need continued moral and legal support to counter harassment and threats by those planning or undertaking illegal activities in MINP.

C. Sustainable Livelihoods

Sustainable Livelihoods is both part of the overall objective and a specific objective focused on increasing the capacity of primary stakeholders to undertake ecologically sustainable livelihoods. The indicator of the overall objective is improved economic security of 1,000 families inside MINP and in buffer zone communities. The indicator of the specific objective (along with CBO formation) is 1,000 primary stakeholders deriving economic benefits from improved conservation farming practices and the implementation of sustainable livelihood/micro-enterprise initiatives. Quite how these two indicators relate is not clear.

The principal strategy of this component is the organization of farmers into CBOs and the promotion of “sustainable farming” activities through the development of credit and savings operations. Sustainable farming is mostly organic agriculture production, although some other activities e.g. cassava production and goat raising have also been promoted. The strategy (supported by the EC MTR) has been to focus on organizing those communities with greatest capacity (often including members with significant resources of land and other assets) with the eventual aim of reaching those communities with fewest resources (the landless poor) that arguably pose the greatest threat to MINP. Within the time frame of the project, this was always going to be a very ambitious goal, and in fact the project has been largely unable to reach those poor communities. The viability of the CBOs post-project must remain in doubt since loan repayment rates are poor and the economic returns to organic farming uncertain.

It should be noted that under the NIPAP project, micro-projects were developed for MINP. These largely failed, including all three of the organic farming initiatives. A review of this experience and lessons learned emphasized the need for detailed planning, allowing adequate time (at least two years) to assess projects and building on promising initiatives.

Overall, the impression gained is that two separate and relatively unconnected projects are being carried out under the umbrella of the MIICDP/SUMMIT project, one a traditional small-scale agricultural development project, the other a series of loosely-linked activities oriented towards improved protected area management. Perhaps this is not surprising given the twin objectives of the project logframe. The impact of the sustainable livelihoods component on protection of MINP has been negligible, highlighting the poor acknowledgement and articulation of the linkages inherent in the ICDP model and compounded by the weakness of the project design.

For ease of reference, the findings related to sustainable livelihoods are considered under the development and organization of CBOs (part of the institution building and capacity development component of the project) and the livelihood initiatives themselves.

i. Findings

a. Institution Building:

1. Thirteen CBOs engaged in Member Savings Operation (MSO) have been formed and/or assisted by the Project within the 23 MINP barangays. Most are production cooperatives providing micro-credit to farmers for production activities. Some of the organizations are

cooperative in nature, and registered with the Cooperative Development Authority, and some are Associations, and registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission. There is considerable range in the capacities of individual CBOs, with some lacking basic organizational development activities such as reviewing their Constitution and By-Laws, holding of regular elections and development of second line leaders. Others, particularly those involving dynamic and trusted individuals, are more advanced. The project has provided significant assistance in developing technical, financial and administrative capacity and linking CBOs to credit providers and marketing organizations. Lack of capital and dependence on project support will be significant issues for the viability of these CBOs in the future.

2. There is a concern that CBOs created under the project reflect a mechanism to avail of the sustainable livelihood activities provided by the project rather than a genuine desire of individuals to organize to improve their livelihoods. One of the issues expressed by the original partner NGOs is that existing CBOs and POs with some degree of organizational structure were seen as being “bypassed” in the rush to create new CBOs for the sustainable livelihood component. This is a particular concern considering the significant time and effort required to develop sustainable organizational capacity of CBOs.
3. One of the fundamental behavioral changes resulting from the creation and organization of CBOs in the community is the increase in peoples’ participation in community affairs, such as recognizing the importance of attending meetings, sharing ideas, reaching consensus through discussion, etc.
4. The formation of the CBO federation (SUSLIVES Inc.) is viewed as a post-project sustainability mechanism for the livelihood component, through the provision of technical, financial and marketing assistance and services to its member CBOs. Transfer of technical and organizational management skills from the project to SUSLIVES and its staff is part of the strategy to build and consolidate the capabilities of SUSLIVES. However, barely a month before the project closes, project staff still assume the responsibility and control over the operations of the organization such as bookkeeping, marketing, procurement, reporting, preparation of minutes of meetings and resolutions. Two project staff have assumed positions as *ex-officio* members of the Board of Directors. While this reflects a concern by project staff about the sustainability of SUSLIVES, it has led to some frustrations by SUSLIVES staff and officials who seek the opportunity for greater autonomy in managing the organization. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the situation, it does raise doubts regarding the long-term survival of SUSLIVES after the project.
5. Another mechanism to unite efforts in Mt. Isarog is the creation of a network of POs composed of MIGS, ANIS (primarily an advocacy organization) and SUSLIVES. A MOA was signed recently among these groups, but no detailed discussions have yet been held on how this alliance will work together. The concept of linking protection, advocacy and sustainable livelihoods is a key one that underlies the entire project and has potential implications for the sustainability of project activities.

b. Sustainable Livelihoods

1. The sustainable livelihood component was developed as a strategy to wean dependence of communities from MINP resources, by introducing conservation farming and off-farm income generating activities. The MSO scheme also provides members with the opportunity to pool their own resources, develop a sense of ownership of the project and expand the organization's "reach" in terms of benefits (e.g. re-lending even to non-CBO members). However, since most CBOs are focusing on sustainable agricultural production activities (a recommendation of the EC MTR), one of the primary requirements for borrowers is that they must have farmlots. This requirement is generally viewed as "limiting" and favors those who are already "well-off" and not the poorest of the poor in the community (which include such some of those relocated families who were not provided with farmlots, and the Indigenous Tribal groups).
2. Except for the nursery establishment related to reforestation inside MINP, most livelihood activities of the project are introduced outside the boundary of the park, which does not offer a direct and concrete link to the conservation of Mount Isarog. It should be noted that agricultural-based activities outside MINP are identified as primary threats in the TRA, although the principal concern appears to be spread of pathogens, such as abaca mosaic virus and the potential effect of agricultural pesticides, rather than direct forest destruction for agricultural purposes. In addition, some livelihood beneficiaries living outside the park still maintain and utilize certain portions of the PA especially those areas planted with permanent crops such as abaca and fruit trees. As the UNDP MTE stated "the lack of any distinction in targeting beneficiaries who were involved in threatening activities and those who weren't risked sending a perverse signal that threat-doers would be rewarded rather than punished."
3. Some community members indicated that organic agriculture (which the project promotes as the principal strategy of the sustainable livelihood component) has a limited adoption rate, because the short term benefits of inorganic agriculture are much higher. Some of the Municipal Agricultural Officers (MAO) still promote inorganic use and inorganic inputs are widely available on the market. The high cost of organic inputs and marketing constraints (e.g. overproduction of organic tomatoes leading to low market prices of two pesos/kilo) also contributes to the low adoption rates.
4. There appears to be limited promotion of livelihoods requiring little or no land, such as off-farm employment or processing of agricultural products. This could be a strategy to wean farmers off unsustainable activities in and around MINP. A list of primary threat-doers was developed rather late in the project as part of the TRA and presented to the sustainable livelihoods component, but it appears that these people could not be easily targeted using the strategy adopted by the component.
5. Funding for sustainable livelihood is relatively low considering the 23 communities it aims to serve. Thus, there were efforts to access funds from other sources such as banks, corporations, government agencies and other funding agencies/donors. While this is a logical approach, and important for sustainability, it has come rather late in the project.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. It takes a long time, and considerable social preparation and financial, technical and logistical support to develop the basic organizational capacities of CBOs before they can undertake investment projects. This highlights the difficulty for CBOs to quickly adopt sustainable livelihood activities.
2. External NGOs (such as CARE) are still perceived as grant-giving agencies, so that communities will seek to be involved in activities without being fully committed to the sustainability of the activities. This may be related to the low repayment rate for loans. Some community members expressed the view that continuing grants leads to beneficiary dependence.

iii. Recommendations

1. Sustainable livelihoods should be focused on reducing threats to MINP. This involves clearly identifying and prioritizing threats and threat-doers, based on validation of the TRA and devising strategies and actions that combine sustainable livelihoods with land tenure (focusing on TMs, IPs and ARBs), capacity building for CBOs, LGUs and other partners, and IEC programs in a coherent and integrated manner. Based on this, consideration could be given to promoting off-farm livelihood programs that use less or no land to earn higher income, village-level processing facilities for surplus production of farmer members and community-based organic fertilizer production. This should be combined with monitoring and protection activities to assess the degree to which sustainable livelihoods are reducing threats and the activities of threat-doers. As recommended by the UNDP MTE, those continuing to threaten MINP should not be eligible for sustainable livelihood support.
2. Considerable assistance and resources have gone into the creation and development of CBOs and the promotion of sustainable livelihoods. It is unlikely that these efforts can continue in the absence of additional support. The situation of the CBOs remains precarious and there is acknowledgement by project staff that the SUSLIVES federation is not yet in a position to effectively support its members. It is recommended that an external assessment of the CBOs and sustainable livelihoods be undertaken to assess institutional viability and whether additional funds, strategically applied, will lead to viable CBOs and sustainable livelihood programs. Future programs should explicitly address the question of linkages to MINP conservation activities, and either pursue targeted activities towards reducing threats, as suggested above, or acknowledge the weak links and pursue more traditional sustainable agriculture activities as an objective in its own right. In the latter case, it would not represent a funding priority for MINP conservation but functional CBOs could still be used as organizational structures to also promote conservation activities, as in the case of reforestation initiatives. In either case, capacity building should include the creation of linkages and networks with other service providers (academe, other NGOs, LGAs, etc) and promote programs that enhance self-reliance, commitment and responsibility (after 10 years of external support).

3. Promote multi-cropping of abaca with trees and minor forest products (anahaw, bamboo, rattan)

D. Forest Rehabilitation

i. Findings

1. The total area rehabilitated by the project covers 401 hectares (300 reforestation and 101 for assisted natural regeneration (ANR), despite some damage inflicted by typhoons in 2004. These activities were implemented by nine CBOs in nine barangays covering five municipalities.
2. The forest rehabilitation component has largely achieved its objectives. Although primarily designed for restoration purposes, it has developed into a livelihood opportunity, not only based on the savings generated from plantation establishment but on the income derived by CBOs. These savings have been used for micro-finance projects, such as the corn-sheller purchased with savings from the reforestation project in Consocep. The use of indigenous species makes it even more appropriate to the PA and its sustainability is concretely addressed with the execution of Resource Management Agreements (RMA) among the different stakeholders. Three RMAs have been finalized.
3. There is willingness to reforest degraded areas of MINP. Reforestation areas have so far been maintained and not been subject to deliberate fires or other disturbance and survival rate is high. A previous ADB-financed Community Reforestation Contracts project in the area had low survival rates because of the lack of maintenance costs after turnover. The maintenance of reforestation areas has been inscribed in municipal Annual Investment Plans (AIPs).
4. Regular monitoring and evaluation carried out on a quarterly basis by a team of DENR, barangay and municipal LGUs, MIGs, CBOs, barangay PAMB representatives and NGOs has resulted in a collaborative initiative.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. CBO-managed reforestation programs generate income to communities and as such should be considered livelihood initiatives.
2. The success of reforestation initiatives is partly due to the strong collaboration among stakeholders (DENR, CBOs, MIGs, LGUs and NGOs).
3. Three years is not long enough to measure the success of reforestation projects.

iii. Recommendations

1. Community-based reforestation initiatives should continue to be monitored and then expanded to other degraded areas of MINP based on the successful model developed by

the project. Particular attention should be paid to involving TMs in reforestation projects to generate livelihood opportunities and participation in PA rehabilitation and management.

2. PAMB and concerned NGOs should adopt a policy promoting the use of indigenous species in reforestation projects, including the identification and protection of “mother trees” of indigenous species as a future source of planting materials.
3. The possibility to explore further reforestation initiatives through the upcoming Bicol River Basin Development Project should be examined. The project classes Mount Isarog as a conservation and protection zone for the watershed.

E. Land Tenure Security

i. Findings

The objective of this component is improved security of access to land by primary stakeholders in forest-edge communities. The primary stakeholders are assumed to be tenured migrants (TMs), Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs) and indigenous people (IPs). As noted in earlier mid-term reviews, land tenure is a complex and contentious issue with many vested interests at all levels, some of which do not necessarily favor speedy resolution of tenure issues and may in fact prefer a state of “relative ambiguity”. As noted by the UNDP MTE “the power of landowners over the political-bureaucratic process” and hence over a key project outcome poses a serious question for project effectiveness. Original project objectives with regard to this component were quite ambitious and were scaled down as a result of the EC MTR. This recommended a focus on leasehold agreements as something within the project’s control. Nevertheless, the project has achieved some successes, albeit on a rather small scale, and put into train some potentially important processes.

1. The framework and strategy of this particular component of the project is not clearly articulated, especially in relation to other components. For instance, CBO organizing and livelihood interventions are not directly linked to land security of tenured migrants. However, the capacity of some IPs was increased through the development of off-farm activities and training that increased household income.
2. The project works in a total of 18 barangays (seven conservation farming communities, 13 for TMs and 12 for IPs). In its early stages, the project concentrated on addressing the issues of land tenure in communities outside MINP following the agrarian reform scheme. While it facilitated the improvement of land tenure access of several communities to agrarian reform areas, the issue of land security of tenured migrants remains a critical issue to date. The project has facilitated the updating and review of the Survey and Registration of Protected Area Occupants (SRPAO) and at the end of the project exerted efforts to address land access of tenured migrants. This remains a major issue at the PA that still poses a potentially major threat to its biodiversity conservation.
3. The awarding of Certificates of Land Ownership Agreements (CLOA) to communities surrounding the PA has not resulted in immediate long-term protection of the park as

most of the ARBs are still maintaining their claimed areas inside MINP especially those planted with abaca and other permanent crops such as fruit trees. It is to be hoped that the awarding of CLOAs will eventually reduce dependence on park resources. However, many communities are still heavily dependent on abaca plantations in MINP (covering 2500 ha), whether they live inside or outside the park and regardless of the tenure situation (the project document estimates 1,400 people living in MINP and 400 households depending directly on MINP resources in 1996).

4. The project organized, oriented and trained TMs and assisted them in preparation of documents for registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission and application for Protected Area Community-Based Resource Management Agreements (PACBRMA). The project also facilitated resource inventories and Community Resource Management Plans (CRMP) in Lugsad and Harubay, involving 20 families and covering 38 hectares. In other communities however, such as Panicuason and Del Rosario, Pili, “park occupants” were relocated. The City of Naga Government initiated and provided the relocation and site (for Panicuason), while Metro Naga Water District (MNWD) handled the relocation for Del Rosario, Pili. In yet other areas, activities related to TMs are not clear.
5. The results of the SRPAO have been frequently disputed. Some qualified tenured migrants who were not at home during the survey were not included. DENR is very strict on the qualification “solely dependent” - even those who are accepting menial jobs like providing laundry services for others, or receiving meager financial assistance from relatives or children serving as house helpers elsewhere were disqualified. The Project has helped in the validation of qualified TMs. During a meeting with the barangay captains on March 15, 2005, it was agreed that the children and successors of the tenured migrants are qualified TMs. However, the “master list” of TMs is still disputed (eight barangays out of 13 have accepted the master list). Other findings are:
 - The relocated families in Panicuason and Del Rosario were only provided housing, but not farm plots or other support for alternative livelihood. Therefore, they feel obliged to return to their original areas of cultivation in MINP, to harvest products from their former farms, and in some cases, harvest forest products. Because they do not have lands to farm, they were not qualified to avail of the sustainable livelihood program of the project.
 - Local community members and even Barangay Council members repeatedly stated that; “we must follow the NIPAS Law under which residing within or using/harvesting the park’s resources is prohibited”. In this regard, there seems to be a lack of orientation on the recognition and rights of tenured migrants under the NIPAS Law, which does not prohibit harvesting in the park.
 - The PAO is optimistic that absentee claimants can eventually be prohibited from harvesting their crops (abaca, banana, coconut, fruits) within the park.
6. The Agta Tribal Federation was organized by the former Office of the Southern Cultural Communities and is continuously assisted by NCIP. They are represented in the PAMB and notably involved in the IEC committee. The IP representative regularly updates the Federation in their meetings and his Barangay Council on issues discussed in PAMB

meetings. Some of the tribal groups are successfully running projects like pig dispersal and the production of banana chips and ginger tea. These have been supported by NCIP and the project for the technology training. However, this particular IP group is already mainstreamed in the socio-political structures of their barangays. Culturally and territorially they are therefore no longer intact. The basis of unity is the CADT, but the group is not very optimistic that it can assume management of the area, because of the complexity of the ownership issue. Assistance in terms of organizational strengthening is still needed for this group.

7. The Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claim (CADC) for the Agta Tabagnon and Cimaron in Ocampo has been facilitated and converted into a Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT). Also the Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP) has been developed and packaged. The project has facilitated the awarding of the CADT and development of the ADSDPP, including facilitating “pledges” towards its implementation. The Negrito Reservation declared in 1920’s covering 1,099 hectares was included in the 5,500+ hectares which is now covered by CADT. A portion (about one third) of the declared CADT is within the MINP. Most, if not all (NCIP has no record) the areas within CADT are privately owned. NCIP has indicated that prior rights (titles) will be acknowledged in CADT areas. The process of investigating whether the titles or proof of ownership are spurious or legitimate has yet to be started. The Agta are not hopeful that they will ever have real control in the use and management of the CADT declared area. The ADSDPP was developed mostly by the chieftains participating in the process and most IPs in the communities remain unaware of its existence. It does not indicate land uses (vis a vis Indigenous Knowledge System (IKS) management plan). Identification of areas for specific uses or programs, for the declaration of ancestral lands determining the extent of forestlands and other management regimes will only be undertaken as part of the implementation of the ADSDPP. In fact, the results of these activities are intended to be the subject or content of the ADSDPP. The overlap of the CADT with the PA and how this will be managed, has not yet been discussed in the PAMB. Other areas around MINP with CADT claims (that are intended to be assisted by the project) are not in the priority list of NCIP this year. NCIP can only process 2 to 3 CADT a year, because of budget and manpower limitations.
8. The project established a good partnership with Department of Land Reform (DLR) through a MOA, which resulted in prioritizing the land acquisition process for ARBs in the municipalities around MINP. A total of 249 CLOAs and Leasehold Agreements have been released, as a result of this partnership, which was only initiated in 2003. The production of IEC materials on ARBs was also supported by the project. Acquisition and distribution of lands however, is limited since only those areas with available lands (qualified for CLOAs) will be processed and awarded, in addition to some areas where tenants do not qualify for CLOAs but where land owners agree to a leasehold arrangement. Insecurity of land tenure (those whose CLOA or Leasehold Agreements are in process, more so with those who are not qualified to avail) is still one of the main reasons that farmers do not develop or plant long-term crops and trees. They are unwilling to invest for the long term for fear that they can be summarily evicted from the lands they are currently occupying.

9. No conditions are attached to relocation agreements that would limit continued use of MINP for resource exploitation. Families relocated by MNWD in Pili have no farm lots and continue to threaten MINP (the more so since they are angry at being penalized for agreeing to move out of the park, relative to those who refused to move and may now be eligible for tenure instrument). These families are landless and so not eligible for sustainable livelihood support under the project, reinforcing the need to provide assistance in either finding farm lots or providing for off-farm employment. It is critical that incentives are created for relocated people that reinforce the move away from destructive activities (such as provision of land and support to alternative activities) and that perverse incentives (such as loss of potential TM status) are not encouraged for continued park settlement and exploitation.
10. Coordination of the different agencies with land ownership responsibilities has long been problematic, despite a national-level task force considering the issues of harmonization of the different programs and laws. The Project has initiated concrete moves to address this in one municipality (Ocampo) where the issues are particularly acute. It is trying to bring together responsible officials of DENR, DAR and NCIP to have each agency develop simple activity maps for Ocampo. These will be overlain on a technical base map to identify areas of overlap and complementarity to coordinate future activities and to prioritize activities in areas with minimal conflict. This could lead to the creation of a local inter-agency task force, ideally under the mayor of Ocampo. Creation of a local-level task force was a recommendation of the UNDP MTE.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. The criteria and process of registering and validating TMs, together with the lack of extensive orientation on the rights and qualifications of TMs has resulted in contentiousness in the interpretation of TM status
2. The adoption of conservation farming techniques will be more widespread if communities have tenure security
3. There is a need to respect the legitimate rights of land ownership (whether of IPs or others) but achieving common understanding is critical to avoid speculation and allay doubts.
4. There is not always clarity and common understanding of the different regulations and ordinances relating to land tenure, so coordination and cooperation between government agencies responsible for related laws is critical for effective implementation.
5. Despite project IEC and related efforts, there is still a perception among some that MINP is an “open” resource

iii. Recommendations

1. DENR should prioritize finalization and agreement of TM master list and build on the modest efforts to organize TMs to develop community resource management plans and eventual PACBRMAs in Lugsad and Harubay, including ensuring that TMs have the appropriate skills in community resource management, and seek to expand this elsewhere in MINP.
2. Pursue the mapping initiative involving responsible local government agencies in Ocampo (see Finding 10, above) as a starting point for future collaboration and an example of a process that could be developed in other municipalities. The support of the LGU (mayor) will be critically important. This includes coordination between NCIP, DLR, and DENR regarding the plotting and integration of titled/private agricultural lands which had been covered by DLR and paid by the Land Bank of the Philippines under Presidential Decree 27 (Operation Land Transfer) and CARP covered areas in the CADT before inclusion in the Register of Deeds, particularly in the municipality of Ocampo.
3. Better integrate future land tenure initiatives with other components, notably sustainable livelihoods through the promotion of off-farm activities, capacity building for organized action and IEC related to increasing awareness on the rights and responsibilities of different stakeholder groups and facilitating improved communication channels.
4. Provide increased assistance in organizational strengthening for IP groups.
5. Prioritize actions needed to determine existence of titles or proof of ownership for claims of privately-owned lands within the CADT areas.
6. Assist LGUs to provide support, in terms of lands and technical assistance in livelihood development for relocated families
7. Take advantage of the GMP revision process to review zoning plans, particularly with respect to Multiple Use Zones (MUZ). Also ensure that the ADSDPP and GMP are consistent.
8. Prioritize continued IEC efforts on tenurial rights in and around MINP.

F. Biodiversity Monitoring & Socio-Economic Research

i. Findings

The objective of this component is “improved generation and utilization of information for conservation and development planning and governance.” Although this appears very broad as phrased, the logframe indicators and results clearly show that it refers to biodiversity and socio-economic information, specific BMS and TRA data and how this is used to improve MINP conservation and management. Note that BMS/TRA information is also included in the IEC component. The project established Community-based Biodiversity Monitoring Groups

(CBBMGs) in seven barangays, to undertake monitoring using BMS tools (transect walk surveys, photo documentation, field diaries and focus group discussions)

1. There is a widespread perception that the degradation of MINP has declined, biodiversity has increased and threats are reduced. However, it is difficult to show the impact because of the lack of baseline information on state of forest and biodiversity. The UNDP MTR indicated that destructive activities had significantly declined before project start-up and forest cover had stabilized. Although this may be the case, it does not diminish the current threat (as evidenced by the treasure hunting fiasco) and continued vigilance is required since pressures have not been permanently removed. New pressures can come through those “unaware” or politically motivated (e.g. mining). Illegal activities in MINP appear to have decreased as a result of increased awareness and improved protection through the presence and activities of MIGs, who are members of forest-edge communities.
2. The BMS tools used are not ideal proxies for assessing habitat and biodiversity status. For example the 28 key indicator species are not all indicators of forest integrity or species of conservation concern. Rather, some are indicators of disturbed habitat. However, BMS tools have the advantage of being easy to apply by non-specialists. While the project was concerned not to develop high-technology monitoring systems such as GIS that may not be continued post-project because of financial costs and technical requirements, the possibilities of partnering with institutions capable of generating and analyzing GIS for the production of baseline maps that could then be used by the project were not fully explored. This could provide a further basis for “triangulating” and validating the results from BMS data for more accurate monitoring.
3. Further cooperation with local academic institutions can enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of biodiversity and socio-economic monitoring and research.
4. The results and analyses of BMS have not been fully packaged and presented in a way to maximize their use in project and policy development. The PAMB has a research and monitoring committee for this purpose. BMS data should also be packaged to be useful to other stakeholders, including CBOs and LGUs for appropriate actions. In fact, several regulations and ordinances at the local level have resulted, in part, from BMS/TRA initiatives.
5. BMS is not always fully appreciated by barangays and LGUs in terms of its usefulness to resource governance in spite the formation of CBBMGs. This results from their not seeing how the data will be applied and used. Even some CBBMGs doubt the utility of their data collection and question their continuation after the project. However, in some cases awareness and appreciation of MINP’s biodiversity has increased among CBBMGs. MIGs are a potential mechanism for sustaining BMS data collection, since they are regularly in the field (some CBBMGs are MIGs and vice-versa).
6. The implementation of threat reduction assessment (TRA) is an innovation made by the project that allows retrospective monitoring (critical in the absence of baseline data).

While TRA is a useful tool for IEC, its utilization for management actions is not well defined, since it is very much dependent on how it is undertaken and who undertakes it for perception of primary threats. Therefore it is not (currently) an objective indicator. For example, local farmers do not see abaca plantation as a threat, but even as a potential reforestation strategy. However, this is one of the major causes of forest degradation – a direct threat to biodiversity. In contrast, inorganic agriculture, primarily outside the park, is seen as a major threat, not because of its direct impact, but as a conduit for crop disease transmission and potential impact of pesticides on biodiversity. Weaknesses in the TRA undertaken by the project include inappropriate categorization of direct threats (as opposed to indirect ones) and overlapping threat categories. However, there remains scope for improving and adapting this methodology as a useful monitoring tool.

7. Population growth in the 23 barangays is relatively high – NIPAP noted that the sugarcane industry effectively reduces pressure on MINP because seasonal laborers, including MINP residents, are hired during planting and harvest season. A collapse in this industry could cause pressure on MINP resources to dramatically increase. Yet inorganic farming and monocropping (which includes sugarcane as a principal activity) is viewed as a major threat in the TRA.
8. The identification of site-specific threats and threat-doers is a critically important element of TRA. However, it was only addressed late in the project, so targeting of primary threat-doers was not achieved until then.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. Accurate and timely baseline data is critical to monitoring changes in forest cover and biodiversity.
2. A strategic mix of BMS/TRA tools can help promote the generation of adequate and objective data.
3. Biodiversity monitoring can be a useful tool for increasing awareness and mobilizing communities to be involved in PA protection and management

iii. Recommendations

1. Explore partnership with appropriate academic and research institutions with GIS capacity to develop a baseline map using GIS data that clearly indicates type of cover and land use and at a scale that facilitates monitoring of potential expansion of cultivated areas or other destructive activities, such as treasure hunting.
2. Develop a system for institutionalizing BMS/TRA results and activities that:
 - Identifies and gets commitments (including resources) from key groups, as well as identifying capacity building needs, to carry out biodiversity monitoring and threat reduction analysis on a regular basis, including PAO, LGUs and

MIGs/CBBMGs, including integration of BMS/TRA into LGU development plans and ordinances;

- Identifies how the results of BMS/TRA will be used in awareness raising, monitoring and policy development, as well as guiding the implementation of the GMP;
- Identifies a process of refining and adapting BMS/TRA to increase accuracy, relevance and usefulness as an adaptive management tool; and
- Builds partnerships with organizations and individuals interested in biodiversity monitoring, e.g. academic groups, NGOs.

G. Information, Education and Communication (IEC)

i. Findings

The objective of this component is the increased adoption of environmentally-friendly behavior among key stakeholders. It is not clear who the key stakeholders are, why and how they have been targeted, nor what constitutes environmentally-friendly behavior. Indicators relate to decreased threats (as measured by TRA) and “target households.” Expected Results refer to PAMB programs and farmers in forest-edge communities shifting from unsustainable farming practices to conservation farming activities. As with capacity building, there appears to have been no IEC strategy that identifies target groups, implements adapted IEC strategies and monitors the changes in awareness and resulting behavior changes against agreed indicators. As the EC MTR notes “focusing on a small number of key IEC activities is....crucial for sustainability.” The EC MTR did not recommend (as it did for the capacity building component) that IEC be a cross-cutting area, and as such IEC activities should be incorporated into each component. This could even have been done as part of capacity building strategies.

1. There is undoubtedly an increased awareness of the importance of biodiversity conservation, MINP and regulations among all stakeholders. This probably results from the project’s on-ground presence and interaction with stakeholders as much as the specific IEC programs developed by the project. In addition, IEC programs formed part of earlier Haribon and NIPAP efforts, so there is quite a long history of awareness raising efforts for the area.
2. Awareness on the need to conserve the PA is well pronounced in many areas especially its importance and values. The project has further broadened the conservation awareness of the general public, which was also initiated by other projects. The awareness level, however, on the different provisions of NIPAS law, particularly on the purpose and intent of management zoning, and land tenure provisions are not well understood in many areas. There is still a common perception that the PA should be free from human occupancy as a result of relocation projects and other factors (DENR, PA communities) initiated in Mount Isarog.
3. While the project has carried out many IEC initiatives and developed a wide array of materials and training, there appears to have been no coherent strategy for identifying priority targets (e.g. young people are perceived to learn faster than their elders) and

developing adapted messages to reach those posing the greatest threat to MINP, nor those with the greatest potential to affect MINP's conservation. As a result, it is difficult to assess the impact on increased awareness and resulting behavior change. Illegal activities in MINP have decreased through increased awareness and protection through MIGs.

ii. Lessons Learned

1. Attention to careful orientation of IEC methods and materials is necessary for these to have maximum value and impact
2. The effects of IEC efforts need to be carefully monitored to assess their impact on increased awareness and understanding, and their application to achieve desired behavioral change.

iii. Recommendations

1. Build into the revised GMP a prioritized strategy and action plan for IEC that identifies, prioritizes and targets different stakeholders (e.g. PACBRMA beneficiaries) and provides a monitoring plan for assessing impact.
2. There should be an effort to involve other influential groups, such as church and religious organizations in IEC efforts for MINP.
3. Use results of BMS/TRA to popularize the value and importance of MINP, indicate trends in park conservation and raise awareness of threats.
4. Community orientations (using popular methods and mediums) on NIPAS, IPRA and Land Reform Law still needs priority attention from the different mandated agencies.
5. Public consultations (communities and other affected sectors) on the proposed MINP PA Bill must be conducted by the PAMB, through the PAO.

H. Project Management

The PMO is represented by a group of capable and dedicated individuals who have performed admirably in working with a diverse set of stakeholders, particularly at the field level where their efforts have been much appreciated. Structurally, the PMO had some flaws, largely as a result of the project design, but PMO members worked hard to overcome these deficiencies. Early adoption and active promotion of an adaptive management approach based on logframe analysis could perhaps have further overcome some of these difficulties.

1. Each component of the project was implemented according to outputs required for that component. There appears to be no system for integrating and harmonizing different components despite the recognition of cross-cutting components (which is reflected in the PMO organizational chart). Once the original Project Director left the project, it was understandably difficult for the appointed OIC Project Director to achieve this

coordinating function in addition to his existing responsibilities for the complex sustainable livelihoods component.

2. The project lacks integrative mechanisms related to the different structures it has introduced at the community level (CBOs, MIGs, CBBMGs). The operations of the different organizations are not well linked due to this absence of integrating mechanisms. The adoption of the barangay council or barangay development council as the focal point for integration could have streamlined operations had the project concentrated on barangay development planning as the entry point for sustainability
3. Relatively high staff turnover, including project managers, resulted in poor institutional memory throughout project, with most current staff having joined the project relatively recently. More effort could have been expended in ensuring that existing knowledge was passed on when staff members or consultants left the project.
4. PMO has done a very good job in organizing stakeholder participation and involving concerned groups and individuals. This was manifested during the PFRE where enthusiastic and capable workshop facilitator teams enhanced the success of the operation. The PMO has also done a very good job in reporting and documentation.
5. Individually, PMO members are capable, committed and hard-working despite sometimes difficult working conditions and the pressure of time constraints. It is to be hoped that the knowledge and skills gained can be used to further the goals of the project in some capacity after the project ends.
6. Financial management and reporting was efficient and timely. CARE has an established financial management system that can accommodate the needs of donor agencies. The way that the donor financial systems are set up made it very difficult to estimate financial allocation and use by individual component. Use of project resources was appropriate.

DAC EVALUATION REPORT SUMMARY

Final Review of Mt. Isarog Integrated Conservation and Development Project (MIICDP)

The general findings are that the project is relevant in design although design flaws hindered an integrated approach which may have limited effectiveness in achieving project objectives. The project had a positive impact, at least in the short term, and generated lessons useful for similar projects in the region. The project was efficiently implemented but sustainability of project achievements remains in doubt.

Subject of the evaluation: MIICDP is an integrated conservation and development project for Mount Isarog Natural Park (MINP) in Camarines Sur, Philippines. It is implemented by CARE Philippines.

Evaluation Description: The main purpose of the final review was to facilitate a process of social learning, capacity development and stakeholder mobilization through a participatory review of project assessment, lessons learned and recommendations. The latter form the basis of the current report. A three-person team worked with a multi-stakeholder workshop facilitator team to conduct workshops in communities around the park and hold meetings and discussions with other key groups and individuals.

Main Findings:

- The project design was very ambitious, given the scope of the objectives and activities and the limited time frame of four years.
- The project design is unclear about the goals and approach of the project, particularly the linkage between conservation of MINP and the development of sustainable livelihoods. This resulted in compartmentalization of the project components rather than an integrated strategy.
- The project has laid the basis for improved conservation, notably through support the mobilization and organization of community-based park guards and raising awareness of the values and importance of the park, as well as rules and regulations regarding its management.
- The project has invested a great deal of effort in supporting the creation and building the capacity of community-based organizations (CBOs) for production, savings, credit and marketing and promoting organic farming. However impact was limited due to limited timeframe and poor linkage with conservation objectives.
- A clear and realistic time-bound strategy and action plan for land tenure security was missing at the beginning of the project, but the project has scaled down its expectations and activities in light of the realities of dealing with this complex situation and has achieved some modest successes which can be built upon.
- The Protected Area Management Board (PAMB) is showing signs of revitalization, although issues of representation, governance and operations remain.
- The forest rehabilitation component has met its targets and provided the basis for an economically viable income generating activity that can in theory be expanded, based on resource management agreements.
- The CARE PMO has worked diligently to try to achieve project outputs. It has worked well with, and mobilized, different stakeholders and project efforts have generally been appreciated by most stakeholders, but significant concern still exists about how to build on project activities.

Recommendations

- EC and UNDP should develop processes to ensure common agreed goals and approaches in co-financed projects such as MIICDP.
- Sustainability of project outputs and outcomes needs to be built into project design and systems for monitoring sustainability developed.
- The General Management Plan (GMP) for MINP currently being revised should be used as a flexible framework for future actions related to MINP conservation. The PAMB/PAO should work with appropriate implementing partners for the programs of the GMP.
- The Protected Area Office (PAO) of the Dept. of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) needs to prioritize its role and actions relative to park management and coordinating GMP implementation.
- There needs to be a more concerted effort to engage Local Government Units (LGUs), particularly at the municipal level to support various concerns in park management.
- Further reforestation initiatives in MINP through the upcoming Bicol River Basin Development Project should be explored.
- Pursue the mapping initiative for land tenure prioritization involving responsible local government agencies in Ocampo as a starting point for future collaboration and an example of a process that could be developed in other municipalities.
- Build on the modest efforts to organize tenured migrants to develop community resource management plans and eventual Protected Area Community-Based Resource Management Agreements in Lugsad and Harubay and seek to expand this elsewhere in MINP.
- Build into the revised GMP a prioritized strategy and action plan for information, education and communication (IEC) that identifies, prioritizes and targets different stakeholders and provides a monitoring plan for assessing impact.

PROJECT RATINGS SUMMARY

CRITERIA	RATING	REMARKS
Achievement of Objectives: Biodiversity resources of Mount Isarog protected and ecologically sustainable livelihoods developed for those living around it.	Satisfactory for protection of biodiversity Marginally satisfactory for sustainable livelihoods	Affected by poor linkage of sub-objectives
Implementation Approach	Satisfactory	Constrained by project design issues
Stakeholder Participation/ Public Involvement	Highly Satisfactory	
Sustainability	Unsatisfactory	Not enough attention paid to post-project sustainability
Monitoring & Evaluation	Satisfactory	Constrained by use of poorly-articulated logframe

SUMMIT/MIICDP Participatory Final Review and Evaluation

Financial Planning Cofinancing Matrix

- Other refers to contributions mobilized from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (in Euro)		Government (in Euro)		Other* (in Euro)										Total (in Euro)		Total Disbursement (in Euro)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	CEC ¹		UNDP-GEF ²		British Embassy- Manila ³		Gov't of Lower Austria thru CARE Austria [•]		Jeff Peierls Foundation [•]		Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
					Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual				
Grants	10,244	10,244			978,546	953,322	730,038	529,687	160,821	166,144	18,585	18,585	71,002	74,232	1,958,992	1,741,970	1,969,236	1,752,214
Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)																		
Credits																		
Equity investments																		
In-kind support																		
Other (*)																		
Totals	10,244	10,244			978,546	953,322	730,038	529,687	160,821	166,144	18,585	18,585	71,002	74,232	1,958,992	1,741,970	1,969,238	1,752,214

NOTES:

¹ CEC funding starts January 2000

² UNDP-GEF Funding starts February 2001

³ British Embassy Funding starts December 1998 until December 2002

• Government of Lower Austria thru CARE Austria funding starts October 1998 until December 2001

• Jeff Peierls Foundation (JPF) April 2000 to June 2001 & January 2003 to June 2004

Leveraged Resources -Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.