

SUMMARY OF BANK IMPLEMENTED NRM AND BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

*Key Lessons and Challenges for
Moving Forward*

CEPF Asia Workshop
June 23-25, 2005

Bank Implemented NRM Projects

- Central Visayas Resource Project (CVRP)
- Sector Adjustment Loan for NRM (SECAL)
- Conservation or Priority Protected Area Project (CPPAP)
- Water Resources Development Project (WRDP)
- Community Based Resource Management Project (CBRMP)

- Laguna de Bai Institutional Strengthening and Community Participation Project (LISCOP)
- Coastal Marine and Biodiversity Conservation Project (CMBC; a component of the Mindanao Rural Development Program)
- Bicol River Basin and Watershed Management Project (a component of the National Support Program for Environment and Natural Resources)
- Ligawasan Marsh and Wetland Biodiversity Project (a component of the National Support Program for Environment and Natural Resources)

Major Features

- Primarily working with Central Government Offices (DOF, DENR, DA, DA-BFAR, etc.) who in turn coordinate implementation
- Multi-agency involvement through partnerships among central government offices
- Implemented by Local Government Units (LGUs) and communities (through Peoples' Organizations or POs)
- Activities are packaged as subprojects designed and developed by LGUs and communities (livelihood, small scale infrastructure, and NRM)
- Capacity building activities are integrated in the menu of activities
- Civil society groups participate either as service providers (technology transfer and community organizing/building) or implementers (e.g., CPPAP)

Key Lessons

- NRM and biodiversity is fundamentally linked to local socio-economic development
- LGUs are integral to the sustainability of NRM and biodiversity conservation initiatives
- Targeted, strategic and demand-driven capacity building is key to the overall preparation and sustainability needs
- Fiduciary systems (including transparency and accountability mechanisms) need to be strengthened at all levels
- Multi-agency involvement requires clear working arrangements especially where mandates overlap

- There is weak service delivery capacity of government field offices
- M&E systems are not given proper attention at the project design stage hence are weak and are not management oriented
- Sustainability mechanisms are not provided attention in project design hence are not carefully articulated in an operational manner
- Livelihood and alternative income generation efforts do not evolve into sustainable enterprise development

Moving Forward

- Focused attention on NRM governance: putting LGUs in the driver's seat
- Articulating the economic benefits of NRM and biodiversity (i.e., PES) – placing NRM and biodiversity conservation into the development radar screens of LGUs
- Orienting government to be facilitators of locally-led NRM and biodiversity conservation
- Optimizing the value of culture and cultural practices in NRM and biodiversity conservation
- Strengthen the link between communities-LGUs-National government
- Designing programs rather than projects where activities are integrated and lead to an overall impact or outcome

Moving Forward in Biodiversity Conservation

- Translating biodiversity conservation in the context of local socio-economic needs
- Placing biodiversity conservation in the overall development agenda of the LGU
- Establishing a functional balance between the various mandates and policies (e.g., LGC, NIPAS, Mining code, PD705, IPRA, etc.)
- Revisiting the NIPAS and IPAF (establishing greater accountability supported by clear incentives)
- Focus on the overall ecosystem (ensuring ecological integrity)

- Establish partnerships with the private sector
- Strengthen and orient government capacities in protected area management
- Strengthen donor coordination and ensure that there is a consolidated and integrative direction to protected area management and biodiversity conservation – government as brokers