PROJECT BRIEF

Title: **Partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation: Mainstreaming in Local Agricultural Landscapes/Biodiversity Partnerships Project (BPP)**

Fund Source: United Nation Development Programme-Global Environment Fund (UNDP-GEF)

Project Cost: US$ 17,022,061

Grant Proceeds: : GEF – US$ 4,500,000
: UNDP –US$ 301,404
GOP Counterpart: : US$ 10,264,598 – Government (including in kind)
US$ 1,956,059 – NGOs & other partners

Start Date: September 2010
Closing Date: December 2016

Implementing Agency: DENR-PAWB

Sector/Sub-sector: Protected Area

Region: Region 2, Region 4b, Region 6, Region 10, Region 11, Region 13 (Caraga)

Province: Cagayan, Quirino, Mindoro, Palawan, Antique, Capiz, Aklan, Negros Occidental, Agusan del Norte, Surigao del Norte, and Davao Oriental

Beneficiaries: Local Government Units (LGUs), Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), Local Communities, and Indigenous Peoples (IPs)

Objective(s):

To demonstrate how Local Government Units (LGUs), with enhanced capacities, and working together with local and national partners, can plan and manage economic activities and growth in ways that meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives in critical biogeographic regions

Rationale/Justification:

The Philippines is considered to be one of the world's most biologically rich countries. Its marine waters support the richest coral reef communities on the planet and its terrestrial ecosystems are similarly diverse, supporting a wealth of natural resources and a rich array of species diversity. It is one of the world's 17 megadiversity countries, which together host more than 70% of the world's species. Together with Madagascar, it is also one of the only two countries in the world which are both a megadiverse country and a global conservation hotspot. The entire country comprises a Conservation International Hotspot, and all remaining forest and coastal areas fall within one of four WWF Global 200 Ecoregions. This makes the Philippines one of the planet's highest conservation priorities. The country is home to a vast assemblage of species, many of them found nowhere else in the world. The Philippines has among the highest rates of species discovery in the world (sixteen new species of mammals have been discovered in the last ten years alone). New species are being discovered at a remarkable rate and this pattern shows no sign of slowing. Current taxonomic estimates show that the Philippines has the highest level of endemism in the Indo-Malayan Realm on a per unit-area basis and the highest concentration of biodiversity on earth.

The primary government response to protect this important biodiversity has been the establishment of a system of protected areas through the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS). However, the system currently excludes other areas of critical connective habitat and other sites which are globally significant for biodiversity conservation. These are the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and the surrounding production landscapes of PAs and KBAs which are important for connectivity of key biodiversity corridors. The result is a highly fragmented landscape, consisting of unsustainable agricultural and natural resources production systems and incompatible land uses which further expose the remaining natural habitats to threats. These are more evident at the level of local government units who are responsible for integrated management of lands under their jurisdiction, including PA/KBA territories, and the production landscape. To arrest fragmentation and ensure that activities in the surrounding landscape conserve species assemblages and maintain ecosystem functions, three major capacity constraints have been identified: (i) inadequate policies, systems, tools and capacities by government agencies at the national level to encourage local government unit (LGU) landscape level biodiversity conservation efforts; (ii) weak capacities and lack of tools by LGUs for mainstreaming biodiversity in landscape level and local development planning; and (iii) failure to integrate biodiversity concerns into local development planning, leading to unsustainable management of the surrounding landscape.

The proposed project will directly address these barriers through an integrated approach aimed at strengthening enabling policies at the national level; enhancing capacities of LGUs, and demonstration in selected pilot sites. These will be achieved through partnerships with key national government agencies, LGUs and national and local conservation NGOs, to muster their resources and expertise.

Description:

The project, which is a programmatic initiative on biodiversity rather than the usual site-based projects, intend to generate the following major outcomes corresponding outputs:

Outcome 1: National-level systems, policies, tools and capacities are in place to support LGU level biodiversity conservation efforts.

      1.1   Policy & tools for biodiversity impact assessments of national agricultural & natural resource policies, plans & programmes adopted by DA & DENR.

      1.2   National-level policy, programs & technical capacity to support biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices.

      1.3   Enhanced national-level system for regulation of trade in wild plant & animal resources.

      1.4   Policies to encourage investments in biodiversity-friendly business opportunities.

      1.5   National-level systems for knowledge management

Outcome 2: LGUs encompassing 1.6 Million hectares in five key biogeographic regions have the tools and capacities to integrate sustainable management into decentralized government structures.

      2.1   Tools, guidelines & methods developed to mainstream biodiversity in local development policy making, planning, budgeting, M & E.

      2.2   Toolkits & implementation capacity for application of SEAs, as well as, landscape & seascape level natural resource management, across multiple LGUs.

      2.3   LGU-level policy framework & technical capacity to support biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices in critical eco-regions.

      2.4   Strengthened local regulation of trade in wild plant & animal resources.

2.5 Regulatory structures & incentive systems to encourage the development of biodiversity-friendly businesses, including investor codes of conduct, established at the LGU level.

2.6 Intra-LGU data & knowledge-sharing & advocacy network to synthesize project lessons learned into national policy & decision-making

Outcome 3: Systems, policies, tools and capacities for landscape level biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are applied at eight pilot sites covering 700,000 hectares across five critical biogeographic regions (Luzon, Palawan, Negros-Panay, Mindoro and Mindanao).

3.1 Biodiversity-friendly projects, programmes & policies achieved via impact assessments incorporated into LGU planning process (all sites).

3.2 Trans-boundary integrated planning achieved via the implementation of toolkits (QPL, CPM, NNNP, Lake Mainit, Mt. Hamiguitan).

3.3 Biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices (e.g. use of indigenous crop varieties), achieved via enhanced & extended standards & associated certification processes. (all sites).

3.4 Improved regulations & enforcement of wild animal & plant gathering & trade achieved via strengthening of permitting system & implementation of trade regulation. (CPM, Malampaya, Mt. Hamiguitan).

3.5 Biodiversity-friendly investment programs promoted in selected sites (Siburan, NNNP, CPM, Mt. Hamiguitan).

3.6 Incentive systems and innovative financing programs to reduce destructive activities by PA/KBA dependent communities (PES in QPL and NNNP, pilot CCAs in PPLS, QPL, CPM, NNNP and Mt. Hamiguitan).

3.7 Data and knowledge management to underpin preceding themes (awareness campaigns, support to inter LGU knowledge sharing, biodiversity monitoring, biological assessments).

Implementation Schedule:

While project approval was obtained in September 2010, actual project operations started only in September 2011 with the mobilization of the Project Management Unit (PMU). The revised implementation schedule of the project, thus, is shown in the Gantt Chart below.

Outcomes	Year				
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
1	██████				
2		████████			
3	██████████████████████████████				