

**FAO COUNTRY PROGRAMMING  
FRAMEWORK 2012-2018**

**Philippines**

**February 2012**

## ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFMA	Agriculture Fisheries Modernization Act
AFNR	Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources
ALM	Adaptation, Learning and Monitoring
AM	Alert Mechanism
ARB	Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries
AusAID	Australia Agency for International Development
BAR	Bureau of Agricultural Research
BAS	Bureau of Agricultural Statistics
BFD	Bureau of Forest Development
CARP	Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program
CB	Capacity Building
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Act
CPF	Country Programme Framework
CY	Calendar Year
DA	Department of Agriculture
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform
DENR	Department of Natural Resources
DILG	Department of Interior and Local Government
DOST	Department of Science and Technology
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DRRMA	Disaster Risk Reduction Management Act
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FSSSR	Food Staples Self-Sufficiency Road Map
GCP	Government Cooperation Project
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOJ-JICA	Government of Japan-Japanese International Cooperation Agency
GOP	Government of the Philippines
GVA	Gross Value Added
HVC	High Value Crops
I	Innovation
ICM	Integrated Coastal Management
IPRA	Indigenous Peoples Rights Act
JP	Joint Programme
LGU	Local Government Unit
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation

MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MPA	Management of Protected Areas
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCI	National Convergence Initiative
NCIP	National Commission for Indigenous People
NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
NFA	National Food Authority
NIPAS	National Integrated Protected Areas System
NMTPF	National Medium Term Priority Framework
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OG	Outcome Group
P	Partnership
PCAMRD	Philippine Council for Aquaculture and Marine Research Development
PCARRD	Philippine Council for Agriculture Resources and Research Development
PDP	Philippine Development Plan
PES	Payment for Environmental services
PHL	Philippines
RAPF	Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific Framework
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
RD&E	Research Development and Extension
SAZDZs	Strategic Agriculture and Fisheries Development Zones
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
TCP	Technical Cooperation Project
TF	Technology Transfer
TF	Trust Fund
TMS	Tracking and Monitoring System
UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank

## Table of Contents

	Page	
I	Introduction	
1.1	Context of CPF	5
1.2	CPF Strategy	5
II	Situation Analysis	
2.1	Status of Philippine Agriculture	6
2.2	Major Issues	7
III	FAO Capacities and Comparative Advantages	
3.1	Context of FAO Capacities and Advantages in Philippines	8
3.2	Philippine Official Development Assistance	9
3.3	FAO Comparative Advantage	10
3.4	Areas for Priority Funding	11
IV	CPF Priorities	
4.1	FAO Support for National Priorities, UNDAF and RAPP	12
4.2	CPF Priority Areas	12
V	CPF Plan of Action	
5.1	CPF Results	17
5.2	Institutions Involved in Governance of AFNR Sector	19
VI	Implementation and Coordination Mechanisms	
6.1	Implementation and Coordination	20
6.2	Monitoring and Evaluation	21
6.3	CPF Resource Requirements	23

## Annex Tables

Annex Table 1	CPF Priority Area Matrix	25
Annex Table 2	CPF Results Matrix	29
Annex Table 3	Work Plan for the Implementation of CPF	35
Annex Table 4	M&E Framework	36
Annex Table 5	CPF Resource Requirement	44
Annex Table 6	2011 On-going Projects	45
Annex Table 7	Strategies and Priorities of PDP 2011-2016	50

## I Introduction

### 1.1 Context of CPF

CPF Philippines succeeds the NMTPF 2010-2011. Unlike its predecessor document, new dimensions are introduced. As a programming tool, the CPF is essentially results-driven. The priority areas for support are defined by results (outcomes and outputs) consistent with the priorities of the Government of the Philippines (GOP), new UNDAF Philippines 2012-2018 and FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific Framework (RAP). The main tools for establishing the linkage of the CPF with these strategic documents are visible in the CPF Priority Area Matrix, CPF Results Matrix and CPF M&E Framework. Second, the CPF has a time frame similar to the UNDAF Philippines, and this is the period of 2012-2018<sup>1</sup>. Thus, the CPF offers enough elbow room to achieve its intended results not only in terms of the expanded period of implementation but also on the institutional mechanisms established to implement and monitor the results, described in the CPF M&E system.

### 1.2 CPF Strategies

Two strategic considerations underpin the formulation of the CPF. These are the principles of co-ownership and “living” document as a *management* tool. By co-ownership, the results were built around shared objectives and pathways through a series of consultations with the government, the development partners and the civil society. Ownership by the government is of utmost importance, because the achievement of results will largely depend on the performance of the implementing departments and/or agencies provided with FAO support. By way of measuring performance, the implementing departments will set values or targets considered as owned by those whose performance would be monitored, including the assurance of resources essential to sustain the programmes/project even after FAO support is completed. The CPF is a “living” document. It should be kept current, that is, the CPF should be revisited or revised when: (i) results are not achieved as expected; (ii) important assumptions proved to be void; and (iii) critical policy, operational or resource problems were not sufficiently acknowledged. Thus, the CPF allows the opportunity to review critical programmatic events and processes.

The CPF has a straight forward logic. It begins with the analysis of the agriculture and natural resources and FAO-related challenges/issues affecting the country, narrative description of various interventions zeroing on “who is doing what” to address these challenges, areas for priority funding and support and finally to the definition of the CPF priority areas and the accompanying results. The CPF is a strategic document, but it provides the unique opportunity to bundle the identified results into an annual work

---

<sup>1</sup> CPF’s timeframe is aligned with the UNDAF Philippines’, i.e. 2012-2018, for flexibility in UN funds programming. The GOP through the NEDA Secretariat has also adopted, as a matter of policy, the UNCT as the overall mechanism for implementation of all UN frameworks in the Philippines. Notwithstanding the differences in the time frame of the CPF vis-à-vis the PDP, the former document is well aligned with overarching goal of PDP 2011-2016 “*in pursuit of inclusive growth*”.

plan that details the inputs and activities to support the achievement of the results (outcomes/outputs).<sup>2</sup>

## II Situation Analysis

### 2.1 Status of Philippine Agriculture

The country's agriculture share to GDP during the period 2004-2010 averaged at about 18%.<sup>3</sup> In terms of growth, the sector grew by about 2.8% annually during the same period. In the same tone, the sector employed about 11.8 million people, accounting for about 35% of the total workforce. One important observation may be noted from these figures. The sector's share to GDP of about 18% and the meagre annual growth of 2.8% fuelled primarily by traditional sub-sectors is reflective of the slow pace of transformation into agro-industrial development. Compared with its Asian counterparts, Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia have their agriculture' share to GDP at 9%, 11% and 14%, respectively during the period 2005-2009, which is indicative of a faster expansion of their agriculture to agro-food systems.<sup>4</sup>

In terms of the agricultural trade balance, the Philippines always end up as net importer of food. In 2004, agricultural exports stood at US\$2.5 billion, while imports reached US\$3.3 billion leaving an unfavourable trade balance of US\$ 0.8 billion. The same pattern was recorded in 2010. Agricultural exports reached US\$ 4.1 billion, while imports stood at US\$ 7.3 billion, yielding a bigger trade imbalance of US\$ 3.2 billion over the 2004 figure. The huge value of imports was made for cereals and cereal preparations for both years, and this sharp increase was mainly attributed to rice importation, although as early as in 1998, the Philippines was importing rice at huge levels. In 1998, the country imported 2.1 million tons. During 2004 to 2010 the Philippines was importing annually close to 2 million tons.<sup>5</sup> These importations were borne out of necessity as several rice self-sufficiency programs that were implemented simply failed to achieve its targets. Thus the Philippines satisfied its rice domestic requirements by depending too much on the rice surplus of Thailand and Vietnam. Rice self-sufficiency was generally taken as a second priority. This policy was reversed in 2009-2010, and the current administration has emboldened it further by making the necessary investments in irrigation and other farm input support.<sup>6</sup>

Physical resources-wise, there are about 9.7 million hectares of agricultural land or 32% of the country's total land area being cultivated to four primary crops, notably coconut (3.3 million hectares), rice (2.5 million hectares), corn (1.4 million hectares), and sugarcane (0.4 million hectares). Against this total, it is

---

<sup>2</sup> The country work plan (CWP) or any operational document is the proper place to include the inputs and activities to support the achievement of the identified outputs and outcomes. This will be at the stage when project proposals are received for consideration, and each project proposal should indicate the linkage of the project outcomes/outputs to the CPF results.

<sup>3</sup> Chapter 4, PDP 2011-2016. The figure of 18% includes the GVA of agriculture, fishery and forestry. Further the annual growth of 2.8% was driven primarily by fishery (1.2%), poultry (0.22%), rice (0.40%), corn (0.31%), banana (0.22%) and livestock (0.13%).

<sup>4</sup> Source: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NV.AGR.TOTL.ZS>

<sup>5</sup> Based on BAS data, the Philippines imported 1 million ton in 2004, 1.82 million tons in 2005, 1.72 million tons in 2006 and 1.81 million tons in 2007.

<sup>6</sup> This is clearly enunciated in the Food Staples Self-Sufficiency Roadmap (FSSR) 2011-2016.

visibly clear that there are few lands planted to high value crops (HVCs). In terms of number of farmers, there are about 4.8 million crop and/or other commodity farmers and 1.6 million fisher folks, mostly 90% of whom are small producers. Efforts by the government to give the available agricultural lands to eligible small farmers are being accelerated through the extension of the implementation of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP), which to date has reached a total of 4.1 million hectares, since its implementation began in 1987.

The pressure to exploit the country's environment and natural resources is being felt intensely because of widespread poverty in the rural communities. Although the incidence of families considered poor slightly diminished at 20.9% in 2003 to 20% in 2009, the poverty headcount in terms of the population actually increased from 24.9% in 2003 to 26.5% in 2009. More people are encroaching on the upland and even on forest lands to source whatever livelihood is available. On the coastal and marine areas, this pressure is likewise intensely experienced leading to over extraction of available marine and fishery production. Threats compounded by human and other destructive activities are leading to precarious degradation of the forest, marine and coastal areas and agricultural lands. The state of deterioration of these natural resources is broadly discussed in the succeeding section (sections 4.2.1-4.2.4).

It should be emphasized, however, that the government is not remiss of its duties and obligations to protect and conserve the remaining natural resources. The Philippines may be considered to have crafted the most number of laws and policies vis-à-vis its Asian counterparts relative to conservation and protection of the environment and natural resources. This is also true in the case of the agriculture sector.

## **2.2 Major Issues**

If this is so, what seems to be the compelling reasons behind the lacklustre performance of the agriculture, forestry and natural resources sector (AFNR)? The Plan has extensively documented the underlying reasons and they are briefly summarized below:

- Growth in the AFNR sector is beleaguered by high cost of inputs, inefficient supply chains and logistics systems, inadequate capital investments in infrastructure, irrigation and other public goods, low adoption of technologies, including mechanization and limited access by small producers to formal credit and financing;
- Slow development of agribusiness;
- Too much reliance on traditional crops such as rice, corn, coconut, and sugarcane;
- Vulnerability to extreme impacts of climate change and other environmental hazards;
- Relatively weak linkage between RD &E compounded by emasculated agriculture extension delivery system of most LGUs;
- Institutional weaknesses in the form of overlapping and conflicting policies, laws and legislations;
- Over-delayed implementation of asset reform; and

- Environmental degradation compounded by weak management of resources, weak enforcement of policies/laws, inadequate data base and management information system and underfunding of most environment and natural resources programs including climate change.

### III. FAO Capacities and Comparative Advantages

#### 3.1 Context of FAO Capacities and Advantages in the Philippines

The period covered in assessing the capacities of FAO in the Philippines was the time frame of the NMTPF, years 2010 and 2011. Most of the projects in 2010 and 2011, however, were carryover of projects being implemented in 2009. Only a few were introduced during the NMTPF period. And as a matter of procedure FAO core functions and congruency of the projects assisted with the objectives of the Philippine MDGs' were applied in assessing its capacities and comparative advantages.<sup>7</sup>

The summary of projects being implemented by FAO during the NMTPF period is given the table below. As a backdrop, the NMTPF document presented only the national projects, the total planned resources of which were about USD 49.4 million. The committed resources during the period were roughly USD 5.8 million, and USD 33 million was supposed to be the additional resources needed to fund the projects identified.

Summary of FAO-Funded Projects during the NMTPF by Funding Source

By Funding Source	2009		Core Function	2010		Core function	2011		Core function
	Number	Budget USD1000		Number	Budget USD1000		Number	Budget USD1000	
<b>National</b>									
<b>TCP</b>	4	1,649	CB	5	1,970	CB	3	1,017	CB
<b>TF</b>	2	774	I	5	8,854	I/TT	2	1,654	I/TT
<b>JP</b>	3	3,680	CB	3	2,167	CB	4	2,167	CB
<b>Total</b>	9	6,102		13	12,990		9	4,837	
<b>Regional</b>									
<b>TCP</b>	3	1,432	TT/P	4	1,877	TT	3	1,377	TT
<b>TF/GCP</b>	12	62,109	CB	13	48,286	CB	12	50,244	CB
<b>Total</b>	15	63,541	I/P	17	50,163	I	15	51,621	I

Source of Basic Data: FAO Projects, 2009-2011, Annexes 5-7.

<sup>7</sup> FAO's standard core functions include the following: monitoring and assessment of long-term and medium-term perspective; development of international instruments, norms and standards; policy and strategy options and advice; technical support to promote technology transfer and build capacity; advocacy and communications; inter-disciplinarity and innovation; and partnership and alliances

CB-capacity building; I-Innovation, TF- Technology transfer; P-Partnership  
 TCP- Technical Cooperation Project; TF-Trust Fund; JP –UN Joint Programme; GCP-Government Cooperation Project

As regards the national projects, the magnitude of the funding appears to be within the committed resources of USD5.8 million, from USD6.1 million in 2009 to about USD 4.8 million in 2011. Although new projects were introduced in 2011, with corresponding increases in budgets, some of these projects appeared to have not been implemented as evidenced by the reduction of projects continued in 2011, 9 projects compared to 13 projects in 2010. The big drop in the budget from USD13.0 million in 2010 to USD 4.8 million in 2011 was due to the non-funding of new projects worth about USD 8.2 million.

A close look at the core functions of FAO also revealed that the trusts of these projects were consistent with its core functions, notably on capacity building, technology transfer, innovations and partnership alliances. All of the national projects were also supportive of the Philippine MDGs objectives, specifically on poverty alleviation (MDG one) and sustainable environment (MDG seven) as given below.

Distribution of FAO-Funded National Projects In Support of MDG Goal one and seven

MDG Goal	2009			2010			2011		
	TCP	TF/GCP	JP	TCP	TF/GCP	JP	TCP	TF/GCP	JP
<b>Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger (Goal one)</b>	2	1	2	2	5	2		2	2
<b>Ensure environment sustainability (Goal seven)</b>	1	1	1	2		1	2		2

In terms of the regional projects, roughly 70% of the TCPs have direct Philippine counterpart whose total regional funding is estimated at USD 0.9 million.<sup>8</sup> In contrast, only a few of the TF/GCP in terms of numbers of project are being implemented in the Philippines. During the period under review, about two to three TF/GCP projects out of 15-17 projects have direct Philippine counterpart. Total regional funding committed for these projects is estimated at USD26 million. By inference, FAO Philippines have thus far leveraged better in the TCP vis-à-vis TF/GCP. While there were plenty of pipeline projects under the TF/GCP, only a few of them may have realized the funding on time, which could explain the dearth of Philippine TF/GCP projects.

The various projects complement Philippine Government’s activities in agriculture, fisheries, forestry, rural development, nutrition, technical advisory, training, relief and emergency assistance, among others. These remain relevant to the Philippine Development Plan for 2011-2016 which envisages a “competitive, sustainable and technology-based agriculture and fisheries sector, driven by productive and progressive farmers and fisherfolk, supported by efficient value chains contributing to inclusive

<sup>8</sup> This is based on the number of projects with direct Philippine counterpart, as given in Annexe Tables 5-7.

growth and poverty reduction.” The projects also contribute in helping attain an ecologically balanced environment that is sustainably productive and climate-change resilient.

### **3.2 Philippine Official Development Assistance (ODA)**

ODA in the Philippines consists of loan and grant portfolios. ODA is being used to fund the country’s fiscal gap.<sup>9</sup> Total ODA loans portfolio for CY 2010 amounted to USD10.06 billion. The social reform and community development sector was the biggest recipient of new loans in 2010. On the basis of average net commitment over the past 10 years, however, the infrastructure sector still gets the biggest chunk of the loans portfolio, accounting for roughly 63% of the average loan commitment. The Government of Japan-Japan International Cooperation Agency (GOJ-JICA) was the biggest source of loans during the last 10 years, although in 2010, the WB provided the biggest amount of new loans.

ODA grant portfolio, on the other hand, are provided in various modes, normally classified by the development partners in the form of: (a) technical assistance; (b) emergency/relief; (c) technical cooperation; (d) capital grants (facility/infrastructure); and mixed (grant projects that have components belonging to different categories). The ODA grant portfolio was close to USD2.5 billion at end of CY 2010. The AusAID provided the biggest chunk of grant portfolio in CY 2010, accounting for USD621.7 million comprising of 17 projects. This was followed by the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) with USD434 million (19%) for 3 projects and fund for M&E facility, and the USAID with about USD349 million or 16% of the total grant portfolio. The UN system had about USD230 million worth of support for technical assistance, emergency/relief and technical cooperation, accounting for about 10% of the total grant portfolio. .

The performance of capital projects under the ODA loans portfolio was reviewed in CY 2010 and the more important findings were as follows: (a) utilization of loan proceeds for projects started in CY 2010 were on track; (b) number of delayed projects decreased; (c) incidence of loan extension decreased from 15 loans in CY 2006 to 10 loans in CY 2010; and (d) commitment fees for CY 2010 amounted to USD10.5 million an increase of about USD3.9 million over the CY 2009 commitment fees. Further, 12 projects out of 21 projects that closed in 2010 have delivered their targeted results. Efforts by the government to improve the implementation of capital projects were pursued, facilitating for instance the institutionalization of an alert mechanism (AM). The AM classifies projects into potential and actual problem projects. Seventeen projects out of 93 active project and program loans that are under implementation between 2001 and 2010 were identified as actual problem projects for priority monitoring and facilitation in CY 2010.

### **3.3 Comparative Advantage of FAO**

FAO’s strengths come from its mandates to manage the agriculture and environment for sustainable development and achievement of the MDGs. It has consistently made a very strong presence in the Philippines implementing ODA grant portfolio in the form of technical assistance, emergency/relief and technical cooperation. The capacity of FAO to deliver a mixed of grant portfolio incorporating small capital investments (e.g. successful EU-funded small-scale irrigation and post-harvest facilities),

---

<sup>9</sup> CY 2010, ODA Review, NEDA, <http://www.neda.ph.gov>

purchased farm inputs and capacity building intended to boost agricultural productivity for small producers fits very well in satisfying the twin overarching national goals of increased agricultural productivity and reduced food insecurity. Lately, FAO has integrated a support to cope with the continuing threats of the extreme impacts of climate change. Another innovative feature involved specific project designed to restore peace through the execution of livelihood activities for rebel returnees in conflict areas. The profiles of these projects are given in Annexes 5-7. All told, the versatility of FAO to utilize and deliver multi-dimensional features of grant portfolio vis-à-vis its core functions is indicative of its comparative advantage.

FAO, in cooperation with the World Bank, has also been working on land administration and management issues, particularly in improving the security of tenure. These are all integral to the work led by FAO on development of Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure.

### **3.4 Areas for Priority Funding**

Gains in productivity of the AFNR sector have been achieved, but the benefits have not been sustained to accelerate a rapid agricultural growth and consequently sector transformation into agro-industrial development. Reducing poverty in the rural areas is not as fast as it should have been expected. The AFNR sector is continually plagued by unstable levels of productivity, especially for basic food staples, limited marketing skills and market access and limited access to technology by small holders. Weak governance of support services and deficiencies of the major sector agencies to achieve planned objectives are evident. Although the institutional framework for equitable and sustainable management of the AFNR sector is in place through the national convergence initiative (NCI) there is yet the need among the leadership of the major sector agencies to actually bring together their resources and focus the delivery in a convergent and holistic fashion. The NCI, a multi-sectoral and integrated planning approach adopted by the DA, DAR and DENR towards more efficient use of resources remains an elusive wish until today. Thus, the desired impact to reduce poverty in the rural areas comes in trickle.

The country has superfluity of laws and policies supportive of the modernization of the AFNR sector, including protection of the small farmers. These laws/policies, however, are often beleaguered with obscure and conflicting elements, compounded by underfunding and thus implementing these laws results virtually in non-tangible accomplishments.<sup>10</sup> Clearly, the development opportunity is to address the institutional weaknesses in the AFNR sector and simultaneously invest in public goods to increase and sustain sector productivity.

The priority areas for attention, where external funding is imminent, are: (a) need to address food insecurity in areas where road network and other infrastructure are underdeveloped; (b) a shift to more sustainable types of agriculture and fisheries in productive and coastal areas through income

---

<sup>10</sup> Chapters 4, 8 and 10, PDP 2011-2016. Chapter 4 mentions of the contradictory rice price policy. Chapter 8 on social protection programs states that “the benefits of social protection programs are compromised by weak targeting systems resulting in high leakage/under coverage to the non-poor and wastage of scarce resources. For instance, the NFA rice price subsidy has a leakage rate of 71%. Chapter 10 on the same tone, states that” the implementation is confused by overlapping and conflicting policies. Cases of policy conflicts are that between forest protection laws and AFMA and SAZDSs; between the NIPAS Act and the Fishery code and the Mining Act, IPRA and LGC. Further, a classic case of an underfunded program is the AFMA, a law legislated by Congress to modernize the agriculture and fisheries sector and whose annual budget appropriation of 20 billion pesos (USD0.5 billion) since 1999, was never met.

improvement; (c) enhanced focus on improving productivity in lowland environment and a fundamental need to accelerate AFNR sector transition through diversification (e.g. niche products), value addition (on and off-farm processing and improved post-harvest management) and support intensification (new crop varieties, exotic breeds, etc.); and (d) need to improve the resilience of the agriculture sector from climate change impacts and respond effectively to natural hazards. The over-all challenge is to integrate the neglected communities into the market economy with greater commercial and sustainable agricultural production systems.

## **IV CPF Priorities**

### **4.1 FAO Support for National Priorities, UNDAF and RAPF**

The preceding discussion on priority financing fits well within the foremost goal of the PDP 2011-2016 of “inclusive growth” which is focused on “productive employment as a means of increasing the incomes to significantly reduce the widespread poverty in the rural sector. Three broad strategies are envisaged in the Plan to achieve inclusive growth: (a) achieving a fast pace of high sustained economic growth through stable macro-economic environment, rapid growth of industry, investments in infrastructure, agriculture and rural sectors (such as electricity, transport, irrigation, and solid waste management); (b) giving equal access to development opportunities through investment in human capital, especially in education, health, and other basic social services, and levelling the playing field to improve access to infrastructure, credit, land, technology, and other productive inputs; and (iii) putting together effective social safety nets to ensure the protection of the most vulnerable groups. Mainstreaming climate change, disaster risk reduction, especially in coastal areas and human rights are fundamental elements of the Plan.

UNDAF 2012-2018 for the Philippines was likewise formulated considering the primary goal of the PDP 2011-2016 of “inclusive growth’. In the same tone, the FAO RPF 2010-2019 for Asia and the Pacific have three overarching goals generally consistent with the above goal and strategies of the Plan. The three goals considered to be the underpinning of the RPF are: (a) reduction of absolute number of people suffering from hunger and malnutrition and ensuring that all people have food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for active and healthy life; (b) elimination of poverty and the driving forward of economic and social progress for all with increased food production, enhance rural development and sustainable livelihoods; and (c) sustainable management and utilization of natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

### **4.2 CPF Priority Areas**

Learning from the experience of the NMTPF, the identification of the CPF priority areas went through an initial process of presentation during a kick-off meeting with key stakeholders held on 12 August 2011. This was followed by a series of consultations with the government, development partners and the civil society. The consultation with the government was of utmost importance to instil the principle of ownership, that is, the implementing partners would have to set values or targets considered as owned as basis for monitoring their performance, including the assurance of resources essential to sustain the programmes/projects, even after FAO support is completed.

The priority areas were selected following a review of three important strategic documents such as: (a) national priorities envisaged in Competitive and Sustainable Agriculture and Fisheries Sector (Chapter 4) and Conservation, Protection & Rehabilitation of the Environment and Natural Resources (Chapter 10) of the PDP 2011-2016;<sup>11</sup> (b) UNDAF 2012-2018 Results; (c) priority areas in FAO RAPF 2011-2019.

The foundations of the CPF priority areas revolve on three major goals: (a) trimming down food insecurity and increasing incomes, (b) conservation and sustainable management of natural resources and (c) improving the resilience of the AFNR sectors from climate change impacts and natural hazards. These foundations are very much akin with the goals of the agriculture and natural resources sectors espoused in the PDP 2011-2016.<sup>12</sup> Emphasis of support will be given to the people living in the rural areas especially the most vulnerable group. These are the small and marginal farmers, fisher folks, including women and children who comprised 40% of the poor. This is to ensure their integration into the market economy and to make sure that their incomes will improve.

For all CPF priority areas, mainstreaming gender considerations will be given utmost importance, particularly on specific measures required to support the engagement of women in decision-making related to agricultural production and productivity as well as in equitable benefit sharing from such decisions. Women farmers and fishers' voice must be promoted in affecting policy changes envisaged under the CPF. As the CPF envisaged the link between food security and climate change, women will be considered important stakeholders. An important consideration, however, is that each community should be understood as being unique and the CPF will orient activities in a manner that upholds gender equity while acknowledging and respecting the cultural and ethnic roles of gender.

**Annex Table 1** presents the CPF priority matrix. Four CPF priority areas were considered as follows:

- CPF priority area 1- Improving food and nutritional security
- CPF priority area 2- Enhancing agricultural production and productivity
- CPF priority area 3- Sustainable management of natural resources
- CPF priority area 4- Improving agricultural adaptation from climate change and disaster risks

#### **4.2.1 CPF Priority Area 1 – Improving food and nutritional security**

Taken in the context of the definition of food security by FAO where “food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life, food security in Philippine setting is rather elusive. The case of NFA rice, for instance, supposedly an affordable rice programme to

---

<sup>11</sup> It should also be noted that the emerging discussions in the preparation of the Philippines Rio +20 Report were also considered in the formulation of the CPF priority areas/results.

<sup>12</sup> The agriculture sector of the PDP (chapter 4) states the following goals: (a) improved food security and increased rural incomes; (b) increased sector resilience to climate change risks; and (c) enhanced policy environment and governance. The natural resources sector (chapter 10) on one hand has the following goals: (a) improved conservation, protection and rehabilitation of natural resources; (b) improved environmental quality for a cleaner and healthier environment; and (c) enhanced resilience of natural systems and improved adaptive capacities of human communities to cope with environmental hazards including climate-related risks. Please note that the goals are expressed as results statements. Each result has identified priorities given in Annex 7.

benefit the poor people, is accessed by only 24% of the poor<sup>13</sup>. Nutrition-wise, underweight, stunting, wasting and thinness are prevalent among children.<sup>14</sup> Although Filipinos who were unable to meet their dietary requirements slightly decreased from 9.9 million in 2006 to 9.4 million in 2009, the number of poor Filipinos increased from 22.2 million in 2006 to 23.1 in 2009. Fisherfolks, farmers and children are the poorest accounting for about more than 40% of the total population. Hunger is very volatile typified by spikes and dips. Obesity owing to non-communicable diseases is also an issue. All told, food security concerns are results of incoherent “social protection programs” brought about by poor targeting systems, conflicting price policy, (e.g. rice), inadequate monitoring & evaluation system compounded by unreliable statistics, especially when making references to indicator that supports the importation of basic food staples.

CPF priority area 1 strives to improve the capacity of national agencies and LGUs to implement food security programmes/projects through the formulation of rational food supply policies, alert mechanism and better targeting system to focus on the most vulnerable group. It seeks to bring together the 3 major rural development Departments to iron out the tricky issue on convergence targeting, especially on pooling of resources to include solutions on food insecurity concerns at the very least on pilot programmes/projects and/or upscale initiatives . FAO has had considerable experiences on CPF priority area 1, and drawing on from the good learning from previous projects, two outcomes will be underscored:

- **Outcome 1.1** Improved policy/institutional environment for food and nutritional security through enforcement of rational food policies including for food safety and early detection of threats to food/agriculture
- **Outcome 1.2** Enhanced capacities by GOP to incorporate nutrition, rural gender and social equity issues in agriculture/ARCs and food security programs and projects

#### 4.2.2 CPF Priority Area 2- Enhancing agricultural production and productivity

There is always a compelling reason to increase agricultural production and productivity in the Philippines notwithstanding significant yield increases in rice and corn in recent years due to the promotion of hybrid varieties. The growth of the total factor productivity for most crops cannot go beyond one percent<sup>15</sup>. Despite access to technological progress, the growth of TFP in Philippines over the past two decades has been dismal at 0.2% per year, compared to Thailand at 1% per year, Indonesia at 1.5% per year and China at 4.7% per year.<sup>16</sup> The change in technological progress could also be reflected in the factor share of crop production inputs. The case of rice, for instance, a major food staple in the Philippines gives an indication of the deteriorating change in technological progress. The factor share of land and farmers’ income for rice decreased during the last three decades despite the favourable economic value of rice output. Factor share of land decreased from 46% in 1970 to 39% in

<sup>13</sup> Competitive and Sustainable Agriculture and Fisheries Sector, Chapter 4, PDP 2011-2016.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, by definition stunting is an indication of prolonged deprivation of food and frequent bouts of infection, while wasting is an indication of lack of food or infection in the past.

<sup>15</sup> TFP is the ratio of growth in output relative to the growth of inputs.

<sup>16</sup> Chapter 4, Competitive and Sustainable Agriculture and Fisheries Sector, PDP 2011-2016

early 2000s, while factor share of farmers' income dropped from 85% in 1970 to 78% in early 2000s.<sup>17</sup> Given this pattern, there is indeed a forceful reason to enhance agriculture production. However, increasing agricultural production *per se* does not automatically increase farm incomes. It must be engaged in the context of the entire activities of agro-food systems (agribusiness). Investments are essential to improve productivity and quality, reduce product losses and utilize by-products as inputs to agriculture and/or other industries, and such investments must be geared towards the needs of the small producers. In irrigation for instance, the lack of fund for operation and maintenance of established systems has been a perennial concern. This is compounded by the weak capacity of the irrigators associations (IAs) to adequately maintain the facilities transferred to them ((by virtue of the government's irrigation management transfer program) in terms of sound water management and agronomic practices.

CPF priority area 2 strives to strengthen the capacities of the national agencies and LGUs by introducing institutional and technological innovations on value and supply chains that can: (a) reduce food costs, losses and supply uncertainties (e.g. food needs of mass markets); (b) increase and diversify incomes; (c) induce productivity gains by small farmers and other organized groups to increase their opportunity for wealth creation and integrate them better into the local, national and global markets. CPF priority area 2 seeks to integrate production and post production activities to ensure that gains in yield increases translate to higher incomes for the small producers including those in conflict areas (or post conflicts areas) with IDPs such as Mindanao. FAO's expertise in value chain implementation tools could realize these noble objectives. Deepening the value chain or innovations on vertical integration can help the small producers/farmers ensure supply or otherwise control inputs, capture more value, achieve economies of scale and/or ensure access to information. Towards this end, 2 outcomes will be highlighted:

- **Outcome 2.1** More efficient stream-lined supply chains resulting from better organization of small farmers to respond to market needs, particularly in local markets
- **Outcome 2.2** Capacity of rural advisory services strengthened to boost productivity in rice/other food staples including HVC, fisheries and livestock and marketing advice to support value chains

#### 4.2.3 CPF Priority Area 3 – Sustainable Management of Natural Resources

The country's major sources of food and other economic goods, notably farmland, forested land and coastal resources are generally dwindling. The quality of farmland is deteriorating, forested lands are declining and coastal and marine resources are being ruined.<sup>18</sup> The deteriorating state of farm land is brought about by erosion, pollution and land conversion. Twenty-one percent of the country's agricultural lands are moderately and severely eroded.

---

<sup>17</sup> State of Rice Industry in the Philippines

<sup>18</sup> Chapter 10, Conservation, Protection & Rehabilitation of the Environment and Natural Resources, PDP 2011-2016.

In terms of forest lands, only 6 million hectares out of the 15.9 million hectares of forestlands are with decent forest cover. Threats to deforestation are due to conversion to agriculture uses, slash and burn cultivation, forest fires and illegal logging. Pressures to depend livelihood on the forestlands, estimated to be about 25 million people are rapidly increasing due to restricted opportunities in the lowland. This is considered to be the most serious threat to deforestation. While efforts by the government to institute tenure security for upland dwellers, including the provision of other instruments to conserve the remaining forestlands have considerably improved over the past years, the government is still wanting in terms of striking a balance of putting a limit between “carrying capacity of nature and preserving ecological integrity”.

Empirical evidence has also shown that Philippine coastal resources have not been sustainably managed. The threats continue to be a multiplicity of factors notably habitat degradation brought about by human activities (e.g. deforestation, destruction of mangrove forests, reclamation, etc.), careless use of resources such as unregulated logging that induces sedimentation of fish resources, and pollution mainly due to discharge of land-based pollutants. The consequence of these factors has led to drastic declines in coastal fish stocks, estimated at only 10-30% of the levels posted in the late 1940s.<sup>19</sup> Production from capture fisheries and commercial fishing have also dwindled due to stock depletion and overfishing. In the same tone, the potential of aquaculture which is the biggest source of growth in fisheries production (about 48% of total fish production) has not been optimized owing to insufficiencies in production support services, notably the establishment of high value multi species hatchery (e.g. grouper, milkfish, sea bass, and tilapia) using new innovations such as sea cages. Relatedly, more than 60 mariculture parks which are designed to produce fishes thru seacage cultures such as milkfish, siganids, groupers, red snappers have been already established by the government.

CPF priority area 3 seeks to improve the competence of the major agencies/stakeholders in the natural resources sector in fine tuning the required legal and policy support, technical know-how in monitoring the overuse of depleted resources and land degradation assessment and other institutional reforms. FAO envisages replicating and up-scaling the best practices generated from the implementation of its national pilot programs/projects (e.g. assisted natural regeneration of BFD) and in the region to achieve the 3 outcomes, underscored below:

- **Outcome 3.1** Enhanced capacity in land degradation assessment and sustainable land management and planning
- **Outcome 3.2** Adoption and use of sustainable fishing practices, including responsible aquaculture promoted
- **Outcome 3.3** Policy-cum action oriented focus on the adoption of participatory approaches to forest and biodiversity promoted

---

<sup>19</sup> Barul *et al*, 2003 and Armada, 2004.

The target outputs will be coordinated with existing initiatives and projects of the DA, DENR and BFAR in the area of land management and coastal resource management to ensure complementation and avoid duplication and overlaps.

#### **4.2.4 CPF Priority Area 4 – Promoting Agricultural Adaptation and mitigation to Climate Change and reducing Disaster Risks**

The Philippines has always been vulnerable to natural calamities. Strong typhoons coupled with torrential rains during the months of June to November, the period of wet season, more often results in flooding (La Niña) of most of the rice granaries in the northern and central parts of Luzon. During the dry season, observed temperatures have become hotter prolonging the dry season (El Niño phenomenon). Cases in point of La Niña and El Niño were typhoons Ondoy and Pepeng in 2009 and 2010, respectively that have wrought havoc to the agriculture sector. In view of these climatic changes, the risk of disasters has also been on the rise. Thus, the vulnerability of the populations in the communities (e.g. coastal communities) where extreme climatic changes have occurred is always a serious concern. The disastrous impacts of climate change and natural disasters affect both the production of crops, livestock, fisheries and lives of the people in the community. These natural phenomena have caused the lackadaisical performance of the agriculture sector. Direct losses from impacts of severe climate change and natural disasters have been estimated to range from 0.5% to 2.5% of the country's GDP.<sup>20</sup>

The Philippines is credited with having laid out the institutional framework for climate change adaptation, probably ahead vis-à-vis other countries in the ASEAN region. The climate change Act (CCA) was passed by Congress two years ago and same with the disaster risk reduction management Act (DRRMA). Existing structures within the bureaucracy have in principle been established. The mechanism for coping natural disaster is also established beginning at the national, down to the local levels. The enabling policy environment so to speak is established. However, the need to fine tune the policies and translate such into coherent strategic plans remains wanting. Whether climate risks or opportunities have been adequately addressed in these strategies or plans is still an area for further investigations. Replicating and/or consolidating best practices on CC adaptation and instilling risk awareness at all levels necessitate all sorts of capacity building and testing technology innovations.

CPF priority area 4 seeks to address the gaps identified above. FAO's distinctive competence in the area of CC adaptation and disaster risk management including response/relief in disaster/calamities stricken areas together with its leveraged resources will be employed to achieve 2 outcomes, underscored below:

- **Outcome 4.1** Practical technologies innovations on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction identified and widely adopted
- **Outcome 4.2** Enhanced commitment to address land, water and forest degradation/integrated watershed management with increased funding for climate change adaptation

## V CPF Plan of Action

### 5.1 CPF Results

Framed on four priority areas, a total of 9 outcomes and 17 outputs have been identified where FAO support will be focused. **Annex Table 2** presents the CPF results matrix, and the summary is given below:

Summary of CPF Results Matrix	
Outcome	Output
<b>CPF Priority Area 1</b>	
<b>Outcome 1.1 Improved policy/institutional environment for food and nutritional security through enforcement of rational food policies including for food safety and early detection of threats to food and agriculture</b>	<b>Output 1.1.1</b> Critical legislations and policy issuances reviewed <b>Output 1.1.2</b> Expanded data and management information system for food and nutritional security/development planning (e.g. food security statistics, food and safety standards and epidemiologic data )
<b>Outcome 1.2 Enhanced capacities by GOP to incorporate nutrition, rural gender and social equity issues in agriculture/ARCs, and food and nutritional security programs/projects</b>	<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Capacity developed resulting in coordinated and harmonized implementation of social protection programs and/or food and nutrition security projects <b>Output 1.2.2</b> Reinforced implementation of SAFDZs <b>Output 1.2.3</b> Innovative risk sharing mechanism (e.g. agriculture, livestock and fisheries insurance) for ARBs and other collective small farmers organization developed and pilot tested in selected areas, e.g. ARC
<b>CPF Priority Area 2</b>	
<b>Outcome 2.1 More efficient streamlined supply chains resulting from better organization of small farmers to respond to market needs</b>	<b>Output 2.1.1</b> ARBOs and other small producers transformed into viable entrepreneurs through contract growing schemes <b>Output 2.1.2</b> Market opportunities of agriculture and fishery products expanded through value adding (including processing) and post-harvest reduction losses
<b>Outcome 2.2 Capacity of rural advisory services strengthened to boost productivity in rice/other food staples including HVC, fisheries and livestock and marketing advice to support value chains</b>	<b>Output 2.2.1</b> Data base and information system for RD&E updated <b>Output 2.2.2</b> Trained extension personnel of the LGUs along activities of value chain operations
<b>CPF Priority Area 3</b>	
<b>Outcome 3.1 Enhanced capacity in land degradation assessment and sustainable land management and planning</b>	<b>Output 3.1.1</b> National policy/program framework to prevent land degradation and poverty in marginal areas and rural communities following the principle of SLM crafted
<b>Outcome 3.2 Adoption and use of sustainable fishing practices, including responsible aquaculture promoted</b>	<b>Output 3.2.1</b> ICM and fishery management plans in accordance with EO 533 for critical coastal communities prepared and implemented <b>Output 3.2.2</b> Management effectiveness of MPAs under NIPAS and aquaculture practices evaluated

<b>Outcome 3.3 Policy-cum action oriented focus on the adoption of participatory approaches to forest and biodiversity promoted</b>	<b>Output 3.3.1</b> Trans-boundary, regulatory concerns and policy on management of mangroves and other marine areas revised and improved <b>Output 3.3.2</b> PES operational guidelines prepared and implemented as part of GOP commitment to REDD
<b>CPF Priority Area 4</b>	
<b>Outcome 4.1 Practical technology innovations on climate sensitive areas and disaster prone areas identified and widely adopted</b>	<b>Output 4.1.1</b> Geo-hazard mapping, vulnerability/risk assessment for highly susceptible land areas/communities undertaken, including promotion of resilient technologies (e.g. exotic plant and livestock genetics, etc.)
<b>Outcome 4.2 Enhanced commitment to address land, water and forest degradation/integrated watershed management with increased funding for climate change adaptation</b>	<b>Output 4.2.1</b> Innovative sources of finance to fund CC technology innovations and adaptation explored and pilot tested <b>Output 4.2.2</b> Enabling policy environment to sustainably finance environment activities and CC adaption reviewed and implemented

The broad approaches to achieve the suggested outcomes have already been touched in sections 3.2.1 to 3.2.4. The suggested outcomes and outputs within each priority area essentially revolve on fine tuning policy frameworks; improving the preparation of plans and programs, including the formulation of capital investment studies; and strengthening the capacities of major stakeholders involved in assessment/monitoring and plans and program implementation. This will be pursued through various modes such as deployment of special experts, conduct of strategic studies, and technical support for the implementation of better tools for monitoring or performance assessment frameworks (e.g. modelling through user and friendly integrated platforms), alliance building, partnership and/or use of high-level policy dialogues to raise the urgency of instituting rational policies. To the extent that new technologies and innovations are also abundant, piloting initiatives will be encouraged to help better understand the implications of up-scaling such innovations. Best practices will be coursed through adaptation, learning and monitoring (ALM) approaches, where support could be provided in funding the establishment of knowledge emporium where small farmers and practitioners can upload or download best practices through a virtually one-stop web portal.

The CPF results matrix provides the specific indicators, means of verifications and assumptions to be able to achieve the outcomes and outputs. It is important, however, that the indicators and the targets should be confirmed by the major agencies. The values assigned to each indicator should be owned by those whose performance would be monitored, which as a matter of principle is the combined efforts of the major agencies.

## **5.2 Institutions Involved in Governance of AFNR Sector**

Public institutions dominate the governance of Philippine agriculture, primarily because the public sector has the prime mandate to develop and modernize the sector. The main institutions are the departments of agriculture (DA), environment and natural resources (DENR), agrarian reform (DAR), science and technology (DOST). The department of trade and industry (DTI) is included due to its role in the promotion of trade and investment in global trade. These departments have bureaus and/or attached agencies whose mandate is normally aligned by specific commodity or sub-sector. They are then responsible for the development of the specific sub-sector. The respective departments are based

in Metro Manila, and the execution of national program and projects is coursed through their respective regional line offices and/or bureaus. These Departments are also supported by State colleges and universities located all over the country.

In terms of mandate, the DA is the lead agency to increase farmers' income and reduce poverty in the rural sector. The DENR is the prime agency responsible for the conservation, management, development, and proper use of the country's environment and natural resources. The DAR leads the implementation of the CARP through land tenure improvement, agrarian justice and coordinated delivery of essential support services to ARBs. The DOST is the premier science and technology body responsible with the twin mandate of providing central direction, leadership and coordination of all scientific and technological activities, and of formulation of programs and projects to support national development. The DTI is the lead agency responsible for facilitating the creation of a business environment where the agriculture sector can compete, flourish and expand its exports.

Agriculture services, primarily delivery of agricultural extension, construction of communal irrigation system and farm to market roads are devolved to the local government units (LGUs). Oversight function over the LGUs is vested with the DILG. Respective LGUs, however, have been given broad powers to implement agriculture and natural resources related activities, but due to their limited resources, both in terms of skills and monetary, the national departments still fund most of their projects through cost-sharing and/or partnership arrangement. In this instance, the role of the DILG becomes relevant in assisting the LGUs to leverage fund from the other departments and/or development partners.

Lately and in view of the importance given to climate change, the Climate Change Commission (CCC) under the Office of the President has been established. The role of this office is primarily coordinative and the respective major departments have established their own "mini" climate change staffs whose role is to see to it that the needs of the sectoral department are considered vis-à-vis climate change adaptation. It should be noted that most of the department's climate change offices are under a period of trial, and through a grant from the World Bank, the pilot being undertaken at the DENR will serve as role model where the other departments can based their staffing and capacity needs. Another office that has direct concerns and relevance to protecting ancestral rights to the poorest poor, i.e. indigenous people (IP) is given to the NCIP. The NCIP coordinates with the DENR through the BFD in the management of the forestlands.

The major departments are generally the recipient of foreign assistance either in the form of loans or grants, and the implementation is normally routed through the regional offices, bureaus and/or attached agencies. An important prerequisite for processing externally funded projects is the process of evaluation and endorsement by the NEDA Secretariat, the premier economic planning body tasked to formulate development plans. This process ensures the consistency and congruency of the projects with the national development goals and priorities. On this aspect, the major multilateral and bilateral funding institutions (WB, ADB, IFAD, JICA, EU, UN System, etc.) have consistently followed this process.

## **VI Implementation and Coordination Mechanisms**

## 6.1 Implementation and Coordination

Consistent with the policy of the government, and FAO being an agency under the UN, the implementation of the CPF will in general follow the mechanisms through the UNCT. The UNCT has a mechanism in place through an inclusive and participatory process to implement the UNDAF and the other frameworks under the UN System.

Notwithstanding the presence of the UNCT, FAO proposes a parallel CPF Joint Review Committee<sup>21</sup> whose main responsibility is to ensure the achievement of the CPF results. It is an oversight committee that is expected to make policy/ground decisions relative to timely provision/procurement of inputs and other resources, prioritization of activities, and convergence of support. The CPF Joint Review Committee will work closely with the four outcome groups (OGs) created under UNDAF to ensure that the implementation of CPF results is congruent with the government and UNDAF results. The work plan for the implementation of the CPF is given in **Annex Table 3**.

The CPF Joint Review Committee will be co- chaired by the FAO Representative and preferably by a Deputy Director-General of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA).<sup>22</sup> Its members will include the key officials, preferably Undersecretary/Assistant Secretary level of major departments/agencies whose mandates are aligned with the CPF four priority areas and a representative from the civil society, chosen/designated and recommended by the core departments.<sup>23</sup>

## 6.2 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

The CPF M&E framework is results-driven. It specifies how the results/outcomes will be measured using specific and measurable indicators, as well as its frequency of monitoring, among others. As such, the tracking of results has been generally sharpened owing to the following elements<sup>24</sup>: (a) baseline data to serve as a starting point for comparison to facilitate assessment of what has changed over the specified period of the CPF; (b) indicators for outcomes/outputs; (c) M&E activity to be undertaken in conjunction with the major partner departments/agencies; (d) more focus on perception of change among the major stakeholders; (e) systematic reporting with more qualitative and quantitative information on the progress towards outcomes. An important consideration is that all data collected and analyzed must be gender-segregated. The CPF M&E framework given in **Annex Table 4** shows the above elements. The same table presents a snapshot on how the CPF results contribute to the achievement of the government, RAP, and UNDAF results. The CPF M&E framework is summarized below.

---

### CPF M&E Framework

---

<sup>21</sup> The Joint Review Committee will be in the context of an annual bilateral consultation between FAO and GOP as practiced by the NEDA Secretariat with other development partners.

<sup>22</sup> The CPF Joint Review Committee is expected to establish its internal rules (e.g. functions, reporting requirement, frequency of meeting, secretariat, etc.) once its chairpersons have agreed to adopt it.

<sup>23</sup> Apart from the major rural development departments, the DILG will be included in the CPF Joint Review Committee by virtue of its supervision over the LGUs that are expected to participate in the implementation of projects supportive of the CPF results.

<sup>24</sup> Baseline and targets will be fine-tuned during the consultations with the key departments/agencies.

Outcome Description	CPF Indicators	Indicator Targets to which the CPF Results Contribute		
		RAP	UNDAF Target	Country
<b>CPF Priority Area 1: Improving food security</b>				
<b>Outcome 1.1 Improved policy/institutional environment for food and nutritional security through enforcement of rational policies including for food safety and early detection of threats to food/agriculture</b>	<p>By 2018, the GOP has streamlined its food security policies (e.g. rice price policy)</p> <p>By 2018, new policy tools are adopted by xxx% of GOP policy/program practitioners to manage food security concerns</p>		By 2018, more poor and vulnerable people have adequate access to <b>food and nutrition</b>	Decreased incidence of families estimated 8.3 % of population below food subsistence/poverty threshold <sup>1</sup>
<b>Outcome 1.2 Enhanced capacities by GOP to incorporate nutrition, rural gender and social equity issues in agriculture/ARCs, and food and nutritional security programs/projects</b>	<p>By 2018, the GOP has issued resolution harmonizing the implementation of food security/social protection programs/project</p> <p>By 2018, leakages of food targeting system is reduced by xxx%</p>		By 2018, more poor and vulnerable people have adequate access to <b>food and nutrition</b>	Decreased incidence of families estimated at 8.3 % of population below food subsistence/poverty threshold <sup>1</sup>
<b>CPF Priority Area 2: Enhancing agricultural production and productivity</b>				
<b>Outcome 2.1 More efficient streamlined supply chains resulting from better organization of small farmers to respond to market needs</b>	By 2018, small producers/farmers have increased : (a) yields of HVC by xxx%; (b) fisheries production by xxx%; (c) livestock population by xxx% and (d) farm income by xxx%		<b>By 2018, more men and women are in decent and productive employment in agriculture, industries and communities utilizing greener processes</b>	Increased in annual average income (in real terms)of families in the agriculture and fishery sectors by about Php 20,000 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Outcome 2.2 Capacity of rural advisory services strengthened to include HVC, fisheries and livestock and marketing advice to support value chains</b>	<p>By 2018, key agricultural extension personnel can execute effective and efficient agriculture extension service along value chain</p> <p>By 2018, area planted with HVC expanded by xxx%; area devoted to responsible aquaculture increased by xxx% and livestock raisers using improved/exotic breeds increased by xxx%</p>			
<b>CPF Priority Area 3: Sustainable management of natural resources</b>				
<b>Outcome 3.1 Enhanced capacity in land degradation assessment and sustainable land management and planning</b>	<p>By 2018, the capacity of GOP to assess land degradation has improved through initiation of sustainable land management policy</p> <p>By 2018, new tools for assessing land degradation are adopted by xxx% of BSWM, DENR, and LGU personnel</p> <p>By 2018, xxx regions have updated data bases on land management systems</p>			Land degradation hotspots with developed SLM practices increased by about one million hectares <sup>1</sup>

<b>Outcome 3.2</b> <b>Adoption and use of sustainable fishing practices, including responsible aquaculture promoted</b>	By 2018, the over-all health system of critical marine and other fishery areas have improved through improved implementation of NIPAS, ICMs, and appropriate aquaculture management practices  By 2018, fisheries production in capture and aqua culture increased by xxx%	Increased percentage of inland water, coastal and marine areas effectively and equitably managed through NIPAS and other area-based conservation measures, estimated at about 0.62% of total marine areas <sup>1</sup>
<b>Outcome 3.3</b> <b>Policy-cum action oriented focus on the adoption of participatory approaches to forest and biodiversity promoted</b>	By 2018, the GOP has significantly improved the management of forest areas through implementation of rational policies  By 2018, xxx people are benefited from new livelihood activities resulting from implementation of streamline policies	Proportion of land area covered by forest increased by 30% <sup>1</sup>
<b>CPF Priority Area 4: Promoting agricultural adaptation and mitigation to climate change and reducing disaster risk</b>		
<b>Outcome 4.1</b> <b>Practical technology innovations on climate sensitive areas and disaster prone areas identified and widely adopted</b>	By 2018, xxx% of small farmers/vulnerable farmers has widely adapted climate sensitive technologies.  By 2018, the GOP has reduced losses through better DRR management.	By 2018, capacities of vulnerable communities to adapt to climate change are enhanced  By 2018, vulnerable communities and the national & local governments are better able to manage natural and human-induced disaster risks
<b>Outcome 4.2</b> <b>Enhanced commitment to address land, water and forest degradation/integrated watershed management with increased funding for climate change adaptation and DRR</b>	By 2018, xxx LGUs have mainstreamed climate change adaptation and DRR plans	By 2018, capacities of vulnerable communities to adapt to climate change are enhanced  By 2018, vulnerable communities and the national & local governments are better able to manage natural and human-induced disaster risks

<sup>1</sup>Targets under PDP 2011-2016

Under the oversight function of the CPF Joint Review Committee, the monitoring of the results variables (outcomes and outputs) will be the joint responsibility of FAO and the government with support coming from the respective departments and/or agencies. For the moment and until the CPF Joint Review Committee has come up with monitoring templates, the tracking of CPF results would be based on the fine-tuned M&E results-based framework.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> At a later date, FAO will establish its tracking and monitoring system (TMS) to monitor the CPF results variables. As data collected and analyzed will be gender segregated, gender audits and gender checklist for all technical

FAO and the government will jointly conduct the evaluation of the CPF, mid-term or annual reviews, the main objectives of which are to: (a) to determine the extent of what has been achieved or being achieved as far as CPF outcomes are concerned; (b) to determine whether the CPF has contributed in the achievement of the selected priorities in the PDP; and (c) to determine whether FAO inputs in the form of its core services have helped in the achievement of the CPF outcomes. Lessons learned, best practices and failures as well will be documented and disseminated to help in the preparation of the succeeding CPFs.

A single coordinating agency, using the annual bilateral consultation as the venue will be designated to process all the data and information from the different implementing agencies. Implementing agencies would be required to submit to both NEDA and FAO regular monitoring reports (i.e., semestral) indicating the project performance status (both at the output and results levels) of their respective projects.

### **6.3 CPF Resource Requirements**

The total requirements needed to implement the four CPF priority areas, comprising of 9 outcomes and 17 outputs over the period 2012-2018 is estimated at USD18.8 million, USD3.5 million of which will come from FAO regular budgets (e.g. TCP) and the balance of USD15. 3 million will come from other sources. FAO, in collaboration with its GOP counterpart agencies, will facilitate the mobilization of resources from potential external donors, for projects supportive of the CPF results, especially those costing above USD0.5 million through donor consultations being organized by the government. **Annex Table 5** shows the resource requirements by outcome.

---

activities of projects undertaken and supportive to the attainment of the CPF results will be required, e.g. TOR for contractors or MOU with GOP will draw attention on gender equity during project implementation.

**Annex Table 1 CPF Priority Matrix, Philippines**

<b>CPF Philippines</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2012-2018</li> </ul>	<b>FAO Regional Priorities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAP FAO Regional Priority Framework 2010-2019</li> </ul>	<b>Relevant National Policy Strategy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Philippine Development Plan 2011-2016</li> </ul>	<b>UNDAF Philippines</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2012-2018</li> </ul>	<b>Other National/Regional Frameworks</b>
<b>CPF Priority Area 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving food security</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening food and nutritional concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusive growth and poverty reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universal access to quality social services with focus on the MDG's</li> </ul>	
<p align="center">Outcome 1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved policy/institutional environment for food and nutritional security through implementation of rational food policies including for food safety and early detection of threats on food/agriculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Relevant RR</b> Institutional, policy, and legal framework for food safety/quality management that support an integrated food chain approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved food security and increased rural incomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food and nutrition security</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attain self-sufficiency in staples</li> </ul>
<p align="center">Outcome 1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced capacities by GOP to incorporate nutrition, rural gender and social equity issues in agriculture/ARCs, and food security programs/projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governments develop enhanced capacities to incorporate gender social equity issues in agriculture, food security and rural development programmes , projects, and policies using sex-disaggregated statistics, other relevant information and resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure the empowerment and protection of the poor, vulnerable and disadvantaged individuals from all types of risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social protection</li> </ul>	

<p><b>CPF Priority Area 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Enhancing agricultural production and productivity</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fostering agricultural production and rural development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusive growth and poverty reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universal access to quality social services with focus on the MDG's</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attain self-sufficiency in staples</li> </ul>
<p>Outcome 2.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient streamlined supply chains resulting from better organization of small farmers to respond to market needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate analysis, policies, and services enable small producers to improve competitiveness, diversify into new enterprises, increase value addition, and meet market requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved food security and increased rural incomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food and nutrition</li> </ul>	
<p>Outcome 2.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity of rural advisory services strengthened to boost rice productivity/other food staples including HVC, fisheries and livestock and marketing advice to support value chains</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The agriculture, fisheries and livestock sectors effectively and efficiently contributes to food security, poverty alleviation, and economic development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved food security and increased rural incomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food and nutrition</li> </ul>	
<p><b>CPF Priority Area 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sustainable management of natural resources</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhancing equitable productive and sustainable natural resource management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusive growth and poverty reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decent and productive employment for sustained, greener growth</li> </ul>	
<p>Outcome 3.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced capacity in land degradation assessment and sustainable land management and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Countries promoting and developing sustainable land management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved conservation, protection and rehabilitation of natural resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Productive employment for sustainable and greener growth</li> </ul>	

planning				
<p>Outcome 3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adoption and use of sustainable fishing practices, including responsible aquaculture promoted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More effective management of marine and inland capture fisheries by FAO member countries and other stakeholders has contributed to the improved state of fisheries resources, ecosystems and their sustainable use</li> <li>Operation of fisheries including the use of vessels and fishing gear is made safer, more technically, and socio-economically efficient, environment friendly and compliant with rules at all levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved conservation, protection and rehabilitation of natural resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Productive employment for sustainable and greener growth</li> </ul>	
<p>Outcome 3.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy-cum action oriented focus on the adoption of participatory approaches to forest and biodiversity promoted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutions governing forest are strengthened and decision-making improved, including involvement of forest policies and legislation, thereby enhancing an enabling environment for investment in forestry and forest industries. Forestry is better integrated into national development plans and processes,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved conservation, protection and rehabilitation of natural resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Productive employment for sustainable and greener growth</li> </ul>	

	considering interfaces between forest and other land uses.			
<b>CPF Priority Area 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Promoting agricultural adaptation and mitigation to climate change and reducing disaster risks</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coping with the impact of climate change on agriculture and food and nutritional security</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusive growth and poverty reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resilience to disaster and climate change</li> </ul>	
Outcome 4.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Practical technologies innovations on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction identified and widely adopted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Countries vulnerability to crisis threats and emergencies is reduced through better preparedness and integration of risk prevention and mitigation into policies, programmes and interventions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sector resilience to climate change increased</li> <li>Enhanced resilience of natural systems and improved adaptive capacities of human communities to cope with environmental hazards including climate-related risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change adaptation</li> </ul>	
Outcome 4.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced commitment to address land, waterforest degradation/integrated watershed management with increased funding for climate change adaptation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental values of forests, trees outside forestry are better realised; strategies for conservation of forest biodiversity and genetic resources, climate change mitigation, rehabilitation of degraded lands, and water and wildlife management are effectively implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sector resilience to climate change adaptation increased</li> <li>Enhanced resilience of natural systems and improved adaptive capacities of human communities to cope with environmental hazards including climate-related risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change adaptation</li> </ul>	

**Annex Table 2 CPF Results Matrix, Philippines**

National Sector priority: Improved food security and increased rural incomes			
UNDAF Outcome: Universal access to quality social services with focus on the MDG's			
FAO Regional result: Strengthening food and nutritional concerns			
<b>CPF Priority Area 1: Improving food security</b>			
CPF Results	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumption
<b>Outcome 1.1</b> Improved policy/institutional environment for food and nutritional security through enforcement of rational policies including for food safety and early detection of threats to food/agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of streamlined policies resulting from the review of conflicting food security policies</li> <li>• New policy tools to manage food security are adopted by xxx% of GOP policy/program practitioners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Order Issuances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GOP is committed to policy reforms aimed at ensuring food security</li> <li>• Concerned Departments and regulatory agencies are willing to support the modification of defective policies</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> Critical legislations and policy issuances reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of policies reviewed among others: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AFMA 1997</li> <li>▪ Fisheries Code 1988</li> <li>▪ Corn and sugar trade policies</li> <li>▪ NFA rice price policy</li> <li>▪ DA-DAR-DENR NCI</li> <li>▪ NIPAS Act</li> <li>▪ IPRA</li> <li>▪ Food safety/labelling law</li> <li>▪ Markets/trade and regulatory laws</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned Department Orders</li> <li>• Legislative issuances and amendments</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 1.1.2</b> Expanded data and management information system for food security/development planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of regions with functional GIS and remote sensing data bases</li> <li>• Number of regions with functional early warning alerts (e.g. price alerts, epidemiologic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA, DENR Reports</li> </ul>	

	<p>alert)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of issued food-based dietary guidelines</li> <li>• Number of policy/program practitioners, especially LGUs trained in the use of policy tools to manage food security</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Outcome 1.2</b> Enhanced capacities by GOP to incorporate nutrition, rural gender and social equity issues in agriculture/ARCs, and food security programs/projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolutions or executive order removing overlaps in terms of mandate among PHL departments implementing social protection program issued</li> <li>• Leakages for food targeting system /social protection reduced by xxx%</li> <li>• Number of people accessed with better social protection programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Order Issuances</li> <li>• Department Orders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GOP government is committed to ensure the rights of the most vulnerable members of the society by providing the essential support mechanism</li> </ul>
<p>Output 1.2.1 Capacity developed resulting in coordinated and harmonized implementation of social protection programs and/or food and nutrition security projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of vulnerable people/communities assisted with social protection component (e.g. food facility, emergency relief, etc.)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DAR-assisted ARC project (foreign and local funded)</li> <li>• NCIP, DENR and DAR Annual Reports</li> <li>• DA and other concerned agencies</li> </ul>	
<p>Output 1.2.2 Reinforced implementation of SAFDZs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of regions with updated/improved SAFDZs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA Annual Report</li> </ul>	
<p>Output 1.2.3 Innovative risk sharing mechanism (e.g. agriculture and fisheries insurance) for ARBs and other collective small farmers organization developed and pilot tested in selected areas, e.g. ARC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of innovative agriculture and fisheries insurance schemes developed/piloted</li> <li>• Number of trained GOP personnel with new skills in insurance underwriting (e.g. risk valuation/analysis)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA Annual Report</li> <li>• DOF Annual Report</li> </ul>	

National Sector priority: Improved food security and increased rural incomes			
UNDAF Outcome: Universal access to quality social services with focus on the MDG's			
FAO Regional result: Fostering agricultural production and rural development			
<b>CPF Priority Area 2: Enhancing agricultural production and productivity</b>			
CPF Results	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumption
<b>Outcome 2.1</b> More efficient streamlined supply chains resulting from better organization of small farmers to respond to market needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yields of major crops /HVC cultivated by small producers increased by xxx%</li> <li>• Livestock population and fisheries production of small producers increased by xxx%</li> <li>• Farm income of small producers increased by xxx%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special surveys</li> <li>• BAS Publications</li> <li>• NSO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ARBOs, other producer organizations and landless workers are willing to pursue chain innovations.</li> <li>• Farming is a profitable undertaking</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2.1.1</b> ARBOs and other small producers transformed into viable entrepreneurs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of SMEs operated by ARBOs and other small producers</li> <li>• Legal/policy frameworks for contract growing piloted/initiated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DAR Annual Report</li> <li>• DA Annual Report</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 2.1.2</b> Market opportunities for agriculture and fisheries products are expanded through value adding (including processing) and post-harvest reduction losses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of investment studies (regional agro-clustering, product champions, cold-chains and other agri-business infrastructure , etc.) prepared</li> <li>• Number of local and international workshops/forums on value-adding organized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Investment Studies, DA</li> <li>• Report on local and international forums, DA</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome 2.2</b> Capacity of rural advisory services strengthened to boost rice productivity/other food staples including HVC, fisheries and livestock and marketing advice to support value chains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of DA, personnel who can apply agribusiness services/value chain in their programs/projects improved by xxx%</li> <li>• Area planted with better crop varieties increased by xxx%</li> <li>• Area devoted to improved aquaculture farming increased</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA, human resource report</li> <li>• Special surveys</li> <li>• Training Assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA is willing to revive its lead role as service provider for RD&amp;E</li> <li>• LGUs are willing to provide funding priority for agriculture extension delivery</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by xxx%</li> <li>Small livestock growers rearing improved and resilient breeds increased by xxx%</li> </ul>		
Output 2.2.1 Data base and information system for RD&E updated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A one-stop shop data base for RD&amp;E</li> <li>Data base for RD&amp;E available and accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DOST/PCARRD/PCAMRRD Report</li> <li>DA/BAR Report</li> </ul>	
Output 2.2.2 Trained extension personnel of the LGUs along the entire activities of value/supply chains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of LGU personnel who received training on agribusiness &amp; value chain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DA and cooperating LGUs</li> </ul>	
National Sector Priority: Improved conservation, protection and rehabilitation of natural resources			
UNDAF Outcome: Productive employment for sustainable and greener growth			
FAO regional Result: Enhancing equitable, productive and sustainable natural resource management			
<b>CPF Priority Area 3: Sustainable management of natural resources</b>			
<b>CPF Results</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Assumption</b>
<b>Outcome 3.1</b> Enhanced capacity in land degradation assessment and sustainable land management and planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of streamlined policy on sustainable land management</li> <li>New tools for assessing land degradation used by xxx% of DENR, BSWM and LGUs staff</li> <li>Number of regions with updated data base on land management systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Executive Order issuance</li> <li>Department Order issuance</li> <li></li> </ul>	
Output 3.1.1 National policy/program framework to prevent land degradation and poverty in marginal areas and rural communities following the principle of SLM crafted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy framework for SLM crafted</li> <li>Number of DENR, DAR and DA/BSWM and LGUs trained on new tools for land degradation assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report of DA, DENR, NEDA and other relevant agencies</li> <li>Draft framework of the SLM</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome 3.2</b> Adoption and use of sustainable fishing practices promoted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over-all health system of critical marine and other fishery resources improved by xxx%</li> <li>Fisheries production in capture and aquaculture increased by</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DA/BFAR, DENR Statistics</li> </ul>	GOP government is committed to protect and conserve all available fishery and marine resources

	xxx%		
Output 3.2.1 ICM and fishery management plans in accordance with EO 533 for critical coastal communities prepared and implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of ICM and fishery management plans prepared for identified vulnerable coastal communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	
Output 3.2.2 Management effectiveness of MPAs under NIPAS and aquaculture practices evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of MPAs reviewed</li> <li>Number of aquaculture practices piloted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DENR/NIPAS report</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome 3.3</b> Policy-cum action oriented focus on the adoption of participatory approaches to forest and biodiversity promoted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of livelihood projects resulting from streamlined policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DENR Report</li> <li>DENR Issuance</li> </ul>	
Output 3.3.1 Trans-boundary, regulatory concerns and policy on management of mangroves and other marine areas revised and improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of streamlined policies or regulatory concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy reviews</li> </ul>	
Output 3.3.2 PES operational guidelines prepared and implemented as part of GOP commitment to the REDD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft PES guidelines</li> <li>Number of PES implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DENR Annual Report</li> <li>Draft PES guidelines</li> </ul>	
National Sector Priority: Sector resilience to climate change increased Enhanced resilience of natural systems and improved adaptive capacities of human communities to cope with environmental hazards including climate-Related risks			
UNDAF Outcome: Climate change adaptation			
FAO Regional Result: Coping with the impact of climate change on agriculture and food and national security			
CPF Priority Area 4: Promoting agricultural adaptation and mitigation to climate change and reducing disaster risk			
<b>CPF Results</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Assumption</b>
<b>Outcome 4.1</b> Practical technology innovations on climate sensitive areas and disaster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percent of small farmers adopting climate-responsive technologies on highly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Special surveys</li> </ul>	Technology innovations due to CC impacts and disaster mitigation are available

prone areas identified and widely adopted	vulnerable areas		
Output 4.1.1 Geo-hazard mapping, vulnerability/risk assessment for highly susceptible land areas/communities undertaken, including promotion of resilient technologies (e.g. exotic plant and livestock genetics, on such vulnerable areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of communities with vulnerability/risk assessments</li> <li>• Number of communities with updated geo-hazard maps.</li> <li>• Number of pilots/trials promoting exotic plant and animal breeds</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA, DENR Reports</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome 4.2</b> Enhanced commitment to address land, water and forest degradation /integrated watershed management with increased funding for climate change adaptation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of streamlined polices to manage sustainably land, water and forest.</li> <li>• Number of LGUs that have mainstreamed climate change adaption plans and DRR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Order Issuance</li> </ul>	GOP government is committed to protect and conserve remaining identified natural resources.
Output 4.2.1 Innovative sources of finance to fund CC technology innovations and adaptation explored and pilot tested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of financing options explored</li> <li>• Number of LGUs with CC and DRR accounts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate Change Office</li> <li>• Office of the President</li> </ul>	
Output 4.2.2 Enabling policy environment to sustainably finance environment activities and CC adaption reviewed and implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of policies reviewed for congruency and harmonization DRRM Act and CC Act Retaining rightful Share of LGUs for environment activities and CC adaptation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned Department Reports</li> </ul>	

**Annex Table 3 – Work Plan for the Implementation of the CPF, Philippines**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>When Activity Occurs (Schedule)</b>	<b>Who Participates</b>	<b>Who Leads</b>
<b>Organization</b>			
1. Convening/organization of the Joint Review Committee	First quarter of 2012	FAO, NEDA, DA, DAR, DENR, DILG and other agencies (with FAO-funded projects)	FAO
<b>Monitoring</b>			
2. Firming up the baseline and target values of CPF results indicators	Second quarter of 2012	FAO, NEDA, DA, DAR, DENR, DILG and other agencies (with FAO-funded projects)	FAO and NEDA
3. Design/implementation of CPF M&E system	Early 2013	FAO, NEDA, DA, DAR, DENR, DILG and other agencies (with FAO-funded projects)	Independent Consultant
4. Preparation/review of annual CWP	Every first quarter of the year	FAO, DA, DAR, DENR, DILG and other agencies (with FAO-funded projects)	FAO
5. Submission of project progress reports	Every end of December	DA, DAR, DENR, DILG and other agencies (with FAO-funded projects)	FAO
6. Annual review and/or bilateral consultation (annual Joint Review Committee meeting)	Annually, preferably during the first quarter of the year	FAO, NEDA, DA, DAR, DENR, DILG and other agencies (with FAO-funded projects)	FAO and NEDA
<b>Evaluation</b>			
7. Mid-term evaluation of CPF	Mid- 2015	FAO, NEDA, DA, DAR, DENR, DILG and other agencies (with FAO-funded projects)	Independent Consultant
8. Final or terminal evaluation of CPF	Early 2018	FAO, NEDA, DA, DAR, DENR, DILG and other agencies (with FAO-funded projects)	Independent Consultant

**Annex Table 4CPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, Philippines**

CPF Priority Areas/Results	CPF Indicators Baseline & targets <sup>26</sup>			Indicator Targets to which the CPF Results Contribute		
	Baseline	Target	CPF Indicator	Regional Result	UNDAF Target	Country if available
<b>CPF Priority Area 1: Improving food security</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1</b> Improved policy/institutional environment for food and nutritional security through enforcement of rational policies including for food safety and early detection of threats to food/agriculture			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2018, the GOP has streamlined its food security policies</li> <li>By 2018 new policy tools to manage food security are adopted by xxx% of GOP policy/program practitioners.</li> </ul>		By 2018, more poor and vulnerable people have adequate access to <b>food</b> and <b>nutrition</b>	Decreased incidence of families estimated 8.3 % of population below food subsistence/poverty threshold <sup>1</sup>
Output 1.1.1 Critical legislations and policy issuances reviewed			By 2018, the GOP has reviewed the conflicting provisions of xxx food security policies and appropriate recommendations forwarded to concerned departments for endorsement			
Output 1.1.2 Expanded data and management information system for food security/development planning			By 2018, the GOP has improved its databases for food security planning/implementation in accordance with the following achievements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of regions with functional GIS</li> </ul>			

<sup>26</sup> Baseline and target values including the activities to achieve the outputs and outcomes will be detailed in the CWP.

			<p>and remote sensing data bases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of regions with functional early warning alerts (e.g. price alerts, epidemiologic alert)</li> <li>• Number of issued food-based dietary guidelines</li> <li>• Number of policy/program practitioners, especially LGUs trained in the use of policy tools to manage food security</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Outcome 1.2</b> Enhanced capacities by GOP to incorporate nutrition, rural gender and social equity issues in agriculture/ARCs, and food security programs/projects</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 2018, the GOP has issued resolution harmonizing the implementation of food security/social protection programs/project</li> <li>• By 2018, the GOP has reduced leakages in food targeting /social protection by xxx%</li> <li>• By 2018, the GOP has increased the number of people by xxx to have accessed with better</li> </ul>		<p>By 2018, more poor and vulnerable people have adequate access to <b>food</b> and <b>nutrition</b></p>	<p>Decreased incidence of families estimated at 8.3 % of population below food subsistence/poverty threshold<sup>1</sup></p>

			social protection			
Output 1.2.1 Capacity developed resulting in coordinated and harmonized implementation of social protection programs and/or food and nutrition security projects			By 2018, the GOP has assisted xxx number of people and xxx number of communities with social protection components			
Output 1.2.2 Reinforced implementation of SAFDZs			By 2018, the GOP has xxx number of regions with improved SAFDZs, akin to agribusiness plans			
Output 1.2.3 Innovative risk sharing mechanisms (e.g. agriculture and fisheries insurance) for ARBs and other collective small farmers organization developed and pilot tested in selected areas, e.g. ARC			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2018, the GOP has pilot tested innovative schemes of agriculture/fisheries insurance</li> <li>By 2018, xxx number of GOP personnel acquired new skills on innovative insurance schemes</li> </ul>			
<b>CPF Priority Area 2: Enhancing agricultural production and productivity</b>						
<b>Outcome 2.1</b> More efficient streamlined supply chains resulting from better organization of small farmers to respond to market needs			By 2018, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yields of major crops /HVC cultivated by small producers increased by xxx%</li> <li>Livestock population increased by xxx%</li> <li>fisheries production of small producers increased by xxx%</li> <li>Farm income of</li> </ul>		<b>By 2018, more men and women are in decent and productive employment in agriculture, industries and communities utilizing greener processes</b>	Increased in annual average income (in real terms)of families in the agriculture and fishery sectors by about Php 20,000 <sup>1</sup>

			small producers increased by xxx%			
Output 2.1.1 ARBs and other small producers transformed into viable entrepreneurs			By 2018, more SMEs are operated by ARBs and other small producers			
Output 2.1.2 Market opportunities for agriculture and fisheries products are expanded through value adding (including processing) and post-harvest reduction losses			By 2018, greater market opportunities (value-adding) of agriculture and fishery products have been studied/explored			
<b>Outcome 2.2</b> Capacity of rural advisory services strengthened to boost rice productivity/other food staples including HVC, fisheries and livestock and marketing advice to support value chains			By 2018, key agricultural extension personnel can execute effective and efficient agriculture extension service along value chain By 2018, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of DA, personnel who can apply agribusiness services/value chain in their programs/projects improved by xxx%</li> <li>• Area planted with better crop varieties increased by xxx%</li> <li>• Area devoted to improved aquaculture farming increased by xxx%</li> <li>• Small livestock growers rearing improved and</li> </ul>			

			resilient breeds increased by xxx%			
Output 2.2.1 Data base and information system for RD&E updated			By 2018, a unified data base for RD&E has been studied/established and accessible to small farmers/producers			
Output 2.2.2 Trained extension personnel of the LGUs along the entire activities of value chain			By 2018, xxx extension personnel of the LGUs have upgraded their skills on value chain			
<b>CPF Priority Area 3: Sustainable management of natural resources</b>						
<b>Outcome 3.1</b> Enhanced capacity in land degradation assessment and sustainable land management and planning			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2018, Xxx Number of streamlined policy on sustainable land management</li> <li>New tools for assessing land degradation used by xxx% of DENR, BSWM and LGUs staff</li> <li>Number of regions with updated data base on land management systems</li> </ul>			Land degradation hotspots with developed SLM practices increased by about one million hectares <sup>1</sup>
Output 3.1.1 National policy/program framework to prevent land degradation and poverty in marginal areas and rural communities following the principle of SLM crafted			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2018</li> <li>Policy framework for SLM crafted</li> <li>Number of DENR, DAR and DA/BSWM and LGUs trained on new tools for land degradation</li> </ul>			

			assessment			
<b>Outcome 3.2</b> Adoption and use of sustainable fishing practices promoted			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 2018</li> <li>• Over-all health system of critical marine and other fishery resources improved by xxx%</li> <li>• Fisheries production in capture and aquaculture increased by xxx%</li> </ul>			Increased percentage of inland water, coastal and marine areas effectively and equitably managed through NIPAS and other area-based conservation measures, estimated at about 0.62% of total marine areas <sup>1</sup>
Output 3.2.1 ICM plans in accordance with EO 533 for critical coastal communities prepared and implemented			By 2018, the GOP has xxx number of ICM and fishery management plans prepared for identified vulnerable coastal communities			
Output 3.2.2 Management effectiveness of MPAs under NIPAS evaluated			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 2018, the GOP has completed the evaluation of xxx MPAs</li> </ul> <p>By 2018, has piloted xxx Number of best aquaculture practices</p>			
<b>Outcome 3.3</b> Policy-cum action oriented focus on the adoption of participatory approaches to forest and biodiversity promoted			By 2018, the GOP has significantly improved the management of forest areas through implementation of Xxx number of livelihood projects resulting from streamlined policies			Proportion of land area covered by forest increased by 30% <sup>1</sup>
Output 3.3.1 Trans-boundary, regulatory concerns and policy on management of			By 2018, the GOP has completed the review of xxx policies/ regulatory			

mangroves and other marine areas revised and improved			concerns detrimental to conservation			
Output 3.3.2 PES operational guidelines prepared and implemented as part of the GOP commitment to REDD			By 2018, the GOP has crafted workable PES guidelines and initiated its implementation to most critical areas			
<b>CPF Priority Area 4: Promoting agricultural adaptation and mitigation to climate change and reducing disaster risk</b>						
<b>Outcome 4.1</b> Practical technology innovations on climate sensitive areas and disaster prone areas identified and widely adopted			By 2018, xxx% of small farmers are adopting climate-responsive technologies on highly vulnerable areas		By 2018, capacities of vulnerable communities to adapt to climate change are enhanced  By 2018, vulnerable communities and the national & local governments are better able to manage natural and human-induced disaster risks	Annual agriculture losses reduced due to adoption of weather sensitive technologies <sup>1</sup>
Output 4.1.1 Geo-hazard mapping, vulnerability/risk assessment for highly susceptible land areas/communities undertaken, including promotion of resilient technologies (e.g. exotic plant and livestock genetics, food safety standards, etc.)			By 2018, susceptibility of more land areas/communities reduced due to improved geo-hazard mapping and better adoption of climate proof technologies			
<b>Outcome 4.2</b> Enhanced commitment to address land, water and forest			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2018, the GOP has xxxnumber of streamlined polices</li> </ul>		By 2018, capacities of vulnerable	Annual agriculture losses reduced due to adoption of weather

degradation/integrated watershed management mobilized with increased funding for climate change adaptation and DRR			<p>to manage sustainably land, water and forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of LGUs that have mainstreamed climate change adaption plans and DRR</li> </ul>		<p>communities to adapt to climate change are enhanced</p> <p>By 2018, vulnerable communities and the national &amp; local governments are better able to manage natural and human-induced disaster risks</p>	sensitive technologies <sup>1</sup>
Output 4.2.1 Innovative sources of finance to fund CC technology innovations and adaptation explored and pilot tested			By 2018, more LGUs have funding mechanisms to cope with the impacts of climate change			
Output 4.2.2 Enabling policy environment to sustainably finance environment activities and CC adaption reviewed and implemented			By 2018, the enabling policy to have a sustainable funding for LGUs has been resolved			

<sup>1</sup>Targets under the PDP 2011-2016

**Annex Table5 CPF Estimated Resource Requirements 2012-2018, Philippines**

CPF Priority Areas	Regular FAO	Others
	In US\$	
<b>1. CPF Priority Area 1 - Improving food and nutrition security (2 outcomes, 5 outputs)</b>	1,000,000	3,200,000
Outcome 1.1 Improved environment for food security through enforcement of rational policies and early detection of threats to food/agriculture		
Outcome 1.2 Enhanced capacities by PHL government to incorporate nutrition, rural gender and social equity issues in agriculture/ARCs, and food security programs/projects		
<b>2. CPF Priority Area 2 - Enhancing agricultural production and productivity (2 outcomes, 5 outputs)</b>	1,500,000	4,100,000
Outcome 2.1 Improved linkage of small producers, ARBs, and landless workers with modern value chains		
Outcome 2.2 Capacity of rural advisory services strengthened to boost rice productivity/other food staples including HVC, fisheries and livestock and marketing advice to support value chains		
<b>3. CPF Priority Area 3 - Sustainable management of natural resources (3 outcomes, 5 outputs)</b>	500,000 <sup>1</sup>	2,000,000 <sup>1</sup>
Outcome 3.1 Enhanced capacity in land degradation assessment and sustainable land management and planning		
Outcome 3.2 Adoption and use of sustainable fishing practices promoted		
Outcome 3.3 Policy focus on the adoption of participatory approaches to forest and biodiversity promoted		
<b>4. CPF Priority Area 4 Promoting agricultural adaptation and mitigation to climate change and reducing disaster risks (2 outcomes, 2 outputs)</b>	500,000	6,000,000
Outcome 4.1 Practical technologies innovations on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction identified and widely adopted		
Outcome 4.2 Political will and commitment to address land, water, forest degradation mobilized with increased funding for climate change adaptation		
<b>Total</b>	3,500,000	15,300,000

Source: UNDAF Philippines 2012-2018

<sup>1</sup>Amount intended for ENR conservation and protection

## Annex Table 6 On-going projects

(As of December 2011)

### National projects – 10

#### 1. Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) - 2

Title	Symbol	Budget (USD)	EOD	NTE	Counterpart Agency
TCP Facility	TCP/PHI/3301	63,457	May 2010	Jun 2012	
National Capability Building for Philippine Land Degradation Assessment and Climate Change Adaptation	TCP/PHI/3302	484,000	Jan 2011	Dec 2012	Bureau of Soils and Water Management (BSWM)-DA

#### 2. Trust Fund(TF)/Government Cooperation Project (GCP) – 4

Title	Symbol	Budget (USD)	EOD	NTE	Counterpart Agency
Enhancing Natural Resources Management through Enterprise Development in the Philippines	GCP/PHI/055/NZE	302,399	July 2008	Feb 2012	Forest Management Bureau-DENR

Restoring Agricultural Livelihoods in Conflict –Affected Areas in Maguindanao Province of the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM)	OSRO/PHI/101/NZE	1,351,413	June 2011	June 2012	Department of Agriculture and Fisheries- ARMM
Support to early recovery needs of conflict-and flood-affected areas in Central Mindanao	OSRO/PHI/102/CHA	299,721	Sep 2011	Jun 2012	Department of Agriculture and Fisheries - ARMM
Restoration of the Agri-based livelihoods and food security of flood affected farmers in Region III Philippines by typhoons Nesat and Nalgae	OSRO/PHI/103/BEL	300,000	Feb 2012 (to be signed)	Nov 2012	Department of Agriculture – RFU III; Provincial and Municipal LGUs

#### **JOINT PROGRAMME -4**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Symbol</b>	<b>Budget (USD)</b>	<b>EOD</b>	<b>NTE</b>	<b>Counterpart Agency</b>
Strengthening the Philippines' Institutional Capacity to Adapt to Climate Change (MDGF-1656)	UNJP/PHI/054/SPA	8,000,000 (FAO: 950,000)	Feb 2009	19 Jun 2012	Field Operations Service - DA
Inter-agency programme to nurture peace, security and decent work through community development in conflict areas of the Philippines (Bondoc Peninsula)	UNJP/PHI/058/UNO	2,493,484 (FAO: 993,923)	Mar 2010	Feb 2013	Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process

Ensuring Food Security and Nutrition for Children 0-2 Years Old in the Philippines (MDGF-2030)	UNJP/PHI/057/SPA	3,499,999 (FAO: 222,757)	May 2010	May 2013	National Nutrition Council-DOH
UN-REDD Philippines Programme: Supporting Initial Readiness Process	UNJP/PHI/060/UNJ	315,650	Oct 2011	Dec 2012	Forest Management Bureau-DENR

### **REGIONAL AND INTER-REGIONAL PROJECTS - 10**

#### **1. TF/GCP - 10**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Symbol</b>	<b>Budget (USD)</b>	<b>EOD</b>	<b>NTE</b>	<b>Counterpart Agency</b>
Regional Fisheries Livelihood Programme for South and Southeast Asia	GCP/RAS/237/SPA	19,549,000	May 2009	Aug 2013	Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources-DA
Capacity Building and Regional Collaboration for Enhancing the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources in Asia	GCP/RAS/240/JPN	1,372,448	Nov 2008	Feb 2012	Bureau of Plant Industry-DA
Collaborative Sub-regional Environmental Animal Health Management Initiative for Enhanced Smallholder Production in South-East Asia (SEAHMI)	GCP/RAS/244/ITA	1,300,000	Jan 2012	Jun 2013	Bureau of Animal Industry -DA

Conservation and Adaptive Management of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) – Full-Sized Project	GCP/GLO/212/GFF	3,500,000	Jul 2008	June 2013	Cordillera Administrative Region - DENR
Intra-African Training and Dissemination of Technical know-how for Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development with Africa-ASEAN Country Cooperation within the Framework of South-south Cooperation	GCP/INT/053/JPN	6,273,361	Oct 2007	Nov 2013	
Moving Forward in the Implementation of the Non-legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests in Liberia, Nicaragua and the Philippines: A Contribution to Reducing Deforestation and Forest Degradation	GCP/INT/111/GER	1,398,804	Aug 2010	Jan 2013	Forest Management Bureau - DENR
Improvement of regional capacities for the prevention, control and eradication of highly pathogenic and emerging diseases (HPED) including HPAI in ASEAN and SAARC countries	OSRO/RAS/901/EC	11,524,190	Dec 2009	Dec 2013	
Medium-term cooperation Programme with Farmers' Organizations in Asia and the Pacific Region	GCP/RAS/249/IFA	1,083,000	Nov 2009	Dec 2012	
Strategies for trawl fisheries by catch management (REBYC-II CTI)*	GCP/RAS/269/GFF	3,000,000	Jan 2011	Dec 2014	Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources - DA

Assessments of Climate Change Impacts and mapping of Vulnerability to Food Insecurity under Climate Change to Strengthen Household Food Security with Livelihoods' Adaptation Approaches	GCP/INT/126/JPN	2,557,731	Aug 2011	Jul 2014	Department of Agriculture
--	-----------------	-----------	----------	----------	---------------------------

**Annex Table 7 Goal, Strategies and Priorities of PDP, 2011-2016, Agriculture and Natural Resources Sector**

Chapter 4: Competitive and Sustainable Agriculture and Fisheries Sector	
Goal	Strategies/Priorities
1. Improved food security and increased rural incomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Raise productivity and incomes of agriculture and fishery-based households</li> <li>1.2 Increase investments and employment across an efficient value chain</li> <li>1.3 Transform agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs) into viable entrepreneurs</li> </ul>
2. Sector resilience to climate change risks increased	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 Reduce climate change-related risks and the vulnerability of natural ecosystems and biodiversity through ecosystem-based management approaches, conservation efforts, and sustainable environment and natural resources-based economic endeavours such as agri-ecotourism</li> <li>2.2 Increase the resilience of agriculture communities through the development of climate change sensitive technologies, establishment of climate-resilient agricultural infrastructure and climate responsive food production systems, and provision of support services to the most vulnerable communities</li> <li>2.3 Strengthen the agriculture and fisheries insurance system as an important risk-sharing mechanism</li> <li>2.4 Incorporate natural hazards and climate risk in the agricultural land use plan of the comprehensive land use plan (CLUP)</li> <li>2.5 Strengthen the capacity of communities to respond effectively to climate risks and natural hazards</li> <li>2.6 Continue vulnerability and adaptation assessments especially in food production areas</li> </ul>
3. Policy environment and governance enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1 Reaffirm the mechanisms and objectives of the National Convergence Initiatives (NCI)</li> <li>3.2 Adopt managing for development results (MfDR) as a common approach among rural development agencies</li> <li>3.3 Implement budgetary reforms</li> <li>3.4 Pursue PPP especially for infrastructure and value chain development</li> <li>3.5 Review critical legislations (i.e. AFMA, Fisheries Code) and policy issuances (i.e. sugar trade)</li> </ul>
Chapter 10: Conservation, Protection, and Rehabilitation of the Environment and Natural Resources	
Goal	Strategies/Priorities
1. Improved conservation, protection and rehabilitation of natural resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 sustainably manage forest and watersheds</li> <li>1.2 Improve protection and conservation of biodiversity</li> <li>1.3 Enhance coastal and marine resources management</li> <li>1.4 Improve land administration and management</li> <li>1.5 Develop and implement environment-friendly enterprise and livelihood opportunities</li> </ul>

<p>2. Improved environmental quality for a cleaner and healthier environment</p>	<p>2.1 Reduce air pollution in Metro Manila and other major urban centers  2.2 Reduce water pollution to improve water quality in priority rivers and other economically and ecologically important water bodies  2.3 Reduce wastes generated and improve waste disposal</p>
<p>3. Enhanced resilience of natural systems and improved adaptive capacities of human communities to cope with environmental hazards including climate-related risks</p>	<p>3.1 Strengthen institutional capacities of national and local governments for CCA and DRRM  3.2 Enhance resilience of natural systems  3.3 Improve adaptive capacities of communities  3.4</p>

Source of basic data: PDP 2011-2016