

PN-ACQ-239

RD10.005.P(j)

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MULTI-SECTORAL CONSULTATION
WORKSHOP: SAMAR ISLAND
BIODIVERSITY STUDY¹**



A

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MULTI-SECTORAL CONSULTATION
WORKSHOP: SAMAR ISLAND
BIODIVERSITY STUDY¹**

by

**ESTER ISBERTO , LUCE AGNES-BULOSAN
and LOWIE C. ROSALES²
Workshop Facilitators**

Samar Island Biodiversity Study (SAMBIO)
Resources, Environment and Economics Center for Studies, Inc. (REECS)

December 2000

¹ This publication was made possible through support provided by the U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of Grant No. 492-G-00-00-00001-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U. S. Agency for International Development

²The authors, Ester Isberto, Luce Simeon-Bulosan and Lowie Rosales, are Workshop Facilitators for SAMBIO, REECS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

1.	OBJECTIVES.....	1
2.	PARTICIPANTS' PROFILE.....	1
3.	PROCESS FLOW.....	1
4.	WORKSHOP OUTPUTS.....	2
5.	SOME PROCESS OBSERVATIONS.....	12
6.	ACTIVITY OBSERVATIONS.....	13

Appendix

- A List of Participants
- B Workshop Design/Facilitators Guide

LIST OF TABLES

WORKSHOP I

Table 1	Prevailing Issues/Concerns and Recommendations in Relation to the Biophysical Studies Presented
----------------	---

WORKSHOP II

Table 2	Multiple Criteria Analysis (Score of 1 – 10, with 1 as the lowest and 10 as the highest) (Eastern Samar)
Table 3	Multiple Criteria Analysis (Score of 1 – 10, with 1 as the lowest and 10 as the highest) (Northern Samar)
Table 4	Multiple Criteria Analysis (Score of 1 – 10, with 1 as the lowest and 10 as the highest) (Western Samar)

WORKSHOP III

Table 5	Priority Land Use Option: Agro-forestry (Northern Samar)
Table 6	Priority Land Use Option: Agro-forestry (Western Samar)
Table 7	Priority Land Use Option: Protection of Biodiversity (Eastern Samar)
Table 8	Significant Accomplishments in the Workshop vis-à-vis the Objectives Set

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MULTI-SECTORAL CONSULTATION WORKSHOP:
SAMAR ISLAND BIODIVERSITY STUDY**

12-13 December 2000

Leyte Park Hotel

Tacloban, Leyte

**A POST-WORKSHOP REPORT BY
THE FACILITATING TEAM**

1. OBJECTIVES

The Samar Island Biodiversity Study Team (SAMBIO), participated in by representatives from the local government units and civil society groups of Western, Eastern and Northern Samar, and key officials from national and regional government agencies convened the multi-sectoral consultation workshop. The objectives of the workshop were as follows:

1. To inform the stakeholders of the results of the biophysical studies;
2. To present and validate the results and assumptions of the economic and institutional studies as starting points of discussion on issues regarding the proposed Samar Island Natural Park; and,
3. To catalyze dialogue among the stakeholders on issues that they may tackle as a community together with the Samar Island Biodiversity Project (SIBP) team.

2. PARTICIPANTS' PROFILE

There were 56 participants who attended: 8 from Northern Samar; 14 from Eastern Samar; 16 from Western Samar; 16 from NGAs and 2 from Development Agencies.
(See appendix A)

3. PROCESS FLOW

The consultation workshop followed a straightforward process: first, a plenary presentation of the research findings; followed by an open forum for clarificatory questions from the participants on the studies presented; and third, mini-workshops where participants were asked to respond to prepared focus questions and undergo simulations of collective decision making processes.

The methodology used for the consultation workshop was the Technology of Participation (ToP), a highly consultative and dynamic process that puts premium on local participation. The facilitating team came up with a design (see **Appendix B**) that they presented to the SAMBIO team and an NGO stakeholder from the SIBP. This combined team discussed and processed the final design.

The challenges that the design of the consultation workshop had to respond to were the following:

1. How to present highly technical studies in layman's terms for stakeholders to appreciate;
2. How to make the sessions light and enjoyable for participants but at the same time serious enough for clear recommendations and options to be defined;
3. How to gear the discussions towards positive directions rather than having fruitless debates.

4. WORKSHOP OUTPUTS

The following are the outputs of Workshop I. The participants discussed the issues/concerns and recommendations regarding the biophysical studies presented on the Forest and Flora, Watershed and Mineral and Risk Assessments. In these workshops the participants were asked to sign up for the particular topic they were most interested in.

Workshop I.

Table 1
Prevailing Issues/Concerns and Recommendations in Relation to the
Biophysical Studies Presented

Watershed Group	Mineral Resources Group	Forest and Flora
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Management and Policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and delineate watershed areas • DENR to lead in disseminating SAMBIO Studies • Watershed management plan outlining institutional arrangements and MOA • Incentives encouraging watershed management 2. Conflicting Economic Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote inter-LGU cooperation within watershed policies • Implement integrated land use plan and policies 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural and technical solutions are available • Strict implementation of policies • No to mining • Conscientious mining 2. Policy Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonize policies • Civil society organizations should affirm and re-affirm their commitments • Strict implementation and tri-partite monitoring of environment programs • Strict implementation of existing policies 3. Technical Problems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict implementation of rehabilitation plans 4. Investment Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource inventory 5. Equity Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint ventures with LGU, civil society and business sector • Organize and empower local community for better bargaining 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forest destruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable utilization of forest resources • Establishment of protected areas and buffer zones • Alternative livelihood for community to address inadequate data on biodiversity 2. Inadequate data on biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of research component to address adequate data on biodiversity 3. Bio-prospecting without permit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict implementation of rules on bio-prospecting 4. Low level of public awareness on biodiversity conservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen IECs to be conducted by lead agencies: DENR, LGUs and other agencies 5. Poor law enforcement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective inter-agency cooperation (community, NGO, LGU, PO and PNP) • Community involvement

The second main session was the presentation of the reports on the Socio-Economic Assessment. The participants were given time to ask clarificatory questions on the reports right after the presentations. Workshop II followed.

Workshop II - A Simulation of the Multiple Criteria Analysis (MCA) per province. Options of the different land uses were presented in a table, which the participants will have to grade (from 1 to 10 with 10 as the highest score) according to a set of criteria.

After the grades were given this was now translated to a percentage rating as follows:

The Legend of the Stars

Mega-Star	85% - 100%
Super-Star	71% - 84%
Star for All Seasons	57% - 70%
Diamond Star	43% - 56%
Starlet	29% - 42%
Twinkle Star	15% - 28%
Falling Star	1% - 14%

The following tables are the results of the preferences of the three Samar provinces.

Northern Samar – Agro Forestry (Star for all Seasons)

Western Samar – Agro Forestry (Super –Star)

Eastern Samar – Protection of Biodiversity (Mega-Star)

Workshop II: Simulation of Multi-Criteria Analysis: A Participatory Approach

EASTERN SAMAR

Table 2
Multiple Criteria Analysis
 (Score of 1 – 10, with 1 as the lowest and 10 as the highest)

Options	Criteria	Efficiency (NPV)	Environmental Protection	Sustainability	Equity	Social Acceptability	Government Revenue	TOTAL (%)	Star Rating
Protection of bio-diversity		4	9	8	10	10	10	85%	Mega-star
Production of wood/non-wood		8/6*	6/6	4/6	6/6	5/9	5/2	57%	Star for all Seasons
Industrial tree planting		9	9	9	3	3	8	68%	Star for all seasons
Agro Forestry		9	7	7	5	8	4	66%	Star for all seasons
Eco-tourism		5	5	5	4	6	6	61%	Star for all seasons
Intensive Agriculture/Kaingin		2	1	1	3	2	1	16%	Twinkle star
Mining		9	1	1	1	1	8	35%	Starlet

Ranking of Criteria according to most important with 5 as the lowest and 1 as the most important

Efficiency - 5
 Environmental Protection – 2
 Sustainability – 1

Equity – 3
 Social Acceptability – 4
 Government Revenue – 6

* First number means rating for wood and the second number means rating for non-wood

NORTHERN SAMAR

Table 3
Multiple Criteria Analysis
 (Score of 1 – 10, with 1 as the lowest and 10 as the highest)

Options	Criteria	Efficiency (NPV)	Environmental Protection	Equity	Social Acceptability	Government Revenue	TOTAL (%)	Star Rating
Protection of bio-diversity		3	10	9/9	8	3	70%	Star for all Seasons
Production of wood/non-wood		8	3	2/7	9	2	51%	Diamond Star
Industrial tree Planting		3	10	8/9	9	3	70%	Star for all Seasons
Agro Forestry Intensive		7	9	8/9	7	2	70%	Star for all Seasons
Agriculture/Kaingin		9	1	1/1	5	2	31%	Starlet
Mining		1	2	8/2	2	8	38%	Starlet
Eco-tourism		8	8	3/7	8	7	68%	Star for all Seasons

Ranking of Criteria according to most important with 5 as the lowest and 1 as the most important

Efficiency – 3
 Environmental Protection – 1
 Equity – 6/5

Social Acceptability – 2
 Government Revenue – 4

WESTERN SAMAR

Table 4
Multiple Criteria Analysis
 (Score of 1 – 10, with 1 as the lowest and 10 as the highest)

Options	Criteria (NPV)	Environmental Protection	Equity	Social Acceptability	Government Revenue	TOTAL (%)	Star Rating
Protection of bio-diversity	8	1	6	9	1	50%	Diamond Star
Production of wood/non-wood	10	2	8	5	7	64%	Star for all Seasons
Industrial tree Planting	7	5	7	8	2	58*	Star for all Seasons
Agro Forestry	6	8	9	10	5	76%	Super Star
Intensive Agriculture/Kaingin	4	3	10	7	6	60%	Star for all Seasons
Mining	3	1	4	1	3	22%	Twinkle Star
Eco-tourism	5	9	3	6	4	54%	Diamond Star

Ranking of Criteria according to most important with 5 as the lowest and 1 as the most important

Efficiency – 3
 Environmental Protection – 1
 Equity – 6/5

Social Acceptability – 2
 Government Revenue – 4

Prior to Workshop III, a presentation of Socio-Institutional Studies was made. This presentation was meant to be an input to the participants as they proceeded to the third workshop where they had to identify the stakeholders in the priority option that they chose for their province. Each group also identified the roles that they believe these stakeholders should play.

Worth noting is the fact that the non-scientific or popular method that was devised by the facilitating team, using the "Star Rating" matches the priority options generated by a more scientific computer generated program analysis that was also presented before Workshop III.³

Workshop III: Stakeholder Analysis

NORTHERN SAMAR

Table 5
Priority Land Use Option: Agro-forestry

Stakeholders	What is their role
1. Forest edge communities (FECs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project implementers • Direct beneficiaries • Manage adjacent forest
2. NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist POs and FECs in project implementation • Linkaging agent between government and civil society organizations • Direct beneficiaries • IEC
3. People's Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project implementers • Direct beneficiaries • Manage adjacent forest
4. LGUs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical and financial support • Local legislation, policies and regulations • Enforcement • Coordination with NGAs
5. DENR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical and financial support • Lead agency in spearheading project implementation
6. DA and DAR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical and financial support
7. Adverse claimants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Micro-financing
8. Academe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology transfer • IEC • Research

³ The computer program allows for weights or ranks attached to the criteria to be factored in while the "Star Rating" does not incorporate such. (pers. comm., SAMBIO project leader).

Added Question: "What livelihood enhancement activities do you want SIB to initiate in your province?"

- Copra and abaca trading and production
- Furniture making
- Bamboo and rattan handicrafts
- Seedling production
- Eco-tourism
- Livestock raising

WESTERN SAMAR

Table 6
Priority Land Use Option: Agro-forestry

Stakeholders	What is their role
1. Upland farmers and farmers within the SIFR or local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource management • Planning • Active participation in governance
2. LGUs (barangay, municipality, province)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide basic services • Primary health care • Marketing assistance • Farm to market roads • Technical support • Synchronize policies • Conflict resolution
3. NGOs, Academe, POs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community organizing • Advocacy • Project implementation • Trainings • Research • Technology transfer
4. DENR and other NGAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic planning • Technical trainings • Tenurial provisions • Capability building • Delineation of farm lots and forest reservations • Policy management • Fund sources • Granting permits for resource utilization
5. Funding Agencies (LBP, USAID, ADB, World Bank)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide network • Administrative support • Technology • Support for policy development
6. Private Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce appropriate technology • Promote investment • Provide funds • Infuse capital
7. Military	Law enforcement/ensure peace and order
8. FOR ALL of the above stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination • Information dissemination • Sustainability • Fund sourcing • Monitoring and evaluation • Introduce alternative livelihood (except POs)

Suggestions on livelihood programs:

- Rattan plantation
- Food processing
- Root crops processing
- Mineral water production
- Reforestation
- DENR green charcoal
- In site educational camp
- Industrial, private tree plantation
- Abaca plantation
- Coffee production
- Funding for livelihood
- Resin production
- Cottage industry

EASTERN SAMAR

Table 7
Priority Land Use Option: Protection of Biodiversity

Stakeholders	What is their role
1. LGUs (barangay, municipality, province)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead player • Joint venture activities • Funding support or counterpart • Policy formulation and implementation • Advocacy
2. Civil society (NGOs, POs, academic community, religious sector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEC • Information provider • Community mobilization • Watchdog • Rewards and recognition • Advocacy • Consensus building • Funding support and counterpart
3. DENR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate land use policies • Funding for protection of biodiversity
4. DA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding
5. PIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEC, media
6. DECS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values formation • Information provider
7. PNP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEC (internal/external) • Protection and enforcement of laws
8. SIBP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with the province • Consider LGU in IBP structure • Livelihood identified
Consider LGUs as partner in planning and implementation	

Suggested livelihood programs:

- Eco-tourism
- Abaca production
- Butterfly farms
- Orchids propagation
- Processing of non-wood products
- Selective utilization of wood products and by-products

Table 8
Significant Accomplishments in the Workshop vis-à-vis the Objectives Set

Objective	Accomplished
1. Presented and validated findings of bio-physical, economic and institutional studies	✓
2. Generated comments and recommendations	✓
3. Identified proposed management options	✓
4. Recommended stakeholders roles	✓
<i>Added accomplishments that were not in the original workshop design:</i>	
5. Presentation of the Multi-criteria analysis computer program	✓
6. Solicit suggestions on possible livelihood programs for Samar Island	✓

5. SOME PROCESS OBSERVATIONS

1. All papers that were to be presented had equal presentation time. Speakers were given 15 minutes to present their paper. The average presentation time was about 13-15 minutes. Limiting the technical presentations to 15 minutes each and batching the reports to three main sessions (biophysical, socio-economic assessment and in institutional and stakeholders relationships) helped in holding the attention of the participants up to the end of the final report.
2. Practicing the technical experts the day before, making sure that their presentations are within the 15 minutes allowable time and giving suggestions on how to do the delivery of the presentations better, helped in making these reports understandable to the participants. We have to thank the experts who painstakingly rehearsed, for their full cooperation, professionalism and humility. Thank you.
3. Despite the delay in starting the activity as there were not enough participants yet for the opening day in December 11, still the workshop proceed and ended as scheduled. Handling the sessions tightly and making sure that the schedules and

outputs were met made the one and a half-day consultation workshop fruitful for the organizers as well as the participants.

4. The use of the Technology of Participation (ToP) facilitation techniques showed that much could be accomplished in a day and half workshop. The workshop design showed that technical studies which may otherwise be difficult to understand can be popularized so that there is a common ground for dialogue between those who belong to the scientific community and those whose expertise are based on their practical experience in the field.
5. The atmosphere in all the three workshops was light and the participants were cooperative and open to each other's opinion. Many said they had fun and appreciated the handling of the sessions in a light manner.
6. One critical factor that is often forgotten or taken for granted is the design of the workshop. It is critical for the team of facilitators and organizers to agree on the objectives and outputs. It is these objectives and outputs that would dictate the elements of the design. Once this is done and a design finalized, it is best not to modify it when the workshops are about to begin. Modifications may be done before the event and should be thoroughly discussed and agreed upon by the original design team. This way, we avoid confusion among the workshop organizers and the facilitating team.

6. ACTIVITY OBSERVATIONS

1. The entire consultation was divided into three main activities – the presentation of the studies that included the open forum on the studies presented, the workshop, and the presentation of workshop outputs. In all these three main activities, it was observed that the participants were most active during the breakout sessions. The participatory facilitating technique gave each participant a chance to share his or her thoughts and ideas. Discussions were lively as well as substantive. In Workshop I, the presence of the specialists in each of the relevant sessions enhanced the discussions further. They answered more in-dept questions from the participants and helped facilitated the small group discussions within the workshop process.
2. The open forum that followed every batch of paper presentation was meant to be a venue for the participants to raise clarificatory questions on the studies presented. It was observed that only a number of participants raised questions during this portion. Rather, the participants took the opportunity to ask more pointed questions to the paper presenters during the workshop sessions. In some instances, the participants took the opportunity to raise issues rather than clarificatory questions. In these cases, the participants were reminded that the workshops were the proper time to raise issues relating to biodiversity in Samar Island as well as the roles that stakeholders have or may not have played.
3. The simulation of the Multi- Criteria Analysis showed that for as long as the concepts or the criteria were clearly defined to the participants, it was relatively easy for the participants to put a score on each criteria per land use option presented to them.

In fact they were able to add some options and criteria that they felt were necessary and particular to their area. In essence, the process showed that the participants were clear about their choice and they identified with the results of the MCA because they processed these themselves.

There was much discussion among the participants when they went through rating their land use choices. The discussion centered on defining clearly what they felt was important to them. In the end they arrived at their priority choice or choices by consensus.

Submitted by the Facilitating Team:

Ms. Ester Isberto
Team Leader

Ms. Luce Simeon-Bulosan
Team Member

Ms. Lowie C. Rosales
Team Member

December 20, 2000

Appendix A

List of Participants

Agency/Institution	Total
National Government Agencies	16
DENR – 7	
SIBP – 3	
PAWB-DENR Central office – 1	
SIBP –DENR Central office - 2	
Regional Directors – 3 (DOT, DTI, DAR)	
Western Samar	16
LGU – 1	
MPDC – 1	
SIBF – 4	
Barangay Captains – 10	
Northern Samar	8
PPDC – 1	
MPDC – 1	
SIBF – 2	
CENRO – 1	
Barangay Captains – 3	
Eastern Samar	14
Governor's Office – 1	
LGU – 2	
PPDC – 1	
MPDCs – 5	
Barangay Captains – 2	
PENRO – 1	
CENRO – 2	
Development Agencies	2
USAID – 1	
UNDP – 1	
Total	56

Appendix B

WORKSHOP DESIGN/FACILITATORS' GUIDE

Objectives:

1. To inform the stakeholders of the results of the biophysical studies;
2. To present and validate the results and assumptions of the economic, institutional and legal studies as starting points of discussion on issues regarding the proposed Samar Island Natural Park; and,
3. To catalyze dialogue among the stakeholders on issues that they may tackle as a community together with the SIBP.

Outputs:

1. **Presented and validated findings of Biophysical, Economic, and Institutional studies;**
2. Generated comments and recommendations; and,
3. Identified proposed institutional arrangements (provincial and Samar-wide)

Process Flow:

PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES

Day 1: 12 December 2000

TIME/Facilitator	ACTIVITY	OUTPUT
8:00 – 9:00	Registration (During registration pax will be asked to sign-up on easel sheets what group they wish to join for Workshop 1. There will be three groups – Forest and Flora; Mineral Resources and Watershed)	Pax registered and given conference materials Pax signed-up for the workshop group they wish to join
9:00 – 9:30 Iting Isberto	Opening Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invocation • National Anthem • Welcome Remarks Oscar Dominguez <i>DENR R-8 Director</i> • Keynote Address Mundita Lim <i>DENR PWB Asst. Director</i> 	Conference formally opened
9:30 – 10:00 Lowie Rosales	Introduction of Participants “Human Bingo” (Before explaining the mechanics of the game, the lead facilitator takes the opportunity to introduce herself and her co-facilitators. Then calls on co-facilitator to explain the mechanics of the human bingo)	Facilitators introduced Pax introduced and able to interact with one another
10:00 – 10:15 10:15 – 10:30 Iting Isberto	Break Workshop Objectives and Process Flow	Pax briefed on the objectives and process flow of the activity
10:30 – 11:15 Iting Isberto	<i>Presentation of Bio-Physical Studies</i> (each presenter is given 15 minutes maximum to present his/her studies.. There will be a rehearsal for paper presenters on the evening of Day 1)	Pax are able to listen to the results of the bio-physical studies
	Forest and Flora Resource Assessment <i>Dr. Antonio Carandang and Dr. Domingo Madulid</i> Mineral Resource Assessment and Risk Assessment <i>Engr. Herman Mendoza and Mr. Alex Anda</i> Watershed Assessment <i>Dr. Rex Cruz</i>	

17

TIME/Facilitator	ACTIVITY	OUTPUT
11:15 – 11:30 Iting Isberto	Open Forum <i>(This will be clarificatory questions only, detailed questions on the studies will be asked during the workshop session)</i>	Pax are able to clarify points on any of the studies presented
11:30 – 12:30 1:00 – 2:00 (Forest and Flora – Iting Isberto Mineral Resources – Luce Bulosan Watershed – Lowie Rosales)	Lunch Break Workshop I: Validation of Bio-physical studies in three concurrent workshops <i>(Lead facilitator per workshop will introduce herself, the resource person and documentor. Request the workshop group to assign a reporter and tell the reporter that he/she will only be allowed a maximum of 10 minutes to report. Pax are first given chance to ask clarificatory questions. Then facilitators ask O R questions. Workshop immediately follows, See Template 1)</i>	Pax are able to recall the highlights of the studies by answering O R level questions. O – <i>What one thing do you remember in the presentation for _____?</i> R – <i>What did you feel when you heard about the status of our _____?</i> Pax are able to provide comments on the paper presentation by answering two focus questions: ✓ <i>What are the prevailing issues that you know of in the area of _____?</i> <i>Workshop method will be used to generate issues. Once issues are generated the lead facilitator will proceed to process the recommendations per issue</i> Pax are able to present outputs and listen/comment on outputs of other groups Pax are able to listen to the integrative results of the socio-economic studies Pax able to clarify points on the study presented Pax divided per province, are able to synthesize the inputs of the consultation by undergoing a collective decision-making exercise
2:00 – 2:30 Iting Isberto	Plenary Presentation of Workshop I Outputs	
2:30 – 3:00	Presentation of Socio-Economic Assessment <i>Dr. Marian Delos Angeles and Ms. Rina Rosales</i>	
3:00 – 3:15	Open Forum	
3:30 – 4:30	Workshop II: Simulation of Multiple Criteria Analysis (MCA) by Province <i>(Groups are asked to score from 1-10 and total the scores based on the horizontal dimensions. See Template 2)</i>	
4:30 – 5:00	Gallery Presentation of Output	

Day 2: 13 December 2000

Time/Facilitator	Activity	Output
8:00 – 8:30	Recap of Day 1 and “Star-Rating” Summary of Table of MCA based on Provincial Outputs (A Summary table will be filled-up by facilitators as outputs are being presented by province Total scores will be given an equivalent “Star Rating for the entire Samar will be given at the end of the presentation as follows: Mega-Star: 85% – 100% Super-Star: 71% – 84% Star for All Seasons: 57% – 70% Diamond Star: 43% – 56% Starlet: 29% – 42% Twinkle Star: 15% – 29% Bituing Walang Ningning: 1% – 14%	Pax reminded of activities and outputs of the previous day
8:30 – 9:00	Presentation of Socio-Institutional Studies Mr. Gilbert Braganza	Pax are able to listen to the integrative results of the socio-economic studies
9:00 – 9:15	Open Forum	Pax able to clarify points on the study presented
9:15 – 10:15 Group 1- Iting Isberto Group 2 – Lowie Rosales Group 3 – Luce Bulosan	Workshop III: Validation of Socio-Institutional Studies (Same process as Workshop 1 but this time they will also go back to their template in Workshop I and add column answering the question, “To whom is the recommendation directed to? See <i>Template 2</i>)	Pax are able to provide comments on the paper presentation by answering two focus questions: ✓ Who are the stakeholders vis-à-vis the province’s top one priority management choice? ✓ What are the roles of these stakeholders
10:15 – 10:30 10:30 – 11:00 Iting isberto	Break Presentation of Outputs	Pax are able to present outputs and listen/comment on outputs of other groups
11:00 – 12:00	Closing Program • Awarding of Certificates per Position (all mayors, barangay captains, etc.) • Closing Remarks Gerry Bison USAID Director	Pax are thanked for their active participation during the consultation process
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch/Departure	

Template for Workshop I

Workshop Group: (Forest and Fauna, Mineral Resources, Watershed)

TOPIC:

Issues	Recommendations
--------	-----------------

- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓

Template for Workshop II

Multiple Criteria Analysis
 (Score of 1 – 10, with 1 as the lowest and 10 as the highest)

Options	Criteria	Efficiency (NPV)	Environmental Protection	Equity	Social Acceptability	Government Revenue	TOTAL
Protection of bio-diversity							
Production of wood/non-wood							
Individual tree planting							
Agro Forestry							
Intensive							
Agriculture/Kaingin							
Mining							
TOTAL							

Summary MCA for Samar Island

Options	Criteria	Efficiency (NPV)	Environmental Protection	Equity	Social Acceptability	Government Revenue	TOTAL
Protection of bio-diversity							
Production of wood/non-wood							
Individual tree planting							
Agro Forestry							
Intensive							
Agriculture/Kaingin							
Mining							
TOTAL							

21

Template for Workshop III

Stakeholders	Roles
--------------	-------

22

"HUMAN BINGO CARD"

A RED	A MALE BARANGAY CAPTAIN	A MALE NGO REP	AN FPE REP	A MALE MUNICIPAL MAYOR OR REP
Signature A SAMBIO MEMBER	Signature A FORESTER	Signature A CENRO	Signature AN MPDO	Signature A NEDA REP
Signature A FEMALE NGO REP	Signature A PPDO	Signature A PENRO	Signature A MINING ENGINEER	Signature A DAR REP
Signature A GOVERNOR OR REP	Signature A DPWH REP	Signature A FEMALE BARANGAY CAPTAIN	Signature AN SIBP REP	Signature A DTI REP
Signature A DOT REP	Signature A FEMALE NGO REP	Signature A MALE NGO REP	Signature A PAWB REP	Signature A FEMALE MUNICIPAL MAYOR
Signature	Signature	Signature	Signature	Signature

23-

