

## Joint Programme Monitoring Report: Environment and Climate Change Window



### Monitoring Report Template

#### Section I: Identification and Joint Programme Status

##### a. Joint Programme Identification and basic data

**Date of Submission:** 6 August 2010

Submitted by:

Sheila Marie M. Encabo  
Programme Coordinator  
National Economic and  
Development Authority  
[Smencabo@neda.gov.ph](mailto:Smencabo@neda.gov.ph)  
+632 6313745

**Country and Thematic Window**

*Philippines, Climate Change and Environment*

**MDTF Atlas Project No:**

67145 (MDGF-1656-E-PHL)

**Title:**

Strengthening the Philippines'  
Institutional Capacity to Adapt  
to Climate Change

**Report Number:** 1

**Reporting Period:** 1 Jan – 30 June 2010

**Programme Duration:** Dec 2008 – Dec 2011

**Official starting date:** December 2008



**MDG ACHIEVEMENT FUND**

<p><b>Participating UN Organizations</b>  <i>FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNEP, UN HABITAT, WHO</i></p>
--

<p><b>Implementing partners <sup>1</sup></b>          National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)          Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)          Department of Agriculture (DA)          Department of Health (DOH)          Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)          Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE)          Department of Science and Technology – PAGASA (DOST-PAGASA)          Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC)          Provincial Government of Albay</p>
--

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

<b>Budget Summary</b>		
<b>Total Approved Joint Programme Budget</b>	UNDP	4,176,800
	UNEP	1,223,200
	FAO	950,000
	WHO	500,000
	UN-HABITAT	550,000
	ILO	600,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,000,000</b>
<b>Total Amount of Transferred to date</b>	UNDP	2,936,104
	UNEP	778,498
	FAO	680,018
	WHO	471,837
	UN-HABITAT	401,483
	ILO	416,838
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,684,778</b>
<b>Total Budget Committed to date</b>	UNDP	1,391,282
	UNEP	355,198
	FAO	564,258
	WHO	157,899
	UN-HABITAT	160,476
	ILO	182,570
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,811,683</b>

<sup>1</sup> Please list all the partners actually working in the joint’s programme implementation, NGOs, Universities, etc



MDG ACHIEVEMENT FUND

<b>Total Budget Disbursed to date</b>	UNDP	947,125
	UNEP	137,716
	FAO	277,694
	WHO	107,929
	UN-HABITAT	111,451
	ILO	126,940
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,708,855</b>

### BENEFICIARIES

**Direct Beneficiaries:** *“The individuals, groups, or organizations, targeted, that benefit, directly, from the development intervention”.* Baseline indicators would be revisited by the group and presented in the next PMC scheduled on September 2010. Thus, figures on this would be available by the next reporting period.

Indicate Beneficiary type	Expected number of Institutions	Number of Institutions to date	Expected Number of Women	Number of Women To date	Expected number of Men	Number of men to date	Expected number of individuals from Ethnic Groups	number of individuals from Ethnic Groups to date
National Institutions								
Local Institutions								
Urban								
Rural								
<b>Total</b>								

**Indirect Beneficiaries:** *“The individuals, groups, or organizations, not targeted, that benefit, indirectly, from the development intervention”*

Indicate Beneficiary type	Expected number of Institutions	Number of Institutions to date	Expected Number of Women	Number of Women To date	Expected number of Men	Number of men to date	Expected number of individuals from Ethnic Groups	number of individuals from Ethnic Groups to date
National Institutions								
Local Institutions								
Urban								
Rural								
<b>Total</b>								

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

### **b. Joint Programme M&E framework**

During the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Programme Management Committee(PMC) Meeting held last 26 April, an agreement was to revisit the framework, especially the assumptions made. The findings of the analysis will then be presented to the PMC. It was noted that important assumptions, including building on the information based on the Second National Communication (SNC) did not fully materialize. The agreement within the PMC on the re-examination of the M&E framework complements the directive of the National Steering Committee (NSC) to harmonize the Programme’s M&E system with the Government of the Philippines (GOP), through the mandated entity monitoring official development assistance (ODA). A harmonization workshop to revisit the framework is planned for the third quarter of 2010.

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Climate risk reduction (CRR) mainstreamed into key national &amp; selected local development plans &amp; processes.</p>	<p><b>Indicators:</b> *Guidelines available for CRR integration into next cycle (2011-2017) nat'l. plans &amp; 100% of target local (43++) land use/dev't.plans w/ qualitative &amp; quantitative CRR measures <b>Baselines:</b> Some nat'l. plans., e.g. NFPP/MTPDP qualitative CRR provisions; local comprehensive land use/development with plans not climate risk based; Current regulatory systems evaluation tools not climate risk- based</p>	<p>DRR Mainstreaming Guidelines available; Draft Methodology on integrated DRR/CRR mainstreaming available</p>	<p>Desk reviews of Agency reports and field verification</p>	<p>Quarterly/annual agency reports ; Quarterly field monitoring</p>	<p><b>UNDP/UNEP/ NEDA/DENR</b></p>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b> *Climate information &amp; guidelines produced on time. * Strong political commitment to effecting planning/programming changes.  <b>Risks:</b> *Weak political support for required planning/programming changes due to lack of appreciation of climate change impacts.  <b>Status of risk:</b> The May 2010 elections brought in new local officials which might make risks materialize. Mitigation: Orientation for new set of officials</p>

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
						starting 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter.
Baseline risk scenario, incl. vulnerability maps for 43 provinces and CRR/adaptation monitoring system developed for priority sectors	<p><b>Indicator:</b> *43 provincial risk scenarios available by 2010 as basis for climate resilient dev't. planning</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Dev't. plans not climate risk based but Multi-hazard maps of 1:50,000&amp;1:10,000 scales being developed; maps available for 4 out of the 43 provinces. No adaptation monitoring system in place.</p>	National baseline climate scenario 1970-1990 available; National Climate scenarios for 2020 & 2050 available	Desk reviews of Agency reports and field verification	Quarterly/annual agency reports ; Quarterly field monitoring	<b>UNDP/UNEP/DENR/NEDA</b>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b> *Timely availability of the required climate &amp; other biophysical/socioeconomic information on the 43 provinces</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> *Delay in the acquisition of the required information resulting in delayed production of model results &amp; monitoring system.</p> <p><b>Status of Risk:</b>  Risk materialized; weak capacity &amp; delayed procurement of goods &amp; services</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> training of PAGASA personnel; procurement fast tracked</p>
Adaptation options for key sectors assessed, valued & prioritized, including "no regrets" options.	<b>Indicator:</b> # of prescribed adaptation options resulting from assessment process made available by	Long list of adaptation measures from literature survey available	Desk reviews of Agency reports	Quarterly agency reports	<b>UNEP/DENR/NEDA</b>	<b>Assumptions:</b> * Timely availability of experts & easy access to existing body of knowledge on CC adaptation.

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
	sector <b>Baseline:</b> Information on adaptation options available globally; some local but mostly undocumented indigenous adaptation practices in various localities in the country.					<p>*Active participation of stakeholders in the prioritization consultations.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> *Failure to identify appropriate adaptation options for key sectors on time. * Weak sectoral participation &amp; ownership esp. in prioritization exercises.</p> <p><b>Status of risks:</b></p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b></p>
Entry points for CRR in key national plans/planning & regulatory (e.g. EIA) processes identified and CRR compendium of adaptation best practices recommended for integration.	<p><b>Indicators:</b> # of CRR guidelines for dev't. plan integration</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No available guidelines</p>	DRR Mainstreaming Guidelines available; Draft Methodology on integrated DRR/CRR mainstreaming available	Desk review of Agency reports	Quarterly agency reports	<b>UNDP/NEDA</b>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b> *Timely buy in of partners and inputs. *Strong local political leadership in support of planning/programming shift towards being CRR based.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> * Weak political commitment &amp; buy-for anticipated reforms. * Non-consensus on prioritization of adaptation options.</p> <p><b>Status of risks:</b></p>

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
						<b>Mitigation:</b>
CRR mainstreaming guidelines adopted by key national government agencies and selected local governments.	<b>Indicator(s):</b> # of executive issuances for guideline adoption <b>Baseline:</b> No administrative issuance on adaptation in place.	No change	Submitted Annual Reports of agencies	Review of NGA reports – Annual	<b>UNDP/NEDA</b>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b> *Strong political commitment to CRR based planning/programming. * Key NGAs/LGUs have required competencies for mainstreaming CRR</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> *Resistance of NGAs and LGUs to change in planning/programming. *Poor leadership support * Technical competencies on CRR based planning/programming not available on time.</p> <p><b>Staus of risk:</b></p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b></p>
Selected local development/ comprehensive land use plans reflect CRR measures.	<b>Indicator(s):</b> 10 local dev't plans./CLUPs which are CR based/reflecting CRR measures <b>Baseline(s):</b> Current local dev't. plan(s)/CLUPs not	No change	JP Annual Reports; Surveys/Interviews. Independent evaluation	Review of JP reports - Annual	<b>UNDP/NEDA</b>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b> *Strong local political commitment to change in planning/programming processes.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> *Untimely change in</p>

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
	CR based.					political leadership *Weak political support for process change. *Poor technical capability in mainstreaming CRR  <b>Status of risk:</b>  <b>Mitigation:</b>
Web-based screening tool & portal for project developers/designers.	<b>Indicator:</b> # of web-based tools accessible to project designers <b>Baseline:</b> No web-based tool available currently.	No change	JP Annual Reports; Surveys/Interviews. Independent evaluation	Review of JP reports - Annual	<b>UNEP/NEDA</b>	<b>Assumptions:</b> *Timely availability of contents & IT experts to develop operational portal. * Moderate to high demand for tool & portal.  <b>Risks:</b> * Delay in production/availability of screening tool & other portal contents & dev't. of portal itself.  <b>Status of risk:</b>  <b>Mitigation:</b>
<b>Outcome2:</b> Enhanced national and local capacity to develop, manage and administer projects addressing climate change risks.	<b>Indicator:</b> *90% accuracy of climate forecasts by meteorological agency PAGASA; *30% improvement	CC Capacity Assessment Report of programme stakeholders available; National baseline climate	Competency assessments; Surveys; interviews; desk review of relevant reports	Surveys; review of NGA/JP reports - Annual	<b>UNDP/NEDA/DENR</b>	<b>Assumptions:</b> *Active participation of stakeholders * Political commitment to CRR change process * Mechanisms & inputs



## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
	<p>over baseline in terms of real time climate information volume and timing of delivery to key nat'l &amp; local stakeholders; *30% increase in level of awareness among national policy makers, local executives &amp; other critical stakeholders (private sector/civil society) on CC issues</p> <p>*30 %</p> <p>improvement in competencies of key nat'l. /sectoral agencies to develop &amp; implement climate resilient plans/prgrammes &amp; measures</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Climate forecasting systems &amp; institutional capacities inadequate for optimum impact planning/programming</p> <p>*Competency of local academic institutions insufficient to</p>	<p>scenario 1970-1990 available; National Climate scenarios for 2020 &amp; 2050 available</p>				<p>for capacity development process are made available on time.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Delayed provision of inputs</li> <li>* Lack of political commitment &amp; poor buy-in/ participation of stakeholders</li> </ul> <p><b>Status of risk:</b></p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b></p>

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
	provide long-term, sustainable technical assistance for CC resilient planning, programming & implementation of local stakeholders.					
Existing capacities and gaps of key NGA, selected LGUs and local HEIs for CRR work assessed.	<b>Indicator:</b> Documentation on level of capacities of concerned NGAs/target LGUs/HEIs in place by 2008 <b>Baseline:</b> NCSA Report available incl. assessment of climate change work of concerned NGAs	CC Capacity Assessment Report of programme stakeholders available	Interviews/Surveys; Reports on results of capacity assessments	Review of JP reports - Annual	<b>UNDP/NEDA</b>	<b>Assumptions:</b> *Active participation of stakeholders  <b>Risks:</b> Survey instruments not developed on time.  Poor participation of stakeholders in surveys/consultations.  <b>Status of risk:</b>  <b>Mitigation:</b>
Awareness raised for key national & local stakeholders on climate change.	<b>Indicator:</b> 30 % increase over baseline of level of awareness of target clientele ( NGAs, LGUs, academe, private sector, CSOs, media) <b>Baseline:</b> Data unavailable; to be determined at start up.	No change	JP Reports, Survey, Interviews, Independent evaluations	Surveys - Annual	<b>UNDP/DENR</b>	<b>Assumptions:</b> *IEC plan & materials developed on time. * Strong interest and advocates in place for a dynamic awareness raising programme.  <b>Risks:</b> * Delay in implementation of preparatory activities to produce IEC plan &

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
						materials. *Poor participation of stakeholders  <b>Status of risk:</b>  <b>Mitigation:</b>
CRR planning & implementation competencies of key stakeholders (NGAs, LGU planners, Academe) enhanced/increased.	<b>Indicators:</b> 10 CRR planning tools available; 30 % increase in competencies of concerned NGAs & target LGUs with implementation of CB programme.  <b>Baseline:</b> Basic impact & decision models available & being used by NGAs; Data on current level of competency for CRR work of target LGUs/HEIs limited.	No change	JP Reports; Surveys/Interviews; Independent evaluation	Review of JP reports; Field monitoring - Annual	<b>UNDP/NEDA</b>	<b>Assumptions:</b> * Timely dev't. of tools * Timely availability of competency dev't. programme. * Timely availability of trainees & their active participation in competency dev't. programme.  <b>Risks:</b> * Competency dev't. programme not developed on time. * Poor participation of stakeholders/trainees.  <b>Status of risk:</b>  <b>Mitigation:</b>
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Coping mechanisms improved through pilot adaptation projects.	<b>Indicators:</b> 100% of innovative approaches designed & tested are documented for upscaling & mainstreamed by concerned	Physical/socio-economic data on pilot sites available	Integrated assessment/independent evaluation of pilot sites; Desk review of national/local issuances; Surveys/Interviews	Surveys/filed monitoring - Annual	<b>UNEP/UNDP/FAO /DENR/DA/ NEDA</b>	<b>Assumptions:</b> * Strong buy in and ownership by stakeholders. * Strong support of partners, including local political leadership.  <b>Risks:</b>

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
	stakeholders into existing practices, systems and local development processes; 30% increase in competency of local stakeholders (e.g. CBOs) to draw , recommended up and implement CC adaptation measures <b>Baseline:</b> Indigenous coping measures in effect but only to current climate variability & extremes; undocumented and mostly anecdotal; many proposals awaiting implementation					* Weak buy in/ownership of projects by stakeholders. *Premature change in political leadership. * Delayed provision of inputs.,esp. technical ones.  <b>Status of risk:</b>  <b>Mitigation:</b>
Enhanced capacities <sup>2</sup> to ensure sustainability through demonstration projects showcasing innovative practices to improve local coping mechanisms, including alternative livelihoods.	<b>Indicator:</b> 30 % increase over baseline in CRR planning/ implementation capacity of community-based organizations (CBOs) by end 2010 <b>Baseline:</b> Data		JP annual reports: agency reports; independent evaluations	Surveys; field monitoring - Annual	<b>UNEP/UNDP/FAO /WHO/ILO/UN-HABITAT/DENR/DA/NEDA/DOH/HLURB/</b>	<b>Assumptions:</b> *Timely provision of inputs esp. CRR information, * Full cooperation of communities & partners.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. local capacities on integrated assessment tools related to climate change adaptation; improved coping mechanisms and alternative livelihoods; local capacities and system in place to reduce the risks to development investments, etc...

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators (with baselines & indicative timeframe)	Status of Indicator(s) as of June 30,2010	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
	unavailable; to be determined upon start of validation exercise.					<b>Risks:</b> *Changes in political leadership. * Force majeure setting back timetables.  <b>Status of risk:</b>  <b>Mitigation:</b>

### c. Joint Programme Results Framework with financial information

To ensure alignment with the ongoing efforts to harmonize the framework and to ensure that results-based M&E is at place, this JP would initially provide data for each outcome. In the next monitoring report, details would be provided as the harmonized framework once approved by the PMC and system would be applied by all partner institutions.

On the finance report, the Programme Management Unit (PMU) requested that each UN agency partner furnish the PMU financial reports generated by their system. This however, remains to be a challenge. The challenge lies more on co-implementors who use the direct execution mode, wherein, financial standing is not provided to their GOP partners. Out of the six UN partners, only UNDP and UNEP use the national execution mode. HABITAI, ILO, FAO and WHO use the direct execution mode. Hence, figures included are only those as reported to the PMU and reconciliation with system generated reports submitted to their respective headquarters is limited.

#### Definitions on financial categories

- **Total amount planned for the JP:** Complete allocated budget for the entire duration of the JP.
- **Estimated total amount committed:** This category includes all amount committed and disbursed to date.

Programme	Activity	YEAR	UN AGENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	Estimated Implementation Progress
-----------	----------	------	-----------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Outputs						NATIONAL/LOCAL	(US Dollars '000)			
		Y1	Y2	Y3			Total amount Planned for the JP	Estimated Total amount Committed	Estimated Total Amount Disbursed	Estimated % Delivery rate of budget
<b>Outcome 1</b>	Climate risk reduction (CRR) integrated into key national & selected local development plans & processes.	867.3	983.5	549.2	UNDP/UNEP	NEDA/DENR/PAG-ASA/EMB	2,400.0	1,172.8	569.3	31%
<b>Outcome 2</b>	Enhanced national and local capacity to develop, manage and administer projects addressing climate change risks.	509.5	702.4	1,188.0	UNDP/UNEP	NEDA/DENR	2,400.0	303.4	300.6	25%
<b>Outcome 3</b>	Coping mechanisms improved through pilot adaptation projects	1,130.1	1,491.9	578.0	UNDP/UNEP/FAO/WHO/UN-HABITAT/ILO	DA DOH/MM/ALBAY DTI/DOLE HUDCC METRO MANILA ALBAY SORSOGON AGUSAN DEL NORTE	3,200.0	1,335.5	838.9	32%
	<b>Total</b>						<b>8,000.0</b>	<b>2,811.7</b>	<b>1,708.8</b>	<b>30%*</b>

\*Please note that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Fund Transfer was downloaded end of May 2010.

- **Estimated total amount disbursed:** this category includes only funds disbursed, that have been spent to date.
- **Estimated % delivery rate:** Funds disbursed over funds transferred to date.

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

### SECTION II: Joint Programme Progress

The second section of the report is intended to shed light on the major advances and difficulties of the Joint Programme. It also aims to collect information on two important objectives that all joint programmes are contributing towards (interagency work, delivering as One and Development effectiveness as described by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Action Agenda).

a. Narrative on progress, obstacles and contingency measures

- a. Please provide a brief overall assessment (250 words) of the extent to which the joint programme components are progressing in relation to expected outcomes and outputs, as well as any measures taken for the sustainability of the joint programme during the reporting period. Please, provide examples if relevant. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

**Progress in outcomes:**

The vulnerability and adaptation assessment are steadily gaining ground with the production of the climate scenarios for the desired planning period of 2020 and 2050, after the training of PAGASA personnel on downscaling techniques for two global circulation models. This is estimates to constitute approximately half of the mainstreaming work towards attainment of critical outputs for Outcome 1. Complementation with other related on-going projects like the UNDP and AusAID assisted project entitled “Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision Making Process,” which is also being implemented by the NEDA, is also being pursued. The delivering of interconnected sub-outcomes to accelerate achievement of the committed MDG targets for the Philippines, particularly competency building (Outcome 2) and showcasing good practices (Outcome 3) as support to achieving climate resilient plans and programs (Outcome 1) are moving behind schedule due to technical issues of downscaling (or localizing) available global climate scenarios and developing standardized tools such as vulnerability and adaptation assessment (V&A). While the partners from the demonstration sites proceeded without the standard tools, a calibration of outputs would be done as soon as tools are available.

**Progress in Outputs:**

Attainment of some outputs (e.g. biophysical and socioeconomic data bases, capacity development programme design) are in catch up mode but are expected to be moving steadily by the end of the third quarter. Agreement with partners (academic institutions and other Offices within NEDA) has been completed. Training of regional and local planners who will ultimately generate the outputs such as V&A and climate resilient plans have commenced. In terms of outputs, the cumbersome process of downscaling global climate scenarios is still the major issue. However, the JP already had finished downscaling of one scenario and is working on completing two other models by end of July. The IEC, which was supposedly to socially prepare its stakeholders, had just begun since the procurement of the contractors took over a year to be completed. While the group did find consensus on engaging academic institutions to develop the V &A tools and methodologies, constant coordination is still being held to ensure that desired outputs are delivered. In terms of demonstration site, closer collaboration and linking/networking is taking place to ensure that project outputs would not only be limited to make communities resilient to climate change, but takes another step to demonstrate how the achievement of MDGs (apart from MDG 7) would be done through the convergence of support services required by the communities.

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

**Are there difficulties in the implementation? What are the causes of these difficulties? Please check the most suitable option**

b.

- UN agency Coordination
- Coordination with Government
- Coordination within the Government (s)
- Administrative (Procurement, etc) /Financial (management of funds, availability, budget revision, etc)
- Management: 1. Activity and output management 2. Governance/Decision making (PMC/NSC) 4. Accountability
- Joint Programme design

c.

- External to the Joint Programme (risks and assumptions, elections, natural disaster, social unrest, etc)
- Other. Please specify: While consensus building is a major approach, both UN and GOP may have conceptual differences, not in desired results but more on strategies/methodologies/delivery that warrants lengthy discussion and consultation processes.

b. Please, briefly describe (250 words) the current difficulties the Joint Programme is facing. Refer only to progress in relation to the planned in the Joint Program Document. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

The downscaling of Global Climate Scenarios (GCMs), which serves as variables to be plugged in the vulnerability and adaptation assessment (V&A) is too cumbersome. The process for downscaling one model/technique is lengthy and demands a high level of competency, which is the intervention provided by the JP. The development of the V&A process is also taking time since GOP and UN have conceptual differences in technical matters, in strategy and methodology to achieve outputs, i.e., how to mainstream climate change in the development planning process. In brief, consensus building among partners demands more time. The issue of nature of Paris Declaration of “ownership” seems challenging given the current consensus building decision making approach.

The protracted procurement process, for NEDA and DENR-UNDP component, of needed inputs such as equipment and software added to the already long gestation period. The procurement bottlenecks are also causing other delays such as, while the JP is on its mid-term, massive advocacy campaign regarding adaptation has not been systematically conducted due to the long awarding of contract to the IEC firm (request made on July 2009 was awarded almost a year later).



## MDG-F Monitoring Report

- c. Please, briefly describe (250 words) the current external difficulties (not caused by the joint programme) that delay implementation. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

While there may be experts on the science of climate change, it seems that local experts on the focus areas of the JP, i.e., coastal, health, agriculture, forestry and water are still developing/building their capacities in relation to climate change. Likewise, as most GOP implementers do not have the desired competencies yet, effective and efficient assessment/validation of inputs from local experts is a challenge. Thus, the novelty of climate proofing the development process is taking longer since the process is exploratory in nature.

Please, briefly explain (250 words) the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or mitigate the difficulties (internal and external referred B+C) described in the previous **text boxes b and c**. Try to be specific in your answer.

The lengthy process of downscaling has been completed for the PRECIS model. The next model, e.g., CCAM, could use high powered equipment that could cut processing time. Sensitizing top level officials to be more knowledgeable on the issue of adaptation is being pursued so they would be able to be champions for prioritizing adaptation measures.

On the procurement bottlenecks, the NSC already instructed to explore and use the GOP procurement process, if this would be faster. The PMU had been using the shopping method for those pending items in its 2009 procurement plan. Constant follow up are being made with UNDP procurement group for those items that they claimed were already processed.

The PMU is coordinating with outside experts that the UN organization can tap. For other options, PAGASA is discussing with CSIRO group in Australia and SIMCLIM developers from New Zealand. Initial talks were made for the SIMCLIM software to be pilot tested (for free) in one of the demonstration sites (Albay).

For the sub-national component, another alternative is to have a local academy on climate change that is being explored to be hosted by the Albay demonstration site, which includes a laboratory, wherein other municipalities can be taught on the methodology used in Albay. Coordination is being made with Office of the President, Climate Change Commission, Department of the Interior and Local Government, and the United Nations to ensure that this would be sustained even beyond the JP's timeframe.

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

### b. Inter-Agency Coordination and Delivering as One

The MDG-F Secretariat asks the office of the Resident Coordinator complete this subsection, briefly commenting on the joint programme, providing its perspective from within the broader country context. The aim is to collect relevant information on how the joint programme is contributing to inter-agency work and Delivering as One.

You will find some multiple choice questions where you can select the most appropriate to the case, text boxes to provide narrative information and 2 indicators on common processes and outputs to measure interagency coordination. These indicators have been already used to measure progress on the One UN pilot countries. Please, refer to the examples in the subsection to complete the information requested.

- Is the Joint Programme still in line with the UNDAF? Please check the relevant answer

Yes  No

- If not, does the Joint Programme fit into the national strategies?

Yes  No

If not, please explain:

What types of coordination mechanisms and decisions have been taken to ensure joint delivery? Are different joint programmes in the country coordinating among themselves? Please reflect on these questions above and add any other relevant comments and examples if you consider it necessary:

Joint coordination meeting for both intra and inter JP are being conducted.

Please provide the values for each category of the indicator table described below:

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

Indicators	Baseline	Current Value	Means of Verification	Collection methods
Number of managerial practices (financial, procurement, etc) implemented jointly by the UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs.	0	0		
Number of joint analytical work (studies, diagnostic) undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs.	0	0		
Number of joint missions undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs.	0	0		

Please provide additional information to substantiate the indicators value (150 words). Try to describe qualitative and quantitative facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

c. Development Effectiveness: Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

This subsection seeks to gather relevant information on how the joint programme is fostering the principles for aid effectiveness by having appropriate ownership, alignment, harmonization and mutual accountability in the last 6 months of implementation.

You will find some multiple choice questions where you can select the most appropriate to the case, text boxes to provide narrative information and 2 indicators on ownership and alignment. These indicators have been used extensively to measure progress on the Paris Declaration. Please, refer to the examples in the subsection to complete the information requested.

**Ownership:** Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions

**Are Government and other national implementation partners involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

- Not involved
- Slightly involved
- Fairly involved
- Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities is the government involved? Please check the relevant answer** *This may not be true for all components.*

- Policy/decision making
- Management:  budget  procurement  service provision  other, specify

**Who leads and/or chairs the PMC and how many times have they met?**

Institution leading and/or chairing the PMC – UNRC      Number of meetings. **3 for 2010**  
*This does not include core group meetings among GOP and UN agencies.*

**Is civil society involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

- Not involved
- Slightly involved
- Fairly involved – *This is especially true in the sub-national level.*
- Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities is the civil society involved? Please check the relevant answer**

- Policy/decision making
- Management:  budget  procurement  service provision  other, specify

**Are citizens involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

This is a target when the JP implements its other components in the 43++ provinces in the 4th quarter. But it is already happening in the implementation of Outcome 3.

- Not involved
- Slightly involved
- Fairly involved
- Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities are citizens involved? Please check the relevant answer**

- Policy/decision making
- Management:  budget  procurement  service provision  other-implementation

**Where is the joint programme management unit seated?**

- National Government  Local Government  UN Agency  By itself  other, specify

Based on your previous answers, briefly describe the current situation of the government, civil society, private sector and citizens in relation of ownership, alignment and mutual accountability of the joint programmes, please, provide some examples. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

The various GOP oversight, line agencies, local government, civil society and academic institutions will provide service delivery and technical assistance on adaptation. The success of the JP will be determined by the adoption and application of the JP's output of the institutions who will use the tools. If these would be successful, then the tools made available by the JP would be integrated in the whole of government development planning process. So far, relevant institutions are being partnered with UN agencies to ensure that developing of tools and process would be collaborative.

### d. Communication and Advocacy

Has the JP articulated an advocacy & communication strategy that helps advance its policy objectives and development outcomes? Please provide a brief explanation of the objectives, key elements and target audience of this strategy, if relevant, please attach (max. 250 words).

- Yes  No

Not fully as the UNDP had just awarded the contract for IEC. The group has met and interview with key informants and conduct of survey for key stakeholders are ongoing. Detailed results may be provided by the next reporting period.

## MDG-F Monitoring Report

What concrete gains are the advocacy and communication efforts outlined in the JP and/or national strategy contributing towards achieving?

- Increased awareness on MDG related issues amongst citizens and governments
- Increased dialogue among citizens, civil society, local national government in relation to development policy and practice
- New/adopted policy and legislation that advance MDGs and related goals
- Establishment and/or liaison with social networks to advance MDGs and related goals
- Key moments/events of social mobilization that highlight issues
- Media outreach and advocacy
- Others (use box below)

What is the number and type of partnerships that have been established amongst different sectors of society to promote the achievement of the MDGs and related goals? Please explain.

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faith-based organizations   | Number |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social networks/coalitions  | Number |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local citizen groups        | Number |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Private sector              | Number |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Academic institutions       | Number |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Media groups and journalist | Number |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Others (use box below)      | Number |

For specific messaging regarding the MDGs, the JP is working with GOP partners that are crafting the MDG progress report. We are exploring partnerships with the UN communications group to put forward a common (GOP and UN) message.

What outreach activities do the programme implement to ensure that local citizens have adequate access to information on the programme and opportunities to actively participate?

- Focus groups discussions
- Household surveys
- Use of local communication mediums such as radio, theatre groups, newspapers, etc
- Open forum meetings
- Capacity building/trainings
- Others

Information on this would be made available by the next reporting period.

## Section III: Millennium Development Goals

## a. Millennium Development Goals

The MDG-F main objective is to contribute to progress to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals worldwide. This subsection aims to capture data and information on the joint programmes contribution to 1 or more Millennium Development Goals and targets.

For this purpose the Secretariat has developed a matrix where you should link your joint programme outcomes to 1 or more Millennium Development Goals and Targets. This matrix should be interpreted from left to right. As a first step you should reflect on the contributions that each of the JP outcomes is making to one or more MDGs. Once this link is established, it needs to be further developed by connecting each joint programme outcome to one or more MDG targets. As a third step you should estimate the number of beneficiaries the JP is reaching in each of the specific outcomes. Finally you should select the most suitable indicators from your joint programme's M&E framework as a measure of the Millennium targets selected. Please, refer to the example provided below.

The results framework, specifically indicators at the societal level would clarify the JP's are of influence with regards to the MDGs. While CC adaptation is lodged in MDG7, adapting to CC can produce positive cross sectoral externalities to several equally important MDGs, e.g., poverty, health, etc. Measuring the extent of contribution to the MDGs would be part results based monitoring and evaluation and would be made available in the next reporting period, i.e. December 2010.

MDG 7	Joint Programme Outcome 1	MDG Target 7.A	# Beneficiaries reached	MDG Indicators	JP Indicator
<b>Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability</b>		Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources		7.1 Proportion of land area covered by forest 7.2 CO2 emissions, total, per capita and per \$1 GDP (PPP) 7.3 Consumption of ozone-depleting substances 7.4 Proportion of fish stocks within safe biological limits	
	Joint Programme Outcome 2	MDG Target 7 B		Indicator	JP Target
		Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation		7.5 Proportion of population using an improved drinking water source 7.6 Proportion of population using an improved sanitation facility	

	Joint Programme Outcome 3	MDG Target 7 C		Indicator	JP Target
		Does not apply			

#### Additional Narrative comments

Please provide any relevant information and contributions of the programme to the MDGs, whether at national or local level.

The JP is seen as a catalyst to get the various development players to prepare for shocks that may be caused by not adapting to effects that may be brought by climate change. In the Department of Health (DOH), the advocacy of the JP had convinced key officials that climate change effects should be considered in their decision making processes, e.g., health sector reform agenda and provincial health investment plans. In a local government perspective, the initiatives of Albay are recognized globally, the IPCC has chosen it as one of the sites that would be using SIMCLIM.

With the current plan to formally partner with key agencies in developing tools for their use in planning, programming and monitoring & evaluation, the JP expects that other agencies would have a template to follow in making their development plans and programs more resilient to the effects of climate change.

The JP is also working with the other JPs to come up with a strategy to convince other major players to collaborate with the MDG-F achievement fund to accelerate attainment of the 2015 MDG targets.

Please provide other comments you would like to communicate to the MDG-F Secretariat:

Apart from the knowledge hub (Teamworks), it would be beneficial if the Secretariat would be able to organize a get together among JP implementers for each thematic window to share experiences and lessons learned.



**1. Environmental and Climate Change policy development and mainstreaming**

**1.1. Number of sectors or mainstreaming laws, policies or plans supported by the joint programme:**  Applies  Does not apply, if so move to section 2

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On Environmental Management			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On Climate Change		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policies	No. National	No. Local	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policies	No. National	No. Local
<input type="checkbox"/> Laws	No. National	No. Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Laws	No. National	No. Local
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans	No. National	No. Local	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plan	No. National	No. Local

**1.2. Please briefly provide some contextual information on the law, policy or plan and the country/municipality where it is (or will be) implemented** (baseline, stage of development and approval, potential impact of the policy):

The JP is currently working on influencing the ff;

- guidelines on the formulation of the successor Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) and Regional Development Plans (RDPs);
- 10 provincial plans;
- 10 municipal plans;
- 5 sector plans; and
- regulatory process such as the environmental impact assessment

<b>1.3. Sector in which the law(s), policy(ies) or plan(s) is/are focused</b>	<b>Comments: Please specify how indicator 1.1 addresses the selected sectors.</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nature conservation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water management <input type="checkbox"/> Sanitation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable management of natural resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adaptation <input type="checkbox"/> Mitigation <input type="checkbox"/> Other , please specify:	The plans embody the policies that will be undertaken by all development partners. The investment plans will be anchored in the priority espoused in the plans.

<b>1.4. Number of citizens and/or institutions that the law(s), policy(ies) or plan(s) directly affects</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Citizens	Total No. to be validated by the results framework	No. Urban	No. Rural
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Public Institutions		No. Urban	No. Urban
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Public Institutions		No. Urban	No. Rural

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Sector Institutions	Total No.	No. Urban	No. Rural
	Total No		
	Total No.		

## 1. Environmental and Climate Change policy development and mainstreaming

<p><b>1.5.<sup>3</sup> Government budget allocated to environmental issues<sup>4</sup></b> before the implementation of the Joint Programme</p> <p>National budget:                   \$ USD</p> <p>Total Local budget (s) :       \$ USD</p> <p><i>(in localities of intervention of the JP)</i></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>This would have to be validated since the GOP uses a Medium Term Expenditure Framework or a Three Year Rolling Budget</p>
<p><b>1.6.% variation in government budget allocated to environmental policies</b> or programmes from the beginning of the joint programme to present time:</p> <p>National budget:                   % Overall</p> <p>  % Triggered by the Joint Programme</p> <p>Local budget:                       % Overall</p> <p>  % Triggered by the Joint Programme</p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Amount triggered by the JP cannot be determined as of the moment.</p>
<p><b>1.7. Government budget allocated to Climate Change</b> before the implementation of the Joint Programme</p> <p>National budget:                   \$ USD</p> <p>Total Local budget (s) :       \$ USD</p> <p><i>(in localities of intervention of the JP)</i></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>This would have to be defined further since strategies used for climate change adaptation are seen as integral part of major final outputs (or organizational performance indicator framework development by the Department of Budget and Management) to be delivered by services agencies. Separating CC funds from delivering development programs/activities/project is not advocated by the GOP.</p>
<p><b>1.8.% variation in government budget allocated to Climate Change</b> from the beginning of the Joint programme to present time:</p> <p>_____ National budget: _____ % Overall</p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Same as 1.7.</p> <p>Accounting of those triggered by the JP should be a conscious effort in M&amp;E.</p>

<sup>3</sup> For indicators 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 the Secretariat acknowledges the potential difficulties to obtain the information requested. Therefore, if not available, please provide the best available estimate. The information requested refers to the budgetary year in which the monitoring report falls

<sup>4</sup> Environmental issues should refer to budget allocated to natural resource management and conservation

	% Triggered by the Joint Programme	
Local budget:	% Overall	
	% Triggered by the Joint Programme	

**2. Institutional capacities for environmental management developed and civil society participation increased**

**2.1. Number of km2 of land newly managed by a natural resource plan supported by the Joint Programme**  Applies  Does not apply f so  
 move to section 2.4

Total of the area managed in Km2. [To be validated](#)

**By habitat<sup>5</sup>:**

<input type="checkbox"/> tropical forest	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands	Km2
<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate forest	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Rocky areas	Km2
<input type="checkbox"/> Savannah	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Desert	Km2
<input type="checkbox"/> Shrub land	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Sea/oceans	Km2
<input type="checkbox"/> Grassland	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Artificial terrestrial (pastoral land, arable land, etc)	Km2

**2.2 Number of institutions, civil servants and citizens trained by the JP to take informed decisions on environmental issues** (excluding climate change): [To be validated](#)

<input type="checkbox"/> Does not apply			
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Institutions	Total No.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector Institutions	Total No.		
<input type="checkbox"/> NGO/CBO's	Total No.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Civil servants	Total No.	Women	Men
<input type="checkbox"/> Citizens			

<sup>5</sup> IUCN categories

	Total No.	Women	Men
<b>2.3. Number of citizens supported by the JP that have organised themselves to effectively participate in natural resource management initiatives:</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Applies <input type="checkbox"/> Does not apply			
Total No.	No. Women	No. Men	Ethnic groups

**2. Institutional capacities for environmental management developed and civil society participation increased**

**2.4. Number of successful environmental service payment mechanisms that have been promoted by the JP :**  Does not apply

Total No.	No. Of beneficiaries:	Sectors of application: <input type="checkbox"/> Forest protection <input type="checkbox"/> Water resources Management <input type="checkbox"/> Pollution	Financing source: <input type="checkbox"/> MDGF <input type="checkbox"/> Public Fund <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/> International Organization <input type="checkbox"/> Others:
-----------	-----------------------	--	---

**2.5. Has the JP had an impact on the development of national and local policies or regulations that recognize schemes of Payment for Ecosystem Services as an environmental management tool, How?**

No impact yet, as the JP is just starting to advocate PES as a possible source of financing for local adaptation measures. The JP is co-financing a PES workshop for decision makers this August 2010.

--

**3. Climate change adaptation and mitigation, and development of institutional capacities**

**3.1 Number of Km2 and type of habitat covered by mechanisms and/or actions to adapt to climate change (implemented with the support of the joint programme:**  Applies  Does not apply

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tropical Forest	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Grassland	Km2
<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate Forest	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands	Km2
<input type="checkbox"/> Savannah	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Rocky Areas	Km2
<input type="checkbox"/> Shrub land	Km2	<input type="checkbox"/> Desert	Km2
		<input type="checkbox"/> Artificial terrestrial (pastoral land, arable land, etc)	Km2

**3.2 Adaptation measures supported by JP that are addressing the following climate change issues:**  Applies  Does not apply

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land degradation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in native species dynamics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alteration of rain patterns,
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soil fertility decrease	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sea levels rise
<input type="checkbox"/> Atmospheric pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drought, Storms/flooding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acidification

**3.3 Based on available data, what kind of improvements on the population’s wellbeing have been achieved through JP supported adaptation measures?<sup>6</sup>:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vulnerability (in terms of natural disasters)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improved livelihoods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others
Governance & Safe Settlements			

**3.4 Number of individuals and institutions with improved capacities to adapt to climate change or mitigate it:**  Applies  Does not apply

<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Institutions	Total No.	
-------------------------------------	--	-----------	--

<sup>6</sup> This indicator requires the use of baseline information from which a variation can be observed. If this data is not available the Secretariat recommends collecting it in order to complete this impact indicator for next reporting period.

<input type="checkbox"/> Mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector Institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Civil servants <input type="checkbox"/> Citizens	Total No. Total No. Total No.	Women Women	Men Men
3.6 Number of clean development mechanism projects registered to mitigate climate change: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does not apply				
3.5 Interventions funded by the JP to improve capacities of individuals and institutions to adapt to Climate Change or mitigate it: <input type="checkbox"/> Does not apply				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adaptation <input type="checkbox"/> Mitigation				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity building <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equipment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge transfer				
<input type="checkbox"/> CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions captured through conservation		Total Number		
<input type="checkbox"/> CO <sub>2</sub> Emission reduction through the use of Renewable Energies		Total Number		
<input type="checkbox"/> CO <sub>2</sub> Emission reduction through the use of clean technologies		Total Number		