



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Strengthening the Philippines' institutional capacity to adapt to climate change – Final Joint Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *Philippines*

Final Evaluation: *May 2012*

Mode of Evaluation: *Independent*

ILO Administrative responsibility: ILO Country Office, Manila

Technical Area: EMP/SFP

Evaluation Management: *The Evaluation Reference Group - The MDG-F Secretariat*

Evaluation Team: *Joel Beasca*

Project End: *March 2013*

Project Code: *PHI/08/03/HSF*

Donor: *USD 8,000,000 UNDP lead*

UNDP: 4,176,800 UNEP: 1,223,200

FAO: 950,000 ILO: 600,000

UN-HABITAT: 550,000 WHO: 500,000

Keywords: *Local Economic Development; human security; peace-building; capacity-building, livelihood, armed conflict, inter-agency collaboration*

Background & Context

In more recent times, the Philippines experienced a number of natural disasters which has placed it among the list of countries that have become most vulnerable to the negative effects of climate change. Latest empirical studies have also indicated climate

changes in the country in terms of temperature increases and occurrences of extreme heat and rainfall. The total cost of extreme events related to climate change is believed to be high, at around 2.7% of the country's GDP. Climate change has also been associated with the difficulties in the country's achievement of the MDGs.

In response to this situation, the Philippines adopted the *Climate Change Law* in 2009 and the *Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Law* in 2010 as its main policy responses. A *National Framework Strategy on Climate Change* and a *National Climate Change Action Plan* were also put in place. The development community also implemented several initiatives on DRR/DRM starting in 2005.

Ongoing from 2008 until 2011, this Joint Programme was implemented by 6 UN Agencies (i.e. FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNEP, UN Habitat, and WHO) in partnership with 9 National Institutions (i.e. DA, DENR, DOH, DOLE, DTI, HUDCC, NEDA, PAGASA, and PGA). The MDG-F funded the intervention at a cost of US\$ 8 million.

By January 2012, formal preparations began for the conduct of a Final Evaluation. After submission of an Inception Report, a Country

Mission to the Philippines was carried out in March-April 2012. The mission involved interviews and group discussions with various informants from the implementing agencies, and beneficiary groups and institutions. Afterwards, a draft evaluation report was prepared. Corrections and comments on the draft report served as bases in finalizing this revised version of the report.

The evaluation determined that significant outputs were achieved by the JP, and that there were immediate effects from these outputs. *Climate Change Vulnerability and Assessment Tools* for the Health, Water Resources, Coastal Resources, and Agriculture/Forestry/Biodiversity Sectors were completed. These were confirmed by the end-users to have been helpful in their re-planning processes and in their capacity-building activities. Five *Mainstreaming Guidelines* were also made, and *Capacity Assessments* were carried out among 13 NGAs and 10 Provincial LGUs. Several *IEC Materials* were produced, and documentations were completed. An underreported output (i.e. the *Climate Projections for 2020/2050*) was also found by the evaluation, which showed potentials of impact.

In the five demonstration sites covered by the JP, the evaluation also found most output commitments to have already been delivered. Aside from these, positive immediate effects were reported by beneficiaries. The *Innovative Financing Scheme* in Agusan del Norte was launched and it had shown impressive results. Around 837 farmers have benefitted from the financing scheme which was coursed through a local co-operative, a rural bank, and Municipal Governments. The interviewed beneficiaries of the scheme reported income increments from their initial harvests, while rationalizing their activities with the issue of climate change. A

Weather Index-Based Insurance (WIBI) System was also piloted in the area, which already paid out indemnities to 327 farmers. The sample of these farmers who were interviewed by the evaluation were likewise appreciative of the system and verified that it had indeed been useful to them in view of the problems brought to them by climate change. Women were active participants in the financing and insurance schemes. There were also other and additional outputs which were completed by ILO and its partners (the DTI and DOLE, among them) in Agusan del Norte.

Main Findings & Conclusions

In Albay, 84 Modified Barangay Contingency Plans have been finished and a Climate Change Academy was created. The modified plans featured an integration of CCA with their former focus on DRR/DRM. On the other hand, the Climate Change Academy is envisioned to be a learning center on climate change adaptation by government and private sector personnel. Aside from these, Modified Lesson Plans with climate change contents are already being used by public school teachers in 15 towns in the province. UNDP is implementing the project in Albay, in cooperation with the PGA.

In Sorsogon City, the project showcased the processes and elements of a climate change-resilient human settlement. A Vulnerability Assessment Report with focus on human settlement areas was done. This led to the crafting of a draft City Shelter Plan which has climate change parameters. The Design Parameters of a Climate-Resilient Coastal Settlement/Community was also completed. A related output was the Retrofitting of 30 Houses in 5 sites and the development of a Prototype of a Climate-Resilient Housing Structure. Alternative Livelihood Training Courses were also conducted to allow greater

income options for the coastal settlers. Most of the participants in these courses noted that they have been able to apply their learnings in food processing and in masonry. Among other outputs, additional support was also provided by UN Habitat to the Sorsogon City Government in the improvement of its planning system through the production of maps and interface with an Automated Weather Station (AWS).

In assessing the relevance of the programme design, the evaluation found that the JP indeed contributed in solving the needs and problems indicated in the programme document through its various interventions in capacity-building, re-planning, and demonstration of CCA Options. The implementing partners (i. e. UN Agencies and National Institutions) were also relevant in the intervention because they added value in the delivery of their various expertise. National alignment of the JP was evident. The JP was also relevant to the global objectives set by the MDG-F Secretariat.

In terms of efficiency, the JP abided by the standard 7% Administrative Cost ceiling and the least cost-high quality norm in procurements. However, there were obstacles faced by the intervention in terms of high start-up and learning costs, lack of efficiency targets and benchmarks, a need to balance operational efficiency with national ownership, trade-offs between cost efficiencies and operational deadlines, late hiring and staff turnovers, and the lack of a functional M&E System.

The evaluation cited evidence of the rootedness of national ownership in the JP through the amounts of local resources that were raised by the national counterpart institutions, their active participation in the affairs of the programme, and their

continuation of project activities despite the closure of the programme last December 2011.

The effectiveness of the JP was assessed on the bases of its output achievements, its contribution to the attainment of the MDGs and the MDG-F Goals on the Environment and Climate Change Theme, and its adherence to the principles and standards in Delivering As One and Aid Effectiveness. In all these criteria, MDG-F 1656 turned out to be a success.

The evaluation also noted some indications of sustainability of the intervention, although in general, it concluded that it was too early to determine if the JP results had indeed become sustainable.

In the end, the exercise led to the following conclusions:

- MDG-F 1656 was implemented at the right time, when present-day needs were brought about by the adoption of the Climate Change Law and when there was growing recognition that climate change is tied up to the MDGs. The JP successfully responded to these needs.
- The JP was also successful in delivering most of the outputs expected from the intervention, and some of these outputs could have a strategic impact on climate change adaptation in the Philippines.
- There was also success in demonstrating the application of the Delivering as One Concept in the UN System, while abiding by the norms on national ownership set in the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
- Except for a weakness in operationalizing an M&E System, MDG-F 1656 complied with the global implementation guidelines set by the MDG-F Secretariat and contributed to the attainment of the MDG-F Goals on Environment and Climate Change.
- Planning and management constraints were faced by the JP due to the newness of the joint

programming modality applied for the intervention, and gaps in applying RBM approaches and techniques within the framework of this modality.

- The pacing of programme activities had been difficult due to an initial delay in the completion and delivery of key predecessor activities and outputs.

- There were weaknesses in the programme, in terms of delayed staff hiring, later procurements and fund transfers, non-functioning of the M&E System, and the lack of a gender strategy.

- The strong features of the JP were the strong participation of women in the project areas, its ability to leverage the programme funds, its flexibility in adapting the management system, its adeptness in working with NGOs and other private sector groups, and its keenness to the creation of national ownership.

- On the whole, MDG-F 1656 performed well in the aspects of Relevance, Ownership, and Effectiveness. Its performance on Efficiency is also within expectations. The Sustainability of the intervention will have to be determined later, although sustainability measures were put in place and there were indications that these were working.

The following recommendations were forwarded in this report:

1. The CCA Options and Schemes, particularly in the agricultural sector, should be aggressively promoted and targeted for replication at a larger scale.
2. The testing period and measurement process in the project areas in Agusan del Norte, Benguet, and Ifugao should be completed, and ex-post monitoring in these priority areas will have to be conducted.
3. The existing initiatives by the project implementers (e.g. ILO) to replicate the CCA Options and Schemes in other areas through successor projects should be endorsed.
4. Ex-post monitoring of the programme results in Albay, Sorsogon City, and Metro Manila should also be done.
5. The baseline institutional assessments under Outcomes 1 and 2 should be replicated to other priority NGAs and Provincial LGUs.
6. With specific reference to the implementation of the current (2012-2018) UNDAF in the Philippines, a Common RBM Training Course among the participating UN Agencies should be held, efficiency benchmarks should be set and efficiency targets should be included among the performance indicators of the JP, a systematic methodology should be used in designing a JP, and a Gender Equality Strategy should be integrated in future JPs.
7. For similar future initiatives to be done by the MDG-F Secretariat, technical assistance in RBM should be provided to the programme proponents together with guidance on the conduct of the Programme Inception, clarification should be made if the three-year time frames include the start-up and exit phases, the full three-year plan of activities should be disclosed in the Joint Programme Document and/or a Programme Implementation Plan, efficiency benchmarks should be set in the JP Guidelines, and efficiency targets should be included in the Programme Proposals and the Signed Joint Programme Document.