

**UN-REDD**  
PROGRAMME



# National Programmes Annual Report - **PHILIPPINES**

---

UN-REDD Programme

---

May 2013

## **Annual Report Template for the UN-REDD National Programmes**

The *Annual Report* for the National Programmes, for each twelve months period ending 31 December (1 January-31 December), should be submitted to the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat as per the deadline agreed between the three participating UN Organizations and the MPTF Office. Prior to submitting the report to the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat ([un-redd@un-redd.org](mailto:un-redd@un-redd.org)), the report should be co-signed by the selected focal point for each participating UN Organization, as well as the Government Counterpart. For more background information, roles and responsibilities please refer to the *UN-REDD Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Framework Document*.

The National Programme annual report draws information from standard management tools (financial and technical) at the programme and national level to minimize the workload for programme teams. The report is divided into four sections: 1) National Programme Status, 2) National Programme Progress 3) General Programme Indicators, 4) Government Counterpart Information, 5) Other stakeholders (non-government) information).

The participating UN Organizations are responsible for filling out sections 1, 2 and 3, the Government counterpart will be requested to fill out section 4 and the other relevant non-governmental stakeholders will be responsible for filling out section 5.

# 1. National Programme Status

## 1.1 National Programme Identification

Country: Philippines  
 Title of programme:  
 UN – REDD Philippines Programme: Supporting Initial  
 Readiness Process

Date of signature<sup>1</sup>: 28 July 2011  
 Date of first transfer of funds<sup>2</sup>: 05 August 2011  
 End date according to National Programme  
 Document: 27 July 2012  
 No-cost extension requested<sup>3</sup>: 30 April 2013

Implementing partners<sup>4</sup>:  
 Forest Management Bureau (FMB) of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)  
 Responsible partners:

1. Code-REDD Philippines
2. Ateneo School of Government (ASoG)
3. Climate Change Commission (CCC)
4. Conservation International-Philippines (CIP)
5. Fauna and Flora International (FFI)
6. Non-timber Forest Products Exchange Programme (NTFP EP)
7. Women's Initiative for Society, Culture and Environment (WISE)

The financial information reported should include indirect costs, M&E and other associated costs.

| Financial Summary (USD) <sup>5</sup> |  |                                 |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| UN Agency                            | Approved Programme Budget <sup>6</sup> | Amount transferred <sup>7</sup> | Cummulative Expenditures up to 31 December 2012 <sup>8</sup> |
| FAO                                  | 315,650.00                             | 315,650.00                      | 142,980.00   |
| UNDP                                 | 162,950.00                             | 162,950.00                      | 102,071.05   |
| UNEP                                 | 21,400.00                              | 21,400.00                       | 0.00   |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>500,000.00</b>                      | <b>500,000.00</b>               | <b>245,051.05</b>  |

<sup>1</sup> Last signature on the National Programme Document

<sup>2</sup> As reflected on the MPTF Office Gateway <http://mptf.undp.org>

<sup>3</sup> If yes, please provide new end date






<sup>4</sup> Those organizations either sub-contracted by the Project Management Unit or those organizations officially identified in the National Programme Document as responsible for implementing a defined aspect of the project. Do not include the participating UN Organizations unless Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) is being applied.

<sup>5</sup> The information on expenditure is unofficial. Official, certified financial information is provided by the HQ of the Participating UN Organizations by 30 April and can be accessed on the MPTF Office GATEWAY (<http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/CCF00>)

<sup>6</sup> The total budget for the entire duration of the Programme, as specified in the signed Submission Form and National Programme Document. This information is available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY: <http://mptf.undp.org>

<sup>7</sup> Amount transferred to the participating UN Organization from the UN-REDD Multi-Partner Trust Fund. This information is available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY: <http://mptf.undp.org>

<sup>8</sup> The sum of commitments and disbursement

| Electronic signatures by the designated UN organization <sup>9</sup>  |   |  | Electronic signature by the Government Counterpart                                  |
|---|---|--|---|
| FAO   | UNDP  | UNEP   |   |
|    |  |  |  |
| <b>Type the date and name of signatories in full:</b>   |   |  |   |
| Toshiiro Tanaka<br>Representative, a.i.<br>FAO<br> | Toshiiro Tanaka<br>Country Director<br>UNDP                                       | Thomas Enters<br>Regional Coordinator<br>UNEP                                      | Analiza Rebueta-Teh<br>Chief of Staff<br>Undersecretary<br>DENR                     |

<sup>9</sup> Each UN organisation is to nominate one or more focal points to sign the report. Please refer to the *UN-REDD Programme Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Framework* document for further guidance

## 1.2 Monitoring Framework

| Expected Results<br>(Outcome or Output)  | Indicators              | Baseline  | Overall progress<br>(Cumulative achievements)   |   | Progress Against Annual Targets<br>(Achievements gained in the reporting period)   |  |
|--|-------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
|  |                         |   | Expected Targets<br>(According to the National Programme Document)  | Cumulative Progress Towards the Overall Target<br>(Outcome or Output)   | Expected Annual Target<br>(According to the annual work plan)  | Achievements of the Annual Target<br>(Outcome or Output)   |
| <b>Outcome 1. REDD+ readiness support by effective, inclusive and participatory management process</b> |                         |   |   |   |  |  |
| Output 1.1<br>Strong commitment on REDD+ from key stakeholders gained                                  | REDD+ readiness roadmap | As per project document, no such materials exist. However, FMB and CoDe-REDD Philippines have already produced the PNRPS and a briefing material on it has been published and shared.<br><br>PNRPS has legal framework (Section 15 of NCCAPP/ approved last Nov 25, 2011) | As per NPD, Roadmap ready after 7 months.<br><br>For UN REDD Philippines, the target is to organize a National-Multi Stakeholder REDD Plus Council (NMRC) as the embodiment of the country's strong commitment to REDD+ | UN REDD Philippines contributes to PNRPS by supporting the creation of the National Multi-stakeholders REDD+ Council (NMRC) and its provincial counterparts.<br><br>1. Programme Executive Board (PEB) formally organized and three PEB meetings held<br>2. National and regional consultation on the structure and functions of Provincial Multi-stakeholders REDD+ Councils (PMRCs) completed<br>3. TOR for the NMRC drafted and presented to UN REDD TWGs for refinements<br>4. Operations Manual for the NMRC Drafted<br>5. CCC Resolution providing policy basis for NMRC drafted and presented to CCC for consideration<br>6. Prospective list of NMRC members completed and invitation to participate in its first meeting sent out by CCC | National Multi-Stakeholder REDD+ Council (NMRC) organized and operationalized. NMRC is envisioned to be the main mechanism that will monitor and regulate REDD+ activities in the country. | 1. Programme Executive Board (PEB) formally organized and three PEB meetings held<br>2. National and regional consultation on the structure and functions of both NMRC and PMRC completed<br>3. TOR for the NMRC drafted and presented to UN REDD TWGs for refinements<br>4. Operations Manual for the NMRC Drafted<br>5. CCC Resolution providing policy basis for NMRC drafted and is for deliberation by the Commission<br>6. Prospective list of NMRC members completed and invitation to participate in its first meeting sent out by CCC<br>7. First meeting of the NMRC and adoption of the NMRC TOR and Operations Manual yet to be achieved |

| Expected Results (Outcome or Output)  | Indicators  | Baseline   | Overall progress (Cumulative achievements)  |  | Progress Against Annual Targets (Achievements gained in the reporting period)   |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
|   |   |  | Expected Targets (According to the National Programme Document)   | Cumulative Progress Towards the Overall Target (Outcome or Output)   | Expected Annual Target (According to the annual work plan)  | Achievements of the Annual Target (Outcome or Output)  |
| Output 1.2. Awareness of key stakeholders on REDD+ enhanced   | Produced and disseminate Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials | No UN REDD Philippines IEC Materials exist                               | As per NPD, the activities should have been started in July 2011 and should already be completed by June 2012.  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PEB adopted the Communications Plan of the PNRPS, including a programme of REDD+ Roadshows</li> <li>Agreement between NTFP-EP and FMB signed, to cover implementation of all activities under Output 1.2</li> <li>Nine Roadshows completed, four of which were co-financed by SDC</li> <li>Frequently asked questions (FAQ) workshop completed</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of the some components of PNRPS' Communications &amp; Media Plan</li> <li>Inventory of existing IEC materials developed on REDD+</li> <li>Development/enhancement of information, education &amp; communications (IEC) materials</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PEB adopted the Communications Plan of the PNRPS, including a programme of REDD+ Roadshows</li> <li>Agreement between NTFP-EP and FMB signed, to cover implementation of all activities under Output 1.2</li> <li>Nine Roadshows completed, four of which were co-financed by SDC</li> <li>Frequently asked questions (FAQ) workshop completed</li> </ol> |
| Output 1.3: National REDD+ capacity programme developed in cooperation with GIZ/ CoDe REDD/ other service providers                               | National Capacity Development Programme for REDD+                                 | No National Capacity Development Programme; Low capacity of stakeholders | Draft Capacity Development Programme based on a Capacity Assessment Report.   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct of Knowledge and Skills Competence Assessment (KSCA) on REDD+</li> <li>Produced Capacity Assessment Tool to aid analysis</li> <li>Capacity/Competency Assessment Report</li> <li>Training packages for REDD+</li> </ol>   | Draft Capacity Development Programme based on a Capacity Assessment Report.   | <p>Full delivery</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct of Knowledge and Skills Competence Assessment (KSCA) on REDD+</li> <li>Produced Capacity Assessment Tool to aid analysis</li> <li>Capacity/Competency Assessment Report</li> <li>Training packages for REDD+</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Outcome 2: Systematic and structural approach to REDD+ readiness identified through concrete studies of options and inclusive consultation</b> |   |  |   |  |   |  |
| Output 2.1 Systematic and structural approach to the application of safeguards in   | REDD+ social and environmental safeguards   | Minimal social and environmental safeguards.                             | Compendium of existing and proposed safeguards<br>Proposed REDD+ safeguards (framework/ guidance, protocols/ monitoring framework, criteria and indicators) | Completed the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work plan completed and agreement concluded with ASoG, CIP and WISE for completion of output 2.1</li> <li>Compendium of existing and proposed safeguards</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compendium of existing and proposed safeguards</li> <li>Proposed REDD+ safeguards (guidelines, framework, protocols/ monitoring framework, criteria and indicators)</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work plan completed and agreement concluded with ASoG, CIP and WISE for completion of activities under output 2.1</li> <li>Compendium of existing and proposed safeguards</li> <li>Review of Literature: REDD+</li> </ol>   |

| Expected Results (Outcome or Output)  | Indicators                                      | Baseline  | Overall progress (Cumulative achievements)   |  | Progress Against Annual Targets (Achievements gained in the reporting period)  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
|   |   |   | Expected Targets (According to the National Programme Document) indicators)  | Cumulative Progress Towards the Overall Target (Outcome or Output)   | Expected Annual Target (According to the annual work plan)   | Achievements of the Annual Target (Outcome or Output)  |
| REDD+ readiness identified  |   |   | <p>3. Review of Literature: REDD+ safeguards framework and guidelines</p> <p>4. Workshop and report on Stocktaking Matrix and Narrative on safeguards and guidelines</p> <p>5. Draft of Safeguards Framework and Guidelines for REDD+ in the Philippines, including monitoring framework and protocols</p> <p>6. Generation of 10 principles and associated criteria for further action on REDD+ safeguards, through literature review, policy and risk analysis</p> | <p>3. Review of Literature: REDD+ safeguards framework and guidelines</p> <p>4. Workshop and report on Stocktaking Matrix and Narrative on safeguards and guidelines</p> <p>5. Draft of Safeguards Framework and Guidelines for REDD+ in the Philippines, including monitoring framework and protocols</p> <p>6. Generation of 10 principles and associated criteria for further action on REDD+ safeguards, through literature review, policy and risk analysis</p> | <p>4. Workshop and report on Stocktaking Matrix and Narrative on safeguards framework and guidelines</p> <p>5. Draft of Safeguards Framework and Guidelines for REDD+ in the Philippines, including monitoring framework and protocols</p> <p>6. Generation of 10 principles and associated criteria for further action on REDD+ safeguards, through literature review, policy and risk analysis</p> | <p>4. Workshop and report on Stocktaking Matrix and Narrative on safeguards framework and guidelines</p> <p>5. Draft of Safeguards Framework and Guidelines for REDD+ in the Philippines, including monitoring framework and protocols</p> <p>6. Generation of 10 principles and associated criteria for further action on REDD+ safeguards, through literature review, policy and risk analysis</p>                                       |
| <b>Project Outcome 3: Enhanced capacities for Monitoring and MRV</b>                                |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.1. Harmonized methodology for reference baselines for selected REDD-able sites established | Harmonized methodology for reference baselining | Several methodologies and approaches in gathering forestry data exist | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced capacity of MRV Technical Working Group on forest monitoring</li> <li>Enhanced database on REDD+ community of practitioners</li> <li>Draft NMRC resolution on REDD+ eligible activities</li> <li>Feasibility Study - monitoring options for REDD+</li> </ul>   | Completed the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical Working Group on MRV organized and regular meetings held to plan detailed activities and schedules</li> <li>Agreements concluded with CIP and FFI to conduct activities under output 3.1</li> <li>'Symposium-Workshop on Forest Stratification for REDD+ and forest monitoring'</li> <li>Workshop on REDD+ eligible activities with MRV TWG</li> </ol>                                     | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced capacity of MRV Technical Working Group on forest monitoring</li> <li>Enhanced database on REDD+ community of practitioners</li> <li>Draft NMRC resolution on REDD+ eligible activities</li> <li>Feasibility Study - monitoring options for REDD+</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical Working Group on MRV organized and regular meetings held to plan detailed activities and schedules</li> <li>Agreements concluded with CIP and FFI to conduct activities under output 3.1</li> <li>'Symposium-Workshop on Forest Stratification for REDD+ and forest monitoring'</li> <li>Workshop on REDD+ eligible activities with MRV TWG</li> <li>Learning visit of MRV TWG</li> </ol> |

| Expected Results (Outcome or Output)    | Indicators          | Baseline                        | Overall progress (Cumulative achievements)                      |   | Progress Against Annual Targets (Achievements gained in the reporting period) |  |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
|   |                     |                                 | Expected Targets (According to the National Programme Document) | Cumulative Progress Towards the Overall Target (Outcome or Output)  | Expected Annual Target (According to the annual work plan)                    | Achievements of the Annual Target (Outcome or Output)  |
| 3.2 A national MRV approach established | MRV approach/design | Fragmented or no efforts at all | Proposed MRV System   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Learning visit of MRV TWG membersto General Nakar</li> <li>6. "Symposium-Workshop on Forest Inventory and data analysis"</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Proposed MRV System</li> </ol>      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. members to General Nakar "Symposium-Workshop on Forest Inventory and data analysis"</li> <li>1. Schedule is finalized and this will be held in Palawan in March 2013.</li> </ol> |



### 1.3 Financial Information

In the table below, please provide up-to-date information on activities completed based on the Results Framework included in the signed National Programme Document; as well as financial data on planned, committed and disbursed funds. The table requests information on the cumulative financial progress of the National Programme implementation at the end of the reporting period (including all cumulative yearly disbursements). Please add additional rows as needed.

Definitions of financial categories:

- **Commitments:** Includes all amount committed to date. Commitment is the amount for which legally binding contracts have been signed and entered into the Agencies' financial systems, including multi-year commitments which may be disbursed in future years.
- **Disbursement:** Amount paid to a vendor or entity for goods received, work completed, and/or services rendered (does not include un-liquidated obligations)
- **Expenditures:** Total of commitments plus disbursements

| PROGRAMME OUTCOME   | UN ORGANISATION | IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS                     |   |                   |                                |
|---|-----------------|---|---|-------------------|--------------------------------|
|   |                 | Amount Transferred by MPTF to Programme (A) | Cumulative Expenditures up to 31 December 2012<br>Commitments (B) | Disbursements (C) | Total Expenditures (D)=(B)+(C) |
| Please write outcome in full  | FAO             | 31,500.00                                   | 0.00  | 5,957.00          | 5,957.00                       |
|   | UNDP            | 44,780.00                                   | 0.00  | 18,707.95         | 18,707.95                      |
|   | UNEP            |   |   |                   |                                |
| Sub-total   |                 |   |   |                   |                                |
| Outcome 1: REDD+ readiness support by effective, inclusive and participatory management process | FAO             | 10,400.00                                   | 0.00  | 0.00              | 0.00                           |
|   | UNDP            | 118,170.00                                  | 0.00  | 83,363.10         | 83,363.10                      |
|   | UNEP            | 20,000.00                                   | 0.00  | 0.00              | 0.00                           |
| Sub-total   |                 |   |   |                   |                                |
| Project Outcome 3: Enhanced capacities for Monitoring and MRV                                   | FAO             | 193,100.00                                  | 3,108.00  | 69,948.00         | 73,056.00                      |
|   | UNDP            |   |   |                   |                                |
|   | UNEP            |   |   |                   |                                |
| Sub-total   |                 |   |   |                   |                                |
| Programme Management  | FAO             | 60,000.00                                   |   | 54,818.00         | 54,818.00                      |
|   |                 | 295,000.00                                  |   |                   | 133,830.00                     |
|   |                 | 20,650.00                                   |   | 9,150             | 9,150.00                       |
| <b>FAO (Total before 7% Indirect Cost):</b>   |                 | <b>315,650.00</b>                           |   |                   | <b>142,980.00</b>              |
| <b>7% Indirect Cost</b>   |                 |   |   |                   |                                |
| <b>FAO (TOTAL)</b>  |                 |   |   |                   | <b>102,071.05</b>              |
| <b>UNDP (TOTAL)</b>   |                 |   |   |                   |                                |
| <b>UNEP (TOTAL)</b>   |                 |   |   |                   |                                |
| <b>Grand TOTAL:</b>   |                 | <b>500,000.00</b>                           | <b>3,108</b>  | <b>241,944.05</b> | <b>245,051.05</b>              |

### 1.3.1 Co-financing

If additional resources (direct co-financing) are provided to activities supported by the UN-REDD National Programme, please fill in the table below:

| Sources of co-financing <sup>10</sup> | Name of co-financer                                | Type of co-financing <sup>11</sup> | Amount (US\$) |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------|
| FFI/PTFCF                             | Philippine Tropical Forest Conservation Foundation | Cash                               | 2,439.02      |
| FFI/EU Funding                        |  | Cash                               | 1,542.98      |
| NTFP/SDC                              |  | Cash                               | 35,898.62     |
| FMB                                   | FMB's Planning Office                              | Cash                               | 24,492.04     |

### 1.3.2 Additional finance for national REDD+ efforts catalyzed by the National Programme

| Name of financer | Description                           | Amount (US\$) |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| USAID            | Cost-sharing in Activities            | 30,000.00     |
| USFS             | Technical Assistance                  | 41,095.00     |
| GIZ              | Cost-sharing and Technical Assistance | 4,000.00      |

## 2. National Programme Progress

### 2.1 Narrative on Progress, Difficulties and Contingency Measures

**2.1.1** Please provide a brief overall assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is progressing in relation to expected outcomes and outputs. Please provide examples if relevant (600 words).

As of end December 2012, all preparatory work under outcome 1 has been completed. The Climate Change Commission (CCC) has completed all regional consultations on the prospective role and structure of both the NMRC and the PMRCs. The Terms of Reference (TOR), Operations Manual, and the CCC Resolution affirming the legal basis of NMRC for the PNRPS, have all been drafted and are awaiting formal adoption. The first meeting of the NMRC is scheduled for March-April 2013. Progress towards outputs 1.1 and 1.2 is therefore well advanced, but not yet complete. Completion of capacity building activities under output 1.2 is dependent on the conclusion of NMRC establishment under output 1.1.

The competency assessment and national capacity development programme under output 1.3 is completed. The UN-REDD Programme, through NTFP-EP, implemented 5 Roadshows in Baguio, Southern Leyte, Iloilo, Zamboanga, and Davao. Further training sessions were implemented by FMB using alternative resources.

Outcome 2 is also close to completion. The safeguards framework and guidelines have been prepared for presentation to the NMRC and other stakeholders but must still be published, subjected to field testing and multi-stakeholder validation and presented to the NMRC for endorsement.

Activities under Outcome 3, relating to enhanced capacities for Monitoring and MRV, are also progressing well. Out of the series of three planned symposia under this outcome, under a LoA with CIP, two have already been conducted, on forest stratification and National Forest Inventory. Under a

<sup>10</sup> Indicate if the source of co-financing is from: Bilateral aid agency, foundation, local government, national government, civil society organizations, other multilateral agency, private sector, or others.

<sup>11</sup> Indicate if co-financing is in-kind or cash.

LoA with FFI Philippines, the MRV TWG received field-based awareness raising in monitoring techniques for forest carbon and biodiversity. The remaining activities are the Remote Sensing symposium and the Integration of all MRV outputs into a consolidated Monitoring and MRV plan for REDD+.

**2.1.2 Please provide a brief overall assessment of any measures taken to ensure the sustainability of the National Programme results during the reporting period. Please provide examples if relevant. (250 words)**

Activities under the UN-REDD Philippines Programme are anchored within the PNRPS and its outputs therefore contribute to the national development framework for REDD+. The PNRPS is being driven by an alliance of CSOs and government agencies (DENR, FMB and CCC), under the leadership of the UN-REDD Programme's implementing partner, the FMB. In this context, REDD+ work is seen as a joint initiative of both FMB and its CSO partners.

The comparative advantage of the UN-REDD Programme is that it provides the enabling environment to consolidate lessons from demonstration sites and to harness and coordinate the resources of the various contributors to the PNRPS. Its outputs provide the platform for the full readiness phase of the PNRPS. The results of the UN-REDD Programme will therefore outlive the Programme itself and be sustained as long as the Philippines continues with REDD+ readiness and implementation. The creation of the NMRC, the safeguards framework, the information campaigns and capacity building programme and the analysis of tools and methodologies for monitoring and MRV, are all important building blocks for the REDD+ readiness phase in the Philippines.

If the UN-REDD Programme has no further involvement in the Philippines after the conclusion of the INP, planning for a comprehensive national REDD+ programme will continue. The FMB and its CSO partners are working with USAID, USFS and GIZ to ensure continuity of REDD+ initiatives in the country and to build on the outputs of the UN-REDD Programme.

**2.1.3 If there are difficulties in the implementation of the National Programme, what are the main causes of these difficulties? Please check the most suitable option.**

- UN agency Coordination
- Coordination with Government
- Coordination within the Government
- Administrative (Procurement, etc) /Financial (management of funds, availability, budget revision, etc)
- Management: 1. Activity and output management
- Management: 2. Governance/Decision making (Programme Management Committee/National Steering Committee)
- Accountability
- Transparency
- National Programme design
- External to the National Programme (risks and assumptions, elections, natural disaster, social unrest)

**2.1.4 If boxes are checked under 2.1.3, please briefly describe any current *internal* difficulties<sup>12</sup> the National Programme is facing in relation to the implementation of the activities outlined in the National Programme Document. (200 words)**

Differences between UN agencies regarding disbursement policies remain an obstacle to efficient management of the Programme. This problem is magnified in a small Programme such as that in the Philippines because of the relative shortage of human resources in the PMU. Shortage of relevant technical expertise within agency country offices resulted in delays in review and finalization of activity proposals and reports, especially in relation to outcome 3,

<sup>12</sup> Difficulties confronted by the team directly involved in the implementation of the National Programme

FMB, as the lead Implementing Partner, is expected to assume a leadership role within the Programme, and ensure national ownership. This leadership and ownership has not been evident. The initial leadership role on REDD+ in the Philippines was taken by civil society in the form of the CoDeREDD alliance. While this was a positive development, particularly with respect to multi-stakeholder coordination and consultation, it reflected a lack of priority and awareness given to REDD+ within the Philippines government. FMB's relatively low profile has inhibited communication and understanding of the potential significance of REDD+ within other branches of the government. On a practical level, the shortage of human resources within FMB, and the growing demands on these limited resources from increased donor emphasis on forestry and REDD+, has impeded coordination between the PMU and the rest of the FMB. The UN-REDD Programme is considered as one of several competing demands on FMB staff time rather than a means to develop institutional ownership of REDD+ activities within the country as a whole.

The multi-stakeholder, consultative nature of the REDD+ initiatives in the Philippines, embodied by the PNRPS, has contributed to delays in implementation experienced by the Programme. It is time-consuming to assemble decision-makers.

**2.1.5 If boxes are checked under 2.1.3, please briefly describe any current *external* difficulties<sup>13</sup> (not caused by the National Programme) that delay or impede the quality of implementation. (200 words)**

N/A

**2.1.6 Please, briefly explain the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or manage the difficulties (internal and external referred to in question 2.1.3 and 2.1.4) described in the previous sections. (250 words)**

The UN-REDD Programme developed constructive partnerships with parallel initiatives of GIZ, SDC, USAID and USFS, which compensated for the limited technical capacity of the PMU and UN agencies in country.

The NMRC will be institutionally linked to the CCC, not within the FMB, which will facilitate inter-departmental coordination within the government and give the PNRPS and REDD+ issues a higher profile than at present. This may facilitate the necessary flow of resources to FMB and other (non-forestry) departments which are necessary for effective implementation of REDD+ strategies.

The PMU worked closely with FMB leadership to ensure a prominent role of government representatives in Technical Working Groups (TWGs), PEB meetings and Programme activities. As the Programme has proceeded, both PMU staff and country offices of UN agencies have become more familiar with the National Joint Programme working modalities and have therefore become more effective in Programme administration.

The adoption of TWGs greatly expedited Programme implementation. Individual TWG members provided much-needed expertise in all Programme outcomes and their inputs shaped all the outputs of the Programme.

Closely working with the FMB Director, who is also the National Programme Director for the UN-REDD Programme, expedited scheduling of activities and the paperwork required for FMB personnel's participation in Programme activities. Greater direct engagement of the FMB Director by the Programme has led to allocation of FMB budget resources to support Programme activities, for REDD 101 training for FMB personnel nationwide, for example. This demonstrated, and enhanced, sense of ownership of the UN-REDD Programme by the FMB.

## **2.2 Inter-Agency Coordination**

The aim of the questions below is to collect relevant information on how the National Programme is contributing to inter-agency work and "Delivering as One".

---

<sup>13</sup> Difficulties confronted by the team caused by factors outside of the National Programme

**2.2.1 Is the National Programme in coherence with the UN Country Programme or other donor assistance framework approved by the Government?**

X Yes  No

If not, please explain:

**2.2.2 What types of coordination mechanisms and decisions have been taken to ensure joint delivery? Please reflect on the questions above and add any other relevant comments and examples if you consider it necessary:**

The main coordination mechanism for the Programme is the PEB, whose members include several government agencies, UN organizations, and civil society organizations. The PEB delegated operational decisions over implementation of Programme activities to Technical Working Groups (TWGs). This enhanced multi-stakeholder ownership of the Programme and reduced the visibility of the individual UN agencies at the activity level. The UN-REDD Programme is therefore perceived within the Philippines as a single Programme rather than a series of separate agency-led initiatives. The use of LoAs with CSOs has been the main method of Programme delivery for all outcomes. This also helps to dilute visibility of individual agencies. However, this is more a result of reduced visibility of the partner agencies at country level rather than an active perception of the agencies working together.

**2.2.3 Are the recommendations of the HACT assessment being applied in the implementation of the National Programme by the three participating UN organisations?**

Yes X No

If not, please explain, including which recommendations from the HACT assessment have or have not been applied:

There has been no HACT assessment. There are attempts to implement HACT but these are experimental in nature and not the main modality for programme expenditures. No cash transfers have been made to FMB.

## **2.3 Ownership<sup>14</sup> and Development Effectiveness**

The questions below seeks to gather relevant information on how the National Programme is putting into practice the principles of aid effectiveness through strong national ownership, alignment and harmonization of procedures and mutual accountability.

**2.3.1 Do government and other national implementation partners have ownership of the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

No x Some  Yes

Please explain:

Formally, agencies of the Philippines government have assumed responsibility over the UN-REDD Programme, with the FMB as the Lead Implementing agency, and the CCC, Protected Area and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB) and the National Council for Indigenous People (NCIP) responsible for particular outputs. REDD+ is gradually being integrated into FMB's programmes and strategies. During the PEB meeting in December of 2012, the FMB director committed to take the lead role for sustaining the achievement of the UN-REDD Programme. However, there is a more clear sense of ownership of the Programme among CSOs within the CoDeREDD alliance, due to their leadership role in the PNRPS.

**2.3.2 Are the UN-REDD Programme's Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement and Operational Guidance Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest Dependent Communities being applied in the National Programme process?**

No x Partially  Fully

---

<sup>14</sup> Ownership refers to countries exercising effective leadership over their REDD+ policies and strategies, and co-ordination of actions.

**Please explain, including if level of consultation varies between non-government stakeholders:**

There was no conscious effort in following the “Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement and Operational Guidance Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest Dependent Communities” but all significant outputs of the UN-REDD Programme went through a series of consultations at varying levels: LGUs, CSOs, and indigenous communities. The NMRC consultations, for example, engaged stakeholders from both the government and indigenous communities to draft both the ToR and the Operations Manual of the NMRC.

The safeguards framework also went through several consultations at different levels – TWGs, expanded stakeholders’ roundtable discussions to include different government agencies and private organizations, and at the field level where LGUs, local CSOs and communities were also consulted. Indigenous communities were specially engaged during roadshows where questions and answers directly impacted on Programme and implementation strategy formulation. The engagement of indigenous communities shaped the communications and the way other IEC methods are implemented. There is a deliberate effort to translate REDD+ concepts into language understandable at the community level.

**2.3.3 What kind of decisions and activities are non-government stakeholders involved in?**

Policy/decision making

Management:  Budget  Procurement  Service provision

Other, please specify

**Please explain, including if level of involvement varies between non-government stakeholders:**

Non-government stakeholders are involved both at the PEB and TWG levels. At the PEB level, they influence identification of activities to be supported and the consequent allocation of financial resources. They also have the right to inquire about Programme expenditures that directly impact activities on the ground. For the UN-REDD Programme, the non-government sector or the CSOs are represented by CoDeREDD. While the representatives can ask questions or participate in setting allocations, it is assumed that they represent the interest of the CSO sector as a whole.

At the TWG level, members can recommend other priority activities related to the performance of TWG roles and functions. Since the PMU directly relates to the TWGs, it is the PMUs role to bring the recommendation of the TWGs to the PEB for decision making.

In terms of service provision, non-government stakeholders are of key importance to the UN-REDD Programme. Activities under all three outcomes have been achieved, in whole or in part, through LoAs with the CSOs listed as Responsible Partners above.

**2.3.4 Based on your previous answers, briefly describe the current situation of the government and non-government stakeholders in relation to ownership and accountability<sup>15</sup> of the National Programme. Please provide some examples.**

### **3. General Programme Indicators**

This section aims to aggregate information on results for the six work areas of the UN-REDD Programme defined in the Programme’s Strategy (2011-2015), delivered through the Global and National Programmes. Information is to be provided cumulatively. If the information requested is not available at this stage of Programme implementation, check the “does not apply” box.

**3.3.1 Number of MRV and monitoring related focal personnel with increased capacities:**

Women Total No 6

Men Total No 8

Comments:

---

<sup>15</sup> Accountability: Acknowledgment and assumption of responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies and encompassing the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences.

The programme cannot measure yet the “increase in capacity” of FMB and development partners’ staff since the country is still at the stage of learning and assessing MRV tools and technologies.

**3.3.2 Does the country have a functional MRV and monitoring system in place?**  
 Yes       Partially      x No       Not applicable at this stage  
**Comments:**

**3.3.3 Does the country have nationally owned governance indicators, developed through a participatory governance assessment?**  
 Yes       Partially      x No       Not applicable at this stage  
**Comments:**

**3.3.4 Was a participatory governance assessment supported by the UN-REDD Programme and incorporated into the National REDD+ Strategy?**  
 Yes       Partially      x No       Not applicable at this stage  
**Comments, including if the assessment was supported by another initiative:**

**3.3.5 Does the National REDD+ Strategy include anti-corruption measures, such as a code of conduct, conflict of interest prohibitions, links to existing anti-corruption frameworks, protection for whistleblowers or application of social standards?**  
 Yes      x Partially       No       Not applicable at this stage  
**Comments:**

The PNRPS identifies several of its strategies and activities as relevant for addressing corruption and vested interests. These mainly deal with institutional and verification issues but the document does not identify existing anti-corruption measures or set out a specific plan to reduce the risk of corruption for a national REDD+ Programme.

**3.3.6 Number of Indigenous Peoples/civil society stakeholders represented in REDD+ decision making, strategy development and implementation of REDD+ at the national level:**  
Women      Total No. 4  
Men      Total No. 4  
**Comments:**

**3.3.7 Number of consultation processes (Meetings, workshops etc.) underway for national readiness and REDD+ activities:**  
Total No. 80  
**Comments:**

**3.3.8 Grievance mechanism established in order to address grievances of people alleging an adverse effect related to the implementation of the UN-REDD national programme:**  
 Yes       Partially       No      X Not applicable at this stage  
**Comments:**

**3.3.9 Country has undertaken to operationalize Free Prior and Informed Consent for the implementation of readiness or REDD+ activities that impact Indigenous Peoples’ and local communities’ territories, resources, livelihoods and cultural identity:**  
 Yes      x Partially       No       Not applicable at this stage  
**Comments:**

The PNRPS states that “all REDD+ projects in ancestral domains areas will be required to comply” with FPIC, as set out in the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA). However, this does not address areas outside ancestral domains (e.g. with customary rights held by ‘local communities’ rather than Indigenous Peoples). The PNRPS itself, moreover, is not a legally enforceable document.

**3.3.10 Country applying safeguards for ecosystem services and livelihood risks and benefits:**

Yes       Partially       No       Not applicable at this stage

Comments:

**3.3.11 Application of the UN-REDD Programme social principles and criteria:**

Yes       Partially       No       Not applicable at this stage

Comments:

**3.3.12 REDD+ benefit distribution system contributes to inclusive development<sup>16</sup>, with specific reference to pro-poor<sup>17</sup> policies and gender mainstreaming<sup>18</sup>:**

Yes       Partially       No       Not applicable at this stage

Comments:

**3.3.13 Country adopting multiple benefit decision tool kit:**

Yes       Partially       No       Not applicable at this stage

Comments:

**3.3.14 National or sub-national development strategies incorporate REDD+ based investments as means of transformation of relevant sectors<sup>19</sup>:**

Yes       Partially       No       Not applicable at this stage

Comments:

**3.3.15 Investment agreements supported or influenced so that they take advantage of the REDD+ as a catalyst to a green economy:**

Yes       Partially       No       Not applicable at this stage

Comments:

---

<sup>16</sup> Inclusive development is development that marginalized groups take part in and benefit from, regardless of their gender, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, disability or poverty. Inclusive growth implies **participation and benefit-sharing**. On the one hand, it ensures that everyone can participate in the growth process, both in terms of decision-making for organizing the growth progression as well as in participating in the growth itself. On the other hand, it makes sure that everyone shares equitably the benefits of growth.

<sup>17</sup> Pro-poor policies are those that directly target poor people (i.e. benefit the poor more than the non-poor), or that are more generally aimed at reducing poverty. There is also a general consensus that pro-poor policy processes are those that allow poor people to be directly involved in the policy process, or that by their nature and structure lead to pro-poor outcomes. For some, the aim of pro-poor policies is to improve the assets and capabilities of the poor.

<sup>18</sup> The overall intention of gender mainstreaming with regard to environment and energy is to ensure the inclusion of gender equality considerations in planning systems at all levels, and to expand both the access of women to finance mechanisms and the direction of that finance to areas that will benefit women. Gender mainstreaming tools include gender analysis, sex-disaggregated data and participatory approaches that explicitly consider women.

<sup>19</sup> Relevant sectors denote those that are related to forests and land use, e.g. including energy, agriculture, mining, transport and land use planning.



#### 4. Government Counterpart Information

**Comments by the Government Counterpart:**

The UN-REDD Philippines Programme continued its functions of providing the venue for synergy and convergence of work by key stakeholders for REDD+. The activities it supported provided the impetus for a more comprehensive work planning and strategy formulation for the country's preparedness for REDD+. Now that the programme is winding down with few remaining activities awaiting completion, the challenge for us in the government is how to sustain its gains and even build on them to achieve a higher level of preparedness. With other development partners getting involved and investing significant resources on REDD+, the DENR, through FMB is slowly making adjustments in its programming to include support to REDD+ activities. FMB will soon be leading an assessment of UN REDD accomplishments and from there identify the gaps. These gaps shall be the basis of the Bureau's work, through its UN REDD PMU, in drafting the next programmatic action plan with corresponding budget. FMB will also assess the current investments and strategically harness them to support the Bureau's work.

UN-REDD also catalyzed and strengthened partnership between the government lead agencies in REDD+ and it is the intent of FMB to sustain these partnerships for an improved and well-coordinated work for REDD+.

Undersecretary Analiza Teh  
DENR Focal Person on UN-REDD

#### 5. Other stakeholders (non-government) Information

**Comments by other stakeholders (non-government):**

The UN REDD Philippines Programme comes at the readiness phase of REDD+ in the Philippines. It complements and builds on existing activities implemented at the three REDD+ demonstration sites, particularly: (1) Gen. Nakar, province of Quezon; (2) southern Leyte; and Victoria-Anepahan mountain ranges, province of Palawan. Specifically for Outcome 3, the UN REDD activities complements on-going MRV-related activities such as: (1) reviewing site-based protocols to measure and monitor biodiversity conservation success in the context of REDD+; (2) discussions on monitoring forest change, forest stratification, REDD+ eligible activities; and (3) assessing the existing national forest inventory system in view of the MRV requirements of REDD+. The programme promoted a very consultative process involving concerned stakeholders in the development and implementation of activities.

The timeframe of UN REDD support should have been longer since having only one year of implementation of the programme is too short to see accomplishments during the readiness phase since many aspects are still being reviewed and assessed, and local situation has to be considered. The targets of the programme (e.g., operational national MRV in place) may not yet be achievable by the end of the initial programme. Also, the delay in the implementation of the programme resulted from confusion among UN agencies themselves on the appropriate contractual arrangements with government and non-government partners during the initial planning stages of the programme. This caused serious delays in the implementation of the programme.

Engr. Jose Don de Alban  
Fauna and Flora International  
TWG on MRV