



STUDY OF PHILIPPINE NGO FUND FACILITIES IN ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

by Ma. Elena Chiong-Javier, Ph.D.
and
Romulo R. Sison

May 2003

EcoGovernance



Development *Alternatives*, Inc.

This project is implemented by Development Alternatives, Inc. with the support of its subcontractors:

- Orient Integrated Development Consultants, Inc.
- Resources, Environment and Economics Center for Studies, Inc.
- Winrock International
- Abt Associates, Inc.
- Management Systems International
- Michigan State University

Produced by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources-United States Agency for International Development's (DENR-USAID) Philippine Environmental Governance (EcoGov) Project through the assistance of the USAID under USAID PCE-1-00-99-00002-00. The views expressed and opinions contained in this publication are those of the authors and are not intended as statements of policy of USAID or the authors' parent organization.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Rationale	1
Objectives of the Study	2
Methodology	2
Limitations of the Study	3
II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL FUND FACILITIES	4
General Traits of Environmental Funds	4
NGO-Managed Fund Facilities in the Study	4
Synthesis of Findings on the Three Fund Facilities	8
III. FUND SUSTAINABILITY OF NGO-MANAGED FUND FACILITIES	9
Sources of Funding for NGOs	9
Revenues from Membership, Leveraging, and Partnership	10
Income from Funds Held in Trust and Investments	11
Management of the Funds	12
Administration Cost	13
IV. GRANTS ADMINISTRATION BY NGO-MANAGED FUND FACILITIES	14
Strategic Program Focus	14
Approved Grants/Projects and Activities: FPE Case	19
Classification of Approved Projects by Broad Ecosystem Types	21
Response/Approval Rate	22
Project Grantees: FPE Case	23
Major Considerations in the Grantmaking Process	23
V. ISSUES AND BEST PRACTICES FROM GRANT RECIPIENTS	29
Sources of Revenue for the Foundation	29
Foundation Thrusts and Projects	31
Project Partnerships	33
Designing the Conservation Projects	35
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	35
VI. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE TFCF	37
APPENDICES	



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tropical Forest Conservation Fund (TFCF) was established in late 2002 as a sinking fund under a debt reduction agreement between the United States Government and the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. This agreement allocates to the TFCF a total of US\$ 8.2 million representing interest to be given in 28 semi-annual payments over the next 14 years, from June 1, 2003 to December 1, 2016.

In view of assisting the Board of Trustees of the new TFCF, this study was undertaken by the Development Alternatives Inc. under the Philippine Environmental Governance (EcoGovernance) program being funded by the United States Agency for International Development. The objectives of the study were (1) to describe the various aspects of fund management and grants administration issues and practices of selected Philippine NGO fund facilities, especially those administering environmental grants, (2) to determine the grant sourcing and administration issues and practices of selected environmental NGO grantees, and (3) to derive some major implications of the study's findings for the operations of the TFCF. The research methods utilized in the study were a review of both published and grey literature on local and international fund facilities, key informant interviews, and some project site visits.

The three NGO-managed fund facilities included in the study are the Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP), the Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE), and the Foundation for Sustainable Society, Inc. (FSSI). PBSP has been existing for 33 years; FPE, 11 years; and FSSI, 8 years. PBSP started operating on a trust fund from donations of member-companies that regularly elect 22 representatives to its board of trustees. Its principal program focus is poverty alleviation. FPE and FSSI began with endowment funds from debt swap and debt cancellation agreements with foreign governments and were established through local and foreign multi-stakeholder participation. Thus both have a mixed private-public board of trustees with 11 members for FPE and nine for FSSI. While FPE concentrates on funding biodiversity conservation, FSSI lends credit to small ECO-enterprises.

Whether making or accepting grants, NGOs have between three and five sources of annual revenues, namely: income from trust fund, grants or membership contributions, other donations, interests from investments, and foreign exchange gains. Except for FPE and FSSI which obtain around three-fourths of their revenues from trust funds, the others are heavily dependent on grants, membership contributions and other donations which are obtainable from foundation members and partners or through leveraging. As an emergent strategy, leveraging allows NGOs to raise more money from such sources as donor agencies and private benefactors to fund new projects and expand program coverage. NGOs with substantial funds held in trust and investments require the assistance of investment managers, mostly local banks, which operate under the guidance and supervision of an oversight committee. Two other practices that enable the NGOs to remain sustainable are to keep their annual administrative costs low (averaging about 11% of annual revenues) and to set up a trust fund where there is none.

All three NGO fund facilities studied have developed their own strategic program focus: the Community-Based Resource Management (CBRM) Program Strategy for FPE, the ECO-Enterprise Strategy for FSSI, and the Area Resource Management in High Growth Areas (ARM-HGA) Program Strategy for PBSP. Much of their grant monies are extended to projects of various NGO and/or PO grantees covered by the programs. However, they also finance some other categories of projects outside of these priority programs.

Based on project titles and descriptions, the grants of these fund facilities may be described as having supported the following four types: (1) land-based ecosystem including forests and marshlands, (2) water-based ecosystem, i.e, marine and coastal environments, (3) combination of land-based and water-based, and (4) others not belonging to the preceding types. Of the FPE grants made in 1999-2001,

49% belonged to the land-based category and 50% of the FPE grant monies went to fund this category. The PBSP projects in 2001 consisted mostly (77%) of the “others” category which included many poverty alleviation projects; the land-based projects represented only 16% of the total number of grants. FSSI-financed projects concentrated on multi-ecosystem/microfinance and croplands enterprises (80-85%) in 1998-1999 and on housing projects (50%) in 2000; agroforestry projects received only 1% of FSSI’s annual investment in 2000.

The total number of grant proposals received by a particular fund facility in a given year may range from 50 to 1123 proposals; however, the rate of approval could range from 25% to 94%. While the majority of NGO and/or PO grantees may have availed of just one grant from the fund facility, their total grant allocation could represent only a third of the total grant monies, especially since these are the small grants. As illustrated in the FPE case, some grantees could avail of as few as two to as many as 15 grants in a given period particularly if they implemented the multi-year site-focused projects and most (60%) of the total grant allocation for that period could go this group.

The major considerations in the grantmaking process of the NGO fund facilities are the presence of clear-cut criteria, guidelines, processes, and/or mechanisms for (1) grant eligibility applicable to NGOs and POs, (2) soliciting and submission of grant proposals, (3) assistance given to improve or revise the concept and design of proposed projects, (4) screening and approval of grant proposals, (5) fund releases, and (6) monitoring and evaluation of grant activities and accomplishments.

The environmental NGOs who are FPE and/or PBSP grantees selected for the study are the Haribon, the World Wildlife Fund – Philippines (WWF-P), and the Philippine Eagle Foundation, Inc. (PEF). Haribon is the oldest at 19 years, followed by PEF at 12 years and WWF-P at seven years. All three rely on scientific data to underpin their conservation efforts even as they retain their own particular program interests. Haribon is committed to the protection of birdlife and its sanctuaries through CBRM strategies, although it had more coastal/marine CBRM projects in 2000. PEF is dedicated to the protection of the Philippine eagle and its forest habitat while embarking on some community-based initiatives with local communities. WWF-P, on the other hand, has focused its work on the conservation of marine and coastal ecosystems.

The three NGO grantees have diverse, anywhere from five to eight, sources of revenue for the operation of their organizations. Both Haribon and WWF-P count among these sources the contributions of international associates which provide support to a number of their projects as local associates. Grants from local and foreign donor agencies for projects they have developed make up another major revenue source for the three NGOs, hence the importance to them of having a select group or individuals whose assignment is to generate projects. In project implementation, it appears equally important that they cultivate links with (1) donor partners, (2) implementation partners like government agencies, local government units, other NGOs, and POs, and (3) client community partners. NGOs generally develop project proposals that address their program agenda but may consider the priorities of a fund facility when turning in a proposal so as to avoid rejection. All these are among the strategies in the survival kit of the NGOs.

Finally, the study’s major findings which have implications for the forthcoming operations of the TFCF may be summed up as follows:

1. The need for funding tropical forest conservation projects of environmental NGOs and POs in the country is largely unmet by the existing fund facilities therefore the TFCF has a valuable function to serve in local grantmaking.
2. Three of the six eligible activities stipulated in the TFCF agreement hardly get assisted by the fund facilities, hence, these are the areas where the TFCF could be expected to make a difference in local forest conservation efforts. These activities are: (a) restoration, protection, or sustainable use of diverse animal and plant species, (b) research and identification of tropical forest plant life

to treat human diseases, and (c) development and support of the livelihoods of individuals living in or near a tropical forest in a manner consistent with protecting such tropical forest.

3. The TFCF is likely to face the major challenge of addressing the capacity of prospective NGO and PO grantees to implement direct forest and wildlife conservation activities considering that they appear to be mostly in the skills building or preparatory stage.
4. Because the attainment of forest conservation goals require sustained assistance over the long term, TFCF can better serve its role if it were to become a sustainable fund facility rather than remain a sinking fund. It should therefore consider diversifying its sources of revenue, including setting up an endowment fund and engaging in leveraging strategies.

The following tasks are also suggested for inclusion in the action or operations research agenda of local fund facilities: (1) evaluation of the impact of indirect conservation activities on the attainment of the end goals of biodiversity conservation, (2) development of key performance indicators for assessing NGO and PO strengths and weaknesses in implementing indirect and direct conservation activities, (3) establishment of a common database system on the grant administration operations of local fund facilities for easy access and reference of NGO and PO grantees, and (4) documentation of lessons learned in various partnerships for assisted conservation work.



STUDY OF PHILIPPINE NGO FUND FACILITIES IN ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Ma. Elena Chiong-Javier, Ph.D.

Romulo R. Sison

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and Rationale

The Philippines became the sixth country that benefited from the programs under the United States' Tropical Forest Conservation Act (TFCA) of 1998 when the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP) signed a debt reduction agreement with the United States Government (USG) on September 19, 2002 (Office of Public Affairs TFCA Fact Sheet, September 19, 2002). Under this agreement, the US would appropriate \$5.5 million to cancel \$8.2 million in GRP interest payments within the next 14 years. In return for debt cancellation, the GRP would set aside the equivalent in local currency of \$8.2 million in a Tropical Forest Conservation Fund (TFCF) for the same duration. The fund, to be utilized for conservation activities of local non-government organizations (NGOs), would be administered by a nine-member board consisting of two representatives each from the USG and the GRP and five representatives from the NGOs. Appendix A summarizes the major provisions of the TFCF agreement.

Recognizing the potential of TFCF to support their forest conservation initiatives, many Philippine civil society organizations actively participated in public discussions that yielded certain recommendations for consideration of the government negotiators in the agreement (The Civil Society Forum for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act, 2002). As early as April 2002, four Philippine environmental NGOs—the Foundation for Philippine Environment (FPE), Conservation International (CI)-Philippines, World Wildlife Fund (WWF)-Philippines, and Haribon Foundation—spearheaded the formation of an Initial Core Group to study the TFCA, especially on how it was implemented in other countries, and to prepare and disseminate information materials on the TFCF mainly through a broad consultative process. The core group subsequently organized a series of regional and national consultations which was collectively known as the “Civil Society Forum on the Tropical Conservation Act: A Venture into the Future of Forest Conservation Financing in the Philippines.” Conducted in August and September 2002, the consultations involved strategic networks or federations of NGOs, people's organizations (POs), academic institutions, and youth groups from different regions of the country. These participants identified a five-year agenda for forest conservation, defined the geographic and thematic foci eligible for TFCF support, recommended mechanisms for fund governance, and prepared a short-list of civil society nominees to the administering board.

The series of civil society consultative fora culminated in a national gathering called “A Roundtable Discussion with Philippine Fund Facilities: Summing Up Lessons Learned in Grant Making and Fund Management” that was held on December 2, 2002. This activity was participated in by heads of prominent NGO fund facilities, many of whom hold a track record in grant making and fund management for environmental projects, donor agencies, and other grant making institutions. Also invited were the civil society representatives who were the nominees to the administering board of the TFCF. The roundtable discussion provided a venue for the NGO participants to share lessons and insights on grantmaking and fund management with the nominees. It highlighted each participating organization's funding priorities, grants administration policies and experiences, including best practices.

On December 20, 2002, an initial amount of US\$ 144,620.50 [approximately P7.23 million [at \$1 - P50 exchange rate]] was deposited to the fund. By January 2003, the Philippine National Bank was appointed as the fund's fiscal agent. Moreover, the GRP endorsed five NGO representatives to the administering board who were drawn from the list of nominees recommended by the civil society organizations.

Now that the TFCF has an initial amount, it is incumbent upon the administering board to set the proper mechanisms in place for fund management and start-up operation to prepare for its eventual grantmaking activities. It is within the context of providing information to the administering board that this study was undertaken by the Development Alternatives Inc. under the Philippine Environmental Governance (Ecogovernance) Project, that is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Objectives of the Study

In general, the study sought to understand how fund facilities, particularly those being managed by NGOs in the Philippines and those established for forest conservation and protection, function as grantmaking institutions for environmental initiatives.

The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To identify the issues and practices (especially innovations) pertaining to various aspects of fund management and grant administration that concern selected local environmental NGO-initiated fund facilities or grantmakers;
2. To determine the issues and practices with regard to sourcing and administration of grants for environmental conservation projects by local NGO and PO grantees; and
3. To draw out the study's implications and recommendations (especially in response to identified gaps) for consideration of the Board of the Tropical Forest Conservation Fund.

Methodology

The study utilized three data gathering methods, namely review of literature, key informant interviews or panel interviews, and onsite visit.

Literature review. To understand the nature and operations of grantmaking institutions in general and the local practices of NGO grantmaking institutions in particular, both local and foreign secondary materials, including empirical studies in the last decade and the "grey" literature (viz., largely unpublished project transcripts, documents, or reports, brochures, and web postings) were reviewed. Hard copies of these materials were obtained from/through various sources, notably the offices of USAID as well as of selected NGO grantmakers and their grantee partner organizations, or downloaded from the websites of certain local and international fund facilities and international donor agencies. The sources reviewed, grouped into specific categories, are listed in Appendix B.

Key informant (KI) interviews. Interviews with individual or panel of key informants (KIs) were conducted in Quezon City, Cebu City and Davao City to derive primary data particularly on topics that were not documented or not elaborated in existing documents. The data generated were also useful for validating information obtained from the literature review.

Before the interviews were done, four local NGOs which appeared in the literature review to be involved in environmental grantmaking activities for at least a decade and which had a national presence

were selected. Upon verification with KIs, however, only one turned out to be entirely a grantmaker for environmental activities; another NGO was a grantmaker-cum-grantee and was engaged in environmental concerns as a means of alleviating poverty; while the remaining two were primarily grant recipients or actively engaged in developing environmental programs/projects for which external funding was sought. Concerning the grantmaking NGO, one of its regional offices and a regional partner NGO-grantee were included in the study. In the case of the grantmaker-cum-grantee NGO, a regional office was included as well. All in all, seven NGO offices (two of which are regional offices) became part of the study.

The study's interviewees, totaling 18 in all, were drawn from these seven NGO offices (Appendix C). Of this number, seven were interviewed individually and the rest participated (along with some individual KIs) in five panel interviews, with each panel having two to three interviewees). The interviewees included three executive directors, one associate director of the operations group, three regional operations managers, nine program/technical officer or coordinator, grants officer, resource mobilization/financial officer or staff assistant, and two project field personnel.

In addition to these local informants, the study also gathered information through e-mail queries on the legal structures of foreign environmental funds listed by the Interagency Planning Group on Environmental Funds. Among the facilities which registered an e-mail address, only five facilities answered the "internet interview."

Onsite visits. Two field visits were made: one in Davao to the project site of an NGO-grantee of the NGO grantmaker, and the other to a Cebu project site of a regional NGO office. The visits involved an ocular inspection and walk-through of selected projects. One of them also provided an opportunity to chat with some members of the project community/PO partner.

Limitations of the Study

Descriptions of the profile and operational practices of NGOs included in the study were largely obtained through an analysis of secondary data derived principally from annual reports and from other published materials. The reporting formats and the reported variables lacked consistency, thus data gaps existed and this did not allow for an easy comparison of data across a period of time for a particular institution, or across several institutions. Also, owing to the small sample size of NGOs included in the study, the findings may not be generalized to the populations of fund facilities and grantees in the country.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL FUND FACILITIES

In the literature reviewed, the term “environmental fund” is synonymous with such phrases as “environmental fund mechanism,” “national environmental fund” or “conservation trust fund;” all these are subsumed under the generic terms “grantmakers” or “grant brokers.” It has been noted that environmental funds are not simply financing mechanisms but institutions with several roles to play—including being technical experts, capacity-builders, and nurturers of other NGOs—other than channeling funds (Jacqz, 1999). In the Philippines, the phrase “fund facility or mechanism” is preferred to denote the institution that channels funds and the term “NGO-managed” to distinguish it from other types.

General Traits of Environmental Funds

The worldwide establishment of environmental funds particularly in the southern (i.e., developing) regions of the world came after the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity, where participating countries committed themselves to the principles of conservation and sustainable development (Rosenzweig, 1999). The countries pledged to adopt a national policy of sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity, and to design and implement appropriate conservation strategies and programs. By 2000, some 92 environmental funds were identified in three regions of the developing world. Of this total, 58% were classified as existing or established funds, 22% were proposed or possible new funds, and 2% were dormant; 45% were set up in Latin America and the Caribbean, 37% in Africa, and 18% in the Asia-Pacific (Norris, 1999). Environmental funds have thus become a means for articulating their respective government’s national conservation policy and strategies, for which they enjoy active government or donor support in return.

Environmental funds are conduits for long-term financing for biodiversity conservation and other activities to address environmental threats. They are typically structured as independent private, non-governmental, non-profit, and tax-exempt foundations. The funds derive and build capitalization from national government payments obtained from bilateral debt reduction agreements, debt-for-nature swaps, multilateral or bilateral aids, or special government taxes, levies, and other charges. A board of trustees, usually with a mixed public-private sector composition, manages capital investments. The proceeds of these investments, and at times part of the capital, are used to support grantmaking for environmental conservation, protection, and sustainable development activities in a defined geographic area.

Financially, environmental funds are supported as endowment funds, sinking funds, or revolving funds. According to Smith (1999), an **environmental fund** is more permanent as it allows only the use of its income while the principal or corpus is invested. **Endowment funds** are appropriate for use in ongoing long-term activities like the maintenance and protection of national parks and protected areas. In contrast, **sinking funds** permit the disbursement of both the principal and income, and have a terminal life (i.e., 10 or more years). Consequently, they are best for financing immediate, shorter-term development projects. **Revolving funds** are funded by receipts from regular sources like special taxes for conservation or forest charges for reforestation. Compared to the two extreme types, these are said to provide predictable, medium-term funding for activities that, upon their conclusion, can be handed to organizations with increased organizational capacity.

NGO-Managed Fund Facilities in the Study

In the Philippines, fund facilities are reportedly NGO-managed foundations established for varied reasons. Three of the foundations have been included in the study: the Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP), the Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE), and the Foundation for Sustainable Society, Inc. (FSSI). Of these three, FPE appears to be the only one in its league as an “environmental

grantmaking institution” established as a sustainable (endowment) fund to provide grants for biodiversity conservation. The two other NGO-managed facilities may financially support environment-related activities, but they had been set up for other reasons: poverty alleviation in the case of PBSP and micro-financing sustainable enterprises for FSSI.

Initially, the study classified two environmental NGOs, i.e., the Haribon Foundation for the Conservation of Natural Resources, Inc. (Haribon) and the Kabang Kalikasan ng Pilipinas Foundation, Inc. popularly known as World Wildlife Fund-Philippines (WWF-P), as fund facilities. Both were, however, found to be concerned with developing programs/projects for external financing rather than disbursing grant monies. Nevertheless, they also provide “sub-grants” to their partner organizations in certain projects to undertake particular activities like capacity-building. This seems to be their closest practice to grantmaking.

PBSP, FPE, and FSSI (as well as Haribon and WWF-P) all operate as non-profit, tax-exempt foundations that sourced monies from public funds and/or private donations, and incorporated under Philippine laws. The foundation serves as an operational arm that can enter into contracts, acquire assets, incur debts, hire staff, receive donations or grants, and engage in income generating enterprises. Registration with the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Philippine Council for NGOs entitles the foundation to avail of tax incentives like exemption from income tax payment, full or limited tax deductions for donors, exemption from donor’s tax, and duty or tax-free foreign donations (Quizon, 1989).

Membership

A comparison of the membership size and composition of the three grantmaking NGOs has yielded the following information:

1. In PBSP, members are composed of corporations from the industrial, manufacturing, banking and allied sectors of the country. Its membership size is not fixed and has increased over time. In 1970, it had 50 founding corporations; this figure rose to 166 in 2000 but dropped slightly to 162 in 2002. Membership is renewed yearly with the payment of annual due equal to 20% of 1% of the company’s preceding year’s net profit before tax (approximately P2000 for every million earned). The member companies meet annually as a General Assembly to elect from among their representatives the trustees of the board and the members of the various regional and special function committees of the foundation.
2. In FSSI, membership was fixed at 21 institutional members from 1998-2000 based on annual reports (but this has increased to 26 according to a verbal report made in the FPE-organized forum for fund facilities in December 2002). Out of the 21 members, most (16) are Philippine development NGOs which includes PBSP; three are Swiss NGOs; and two are representatives of the Swiss and Philippine governments, i.e., from the Swiss Embassy and the Department of Finance (DOF), respectively. Like PBSP, the FSSI institutional members convene an annual General Assembly to elect its Board of Trustees. Government representatives sit as ex-officio members in both the assembly and the board since FSSI was set up with endowed fund from a debt cancellation agreement between the two governments.
3. Unlike PBSP and FSSI, FPE has 11 individuals who serve a four-year term concurrently as foundation members and trustees of the board. Nine of these individuals are affiliated with different Philippine civil society organizations from different parts of the country, one is with an international NGO, and the last is with a government agency. The mixed (private-public) composition of the members-cum-trustees is, like FSSI, traceable to the nature of the fund as an endowment from a debt swap agreement between the governments of the United States and the Philippines. The civil society organizations, which the members were affiliated with usually as their respective heads, were quite variable. Although members retain their institutional affiliations while serving in FPE, they are nevertheless considered to be representing only themselves. Since all foundation members are trustees, the description of the governing board (see below) also applies to them.

Governing Board

All three fund facilities are governed by a Board of Trustees with varying membership sizes. While FSSI has the smallest board (10 members), PBSP has the largest (22 members), with FPE falling in between (11 members).

Between 1998 and 2000, the FSSI trustees came from a total of nine NGOs (excluding the two ex-officio members). Four of these NGOs had been in the board for the entire three years; another four for two years; and one for a year.

The PBSP trustees, on the other hand, represented 20-21 member companies in the three years from 1999-2002. More than half the number of trustees was usually reelected to the board. And only one company always had two representatives in the board.

The FPE board, which has many dissimilar characteristics compared to the FSSI and PBSP boards, is described in greater detail in Box 2-1.

In terms of tenure, the PBSP and FSSI boards are elected annually during their respective General Assembly meetings and may be reelected the following year. Unlike them, the members of the FPE board serve a four-year term and are elected on a staggered basis to ensure smooth transition. This means that about half the number of trustees get elected every two years. Moreover, they are not immediately eligible for reelection until after a year has passed from end of tenure.

Both PBSP and FSSI choose their trustees from among the representatives of their member companies or member NGOs. In contrast, FPE differs in the following ways:

1. The selection of FPE trustees is done with the participation of a broad NGO constituency and with certain precautionary measures. Nominations to the board are made by three autonomous Regional Advisory Councils (RACs) to ensure national representation and to deter FPE from becoming a Metropolitan Manila-centered organization. Nominees must come from on-the-ground Regional Consultative Councils/Groups (RCCs/RCGs) which are comprised of local civil society organizations from the community, NGO, and academic sectors. Because RAC members make the nominations, they are themselves disqualified from getting nominated.
2. The FPE trustees are selected based on (a) individual track record in their field of technical expertise rather than for their specific NGO affiliation, and (b) on

Box 2-1. FPE Board of Trustees, 1992-2002

- There were 31 trustees in all: 15 represented NGO constituencies in Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao; 8, members-at-large; 3, international NGOs, and 5, the Philippine government.
- 73% of the three major island representatives and 63% of members-at-large representatives headed the institutions they were affiliated with either as the president, executive director, chairperson, or bishop.
- Almost two-thirds (61%) were males. A small percentage (19%) was from the religious.
- All trustees had served one 4-year term, except for six trustees in the first batch who served only two years.
- The island and members-at-large trustees came from different civil society organizations/NGOs, except in two cases where both trustees hailed from U.P. in the Visayas but they served consecutive batches and represented two different categories of representatives.
- Two of 3 international NGO trustees came from World Resources Institute; the third, from WWF-US.
- The 5 government representatives came from Central Bank of the Philippines (2), Department of Finance (2), and Philippine Deposit Insurance Corporation (1).
- Three batches of officers had been elected. The 1st and 2nd batches each had 2 males and two females and a male chair-person; the 3rd batch was an all-female group along with the chairperson. Only the female chairperson occupied two positions (earlier as secretary) within a 4-year term.

geographical spread. Sitting in the board as individuals representing only themselves, the trustees are expected to be fair and impartial, and free of the pressures and influences that could result if they represented their organizations. To serve as a precautionary measure, a trustee's organization cannot avail of any grant financing from FPE during his/her term of office.

In all three of the fund facilities, the board chooses a set of officers from among its members. For PBSP, the officers are six: chair, two vice-chairs, president, treasurer, and corporate secretary. In the case of FSSI, the four officers are chair, vice-chair, treasurer, and corporate secretary/legal counsel. FPE likewise has four officers: chair-person, vice-chairperson, secretary, and treasurer.

Staffing

The three fund facilities publish the names and positions of their officers and staffs in their annual reports, from the executive director down to the last service personnel. PBSP, as the oldest player, has expanded its staff along with its operations through the years and now possesses the largest staff size (182 persons). This is followed by FPE (40 persons) and FSSI that has the leanest staff (10). Table 2.1 provides data on the various staff classifications found in the three foundations.

Table 2.1. Number of staff by type of office/unit in PBSP, FPE, and FSSI.

Org'n (year)	Exec. Office	Program/Project Operations					Finance & Mgmt	Training &/or Consult.	Foun- dation Affairs	Centers	Total
		Head Office	Luzon Office	Visay. Office	Minda Office	Total					
PBSP (2002)	5	6	16	38 ^a	21	81	29 ^b	34 ^c	13 ^d	20 ^e	182
FPE (2001)	3	4	4	6	4	18	6	13 ^f	-	-	40
FSSI (2000)	2	3	-	-	-	3	5 ^g	-	-	-	10

Sources: Available latest Annual Reports.

^a Includes two field offices in Negros and Samar.

^b Includes internal audit, small & medium enterprise credit, and management information system.

^c Includes training and consulting in two projects (Batangas & Vigan) and human resource developm

^d Includes membership development.

^e Refers to Center for Corporate Citizenship and Center for Rural Technology and Development.

^f Covers human resources development and administration unit, and development communications u

^g Covers administration.

Several other observations may be made from the staffing patterns of the three foundations, as follows:

1. Because only PBSP depends on membership dues as a main source of capitalization, it is the only one with units (foundation affairs, membership development, and center for corporate citizenship) that function for the purpose of assisting members or expanding membership.
2. While all have an executive director who heads the officers and staff, in PBSP the overall head in the executive office is the president of the foundation.
3. Both PBSP and FPE have "regional" operations staffs that are based in the National Capital Region for Luzon projects, Cebu City for Visayas projects, and Davao City for Mindanao projects. In addition, PBSP also has several other field- or project-based offices in Vigan and Batangas for Luzon, and in Negros and Samar for the Visayas.

-
4. An attempt to obtain the ratio of program/project operations staff (which included administrative assistants/secretaries in Table 2.1) to the number of approved projects per year shows FSSI to have the highest ratio considering it has the leanest staff. The rough estimates of the ratios are shown in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2. Selected data for estimating the ratio of projects to staff

Org'n	(Year)	No. of Staff	No. of Projects	No. of Projects Per Staff
PBSP	(2002)	81	245	3
FPE	(2001)	18	70	4
FSSI	(2000)	3	63	21

Source: Annual Reports

Synthesis of Findings on the Three Fund Facilities

The three NGO fund facilities are different from each other in at least four ways. First is duration of existence: PBSP is the oldest at 33 years, followed by FPE at 11 years and FSSI at 8 years. The second difference is initial source of funding: both FPE and FSSI received endowment funds from debt swap and debt cancellation agreements with foreign governments, respectively, while PBSP started with a capital or trust fund from corporate donations. Third is the nature and composition of the governing body or the board of trustees. FPE and FSSI have a mixed private-public board with FPE having more trustees (11) than FSSI (nine). However, PBSP has a 22-member board whose members represent different member-companies. Finally, the fourth difference relates to program focus: FPE concentrates on biodiversity conservation and other environmentally-related activities, PBSP addresses poverty alleviation, whereas FSSI lends credit to small, ecologically-sound enterprises.

In the cases of FPE and FSSI which exist on an endowment, their funds were established through the participation of multi-stakeholders from the northern (developed) countries as well as from the Philippines. Establishment of the FPE endowment fund has been described as the result of a "four-cornered partnership" involving the governments or their instrumentalities, the advocacy groups and the development/environmental NGOs in the United States and the Philippines. But the creation of the foundation was the product of broad-based consultations that included around 600 people from local NGOs and POs over two years (Quizon and Lingan-Debuque, 2001). FSSI reportedly follows the same pattern.

III. FUND SUSTAINABILITY OF NGO-MANAGED FUND FACILITIES

Sources of Funding for NGOs

The nature of the sources of funds of NGOs, whether a fund facility or not, is the same—to maintain their sustainability. The difference is in the profile of the amounts per NGO. NGOs that were originally organized with an endowment fund, like FPE and FSSI, rely heavily on the income from the corpus of the fund. Others depend on grants, donations, membership fees, and other income such as training fees, interests, and income from corporate investments, etc. FSSI which is substantially engaged in lending funds also draws interest income from its lending operations, whereas interest income of the others come from their short-term currency placements in banks, or government securities. PBSP registers the highest revenues totaling P184 million of which P120 million came from its corporate members, while WWF-P receives regular support from its WWF global connections. Shown in Table 3.1 is the breakdown of average annual revenues.

Table 3.1. Comparison of annual revenues by source of revenues (in million pesos)

Source	PBSP	WWF	FPE	FSSI	PhilDH RRA	Total	% to Total
Grants/donations	P120.6	P68.5	P0	P4.9	P65.8	P259.8	56%
Income of trust funds	8.5	16.8	62.5	31.2	0	119.0	26
Other donations	26.9	12.5	0	0	2.3	41.7	9
Interests/investments	20.8	2.8	0	5.1	4.0	32.7	7
Others	7.2	0	1.8	.4	.4	9.8	2
Total	P184.0	P100.6	P64.3	P41.6	P72.5	P463.0	100%
Percent to Total	40%	22%	14%	9%	16%	100%	
Foreign exchange (FX) gains	0	0	16.5	0	0	16.5	
Total	P184.0	P100.6	P80.8	P41.6	P72.5	P479.5	

(Foreign exchange gains of above NGOs if not significant are probably lumped in "Others" gains include both gains actually realized in foreign currency-denominated transactions and estimated gains on foreign currency deposits)

Grants and donations are the largest sources of revenues. As shown in Table 3.1, revenues from grants and donations totaling P259 million represent more than half or 56% of the total source of funding. Income of trust funds totaling P119 million is 26% of total revenues. Income shown as "interests/investments" totaling P32.7 million or 7% would likely include dividends or share in profits of joint ventures entered into by the NGOs, and interests earned by FSSI and PBSP on their micro-lending operations. The P16.5 million foreign exchange gains of FPE above is an average of its FX gains for the years 1999 and 2000. In year 2000 FPE earned P44 million on its foreign currency holdings.

Fund facilities have different ways of maintaining their sustainability. Donations and grants are the main sources of revenues. The local NGOs surveyed that were not initially set up with an endowment fund show that donations they receive annually represent 56% of their total revenues from all sources. Income from trust funds represents only 26% of the total revenues.

The NGO fund facilities maintain a project development staff whose main task is to search for new projects, or new funds that will maintain or expand ongoing projects. WWF-P has a project development staff with a primary purpose of preparing project -proposals to be submitted to funding agencies. The same staff also assists community organizations in the preparation or fine-tuning of grant applications.

For other granting and non-granting foundations like PBSP, Haribon, and WWF-P, setting up a capital or endowment fund is imperative to sustain operations. The sources for this fund are unspent unrestricted monies from membership contributions and unexpended program allocations provided by various local and foreign/multilateral donors. PBSP also gets restricted funds by acting as channels for small chunks of corporate funds for special purposes like building community or educational infrastructures. Other new monies come in by actively developing programs and seeking external funding for them.

The literature points to other possible sources of funds for environmental NGOs or fund facilities, namely: the proceeds of taxes or impositions on gasoline or air pollution emitting facilities, water fees for watersheds, proceeds from pollution cases that are settled out-of-court, part of charges on garbage disposals (“brown” environment) for use in “green” nature conservation and protected areas, or as tax on airline tickets. None of these seems to have been tapped by the NGOs studied.

The NGOs that were initially organized with an endowment fund eventually augmented their revenues by sourcing from grant makers, corporate donations, and fund campaigns.

Revenues from Membership, Leveraging, and Partnership

Membership in the foundation is a continuing source of revenue. Some organizations raise funds by inviting corporations to become members who are required to pay membership fees and annual contributions. PBSP, the largest local NGO with assets totaling P826 million in 2001, requires its corporate members which are in the top 500 corporations to contribute 20% of the 1% of corporate income before taxation. In 2001, it received funds from its members in the amount of P24 million out of total unrestricted revenues of P65 million, and P21 million out of P60 million in year 2000. While other NGOs encourage membership and to pay annual dues this has not been their main source of revenues.

Leveraging is an emerging strategy of NGOs.

Because only the income from an endowment can be spent for the foundation’s program thrusts, it is not possible to expand operations if the fund were to remain constant. In the case of FPE, it started for about three years by simply “moving the funds” or disbursing available monies for grants. Then it developed a resource mobilization strategy which included: (1) getting better placements for the fund, (2) bringing in new money through fund-raising schemes, (3) serving as a conduit or grant administrator for another facility in exchange for management fees, and (4) entering into co-financing or fund complementation ventures with other donors. The last mechanism may not necessarily yield monetary returns but allow work to be expanded in a priority area with least cost to FPE.

On the other hand, the case of FSSI is unique in that it is a lending institution that provides credit with collateral requirements, and increases its endowment through wise investments and practices like lending only to viable clients. Thus its performance in the last six years is reportedly comparable to commercial banks.

PBSP in its role as grantmaker and grantee primarily gets its continuing revenues from the contributions of its corporate members as corporate citizens under its concept of Corporate Social Responsibility. In 2002, it received P47.25 million from members and leveraged P175.73 million from partners. It granted assistance totaling P366 million for 245 project from 337 partners, a ratio of P3.72 per P1 of members’ contributions.

In 2001, it received contributions from its members totaling P40.16 million which it used to leverage P177.46 million from donor agencies and corporate benefactors, or P4.41 leveraged funds for every P1 of members’ contributions.

In the same year, it gave away P193 million in grants for 218 projects of 83 partner organization, benefiting 111,599 families nationwide composed of workers, farmers, fisherfolks, indigenous communities, urban poor, disaster victims and other underprivileged sectors.

In 2000, PBSP leveraged P117 million from its membership contributions of P26.29 million, from which it gave out financial assistance to 194 projects with 67 partners in the amount of P123 million (Table 3.2). PBSP also raises funds by sponsoring annual fund raising campaigns like its Festival of Trees, GMA-PBSP Golf Cup, Christmas Card Drive and Disaster Response.

PBSP is able to expand its network of partners, with other NGOs in the region for exchange of know how and access assistance, by helping organizations like the Conference of Asian Foundation and Organizations build their organizational capacity and acting as secretariat to the network.

Some NGOs are engaged in micro-lending as a complementary activity to their grant making. FSSI is substantially in micro-lending “to serve as a resource institution for the empowerment of enterprising rural and communities, and in a limited scale grant making for pilot projects, technical assistance, economic research, feasibility studies, and the like.

NGOs with micro-lending programs resort to borrowing as the funding source. One NGO in micro-lending has obtained a 3-year unsecured loan with interest at 7% per annum. The interest is payable semi-annually while the principal plus the final interest will be payable at the maturity of the loan

PBSP has obtained a credit facility through a tri-partite agreement involving the GRP. The fund was

Table 3.2. Summary of members’ contributions, leveraged amounts, number of projects and partners, and financial assistance granted to PBSP

Year	Leveraging Funds		Projects Assisted with Partners		
	Members’ Contributions	Amount Leveraged	Number of Partners	Number of Projects	Amount of Projects
2002	P47.25	P175.73	337	245	P336.9
2001	P40.16	P177.46	83	218	P193
2000	P26.29	P117.69	67	194	P123.
1999	P36.00	P135.00	48	181	P135
1998	P42.00	n.a. ^a	30	179	P116
1997	P42.54	n.a.	48	194	P150

^a Not available.

extended by the European bank as a loan to the Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP) which in turn channeled the loan in full to the NGO as the Executing Agency. The NGO in turn lends the fund to intermediary financial institutions (IFIs) up to a term of five years with a spread of 1% over all costs that it assumes. The GOP receives a fee for the assumption of guarantee and foreign exchange risks and related taxes. The loan is secured by assignment of receivables.

Income from Funds Held in Trust and Investments

Endowment fund is a permanent capital that will provide a yearly income for the fund facility. Sustainability of an endowment fund will of course depend greatly on the return on investment. For the fund to maintain its real value over time, a portion of its income should be plowed back to the corpus to compensate for inflation. The amount that is plowed back will reduce the amount for grant making and administrative expenses.

Shown in Table 3.3 is a comparative summary of average income from investments of funds held in trust or from equity by the NGOs.

The profile of investments in stocks, bonds, and deposits of the surveyed NGOs was not obtainable. Nevertheless, available data reveal that FPE with a high level of deposits in year 2000 realized a foreign exchange gain in the amount of P44 million that is 39% of its total revenues in year 2000, and P8.4 million or 11% of its revenues in year 2001. While investment in bonds is more conservative, stocks give a higher level of protection against inflation.

It will be interesting to know how much of the funds are actually invested in environment related industries.

In addition to investments in corporate stocks, bonds, currency, and other debt instruments, one NGO derives income from its properties. An environmental NGO like the Philippine Eagle Foundation (PEF) owns a building and operates a school. It also collects entrance fees and sponsors educational tours for visitors in its Philippine Eagle zoo in Calinan, Mindanao.

Table 3.3. Average income from fund investments by NGO (in million pesos)

NGO	Pesos Amount	Source of Data
PBSP	29.312	Yrs 2001 & 2000
FPE	61.348	Yrs. 2001 & 2000
FSSI	32.005	Yrs 1999-2001
WWF-P	2.801	Yrs 1999-2001
PhilDHRRA	3.984	Yrs 2000 & 1999
Total Average Annual Income	129.450	

Management of the Funds

There are no hard and fast rules in establishing a level of risk and diversification in a portfolio. Investment managers have their own unique styles in balancing their investments in corporate stocks, bonds and debt instruments, or in currency deposits. It seems that fund facilities prefer to hire professional investment managers while they focus more on grant making and fund sourcing. The strategy used is to provide guidance to the investment manager on risk, acceptable return, liquidity needs, and currency deposits.

Some fund facilities create an investment or finance committee that reviews the investment performance, sets up guidelines, and has oversight over the investment manager. The committee is composed of one or two members of the board, the treasurer, and the executive director or the finance manager.

Some NGO facilities like FPE and FSSI engage the services of more than one investment manager, mostly local banks and some offshore ones, and their performances are reviewed and compared annually. In one case the investment manager is provided a list of negative investments particularly on companies that degrade the environment.

To obtain an idea of the funds held by trustee banks for an NGO fund facility, the case of FSSI is illustrated in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4. List of trustee banks and funds held for FSSI as of December 31,

Trustee Banks	Pesos Amount
AB Capital and Investment Corporation	127,216,199
Metropolitan bank and Trust Company	114,452,114
Deutsche Bank	86,642,512
Bank of the Philippine Islands	72,082,801
Equitable PCI Bank	68,863,894
Rizal Commercial Banking Corporation	42,870,695
Total	512,128,215
Less: Allowance for probable losses	12,804,712
Net	499,323,503

Administration Cost

The administrative costs of a fund will depend on the operational approach in grant making activities and the role of the Executive Director. Currently, there is yet no uniform guide in the classification of expenses to be included in “administrative costs.” The average administrative cost of the NGOs studied is P10 million per year, more or less. Their annual administrative costs range from a low 6% to as high as 20% of total revenues, or P5.6 million to P14.4 million. Shown below is Table 3.5 that provides a comparison of the administrative costs, revenues, and percentages of five NGOs that engage in environmental activities as grantors or grantees.

There should be a spending rule on administrative costs and on grants. Some fund facilities include in their articles of incorporation a limitation on the administrative expenses. This ranges from 20% to 25% of donations received. One NGO requires a maximum of administrative costs at 20% of all donations and

**Table 3.5. Selected data on administration costs and revenues by NGO
(in million pesos)**

NGO	Administration Costs	Average Revenues	Admin as % of Revenues
PBSP	₱13.2	₱184.0	7%
WWF	5.6	100.7	6%
PhilDHRRA	14.4	72.5	20%
FPE	10.1	64.3	16%
FSSI	6.3	41.7	15%
Total	49.6	463.2	11%
Annual Ave	₱9.9	₱92.6	11%

not more than 25% of income from its assets. An NGO that has a tie-up with a foundation that is engaged in worldwide wildlife conservation is required to devote 70% of its gross income on projects that are directly or indirectly related to the purposes for which the foundation is established.

IV. GRANTS ADMINISTRATION BY NGO-MANAGED FUND FACILITIES

Fund facilities are usually established for a broad purpose (e.g., biodiversity conservation or sustainable development); thereby creating opportunities for diverse stakeholder communities like NGOs and POs to participate in delineating the scope of grant program priorities. Foreign facilities like the Mexican Nature Conservation Fund and local ones like FPE, as well as the new TFCF, all went through a broad-based consultative process that enabled stakeholders to communicate or negotiate for the inclusion of specific types of project initiatives within the mandated program scope. But carving strategic project directions from mandated programs entails a long process of constantly assessing grant-making experiences, sifting through lessons, and making the necessary adjustments in program foci.

Strategic Program Focus

One of the lessons learned by fund facilities during their start-up years was how not to pulverize resources by spreading them thinly over a wide spectrum of possible projects that could fit under a broad program focus. Their response was to define a strategic program approach that would be where they would make substantial investments and which would enable them to obtain maximum impact from these investments.

The CBRM Strategy of FPE

From a broad program goal (i.e., biodiversity conservation), FPE defined its major program thrusts and acceptable projects under these thrusts (Table 4.1). Today, its principal investments go to the implementation of the Community-Based Resource Management (CBRM) strategy which was developed between FPE and its site partners as a strategic approach to biodiversity conservation. This strategy has four basic components that are executed in three phases (Preparatory, Phases I and II):

- *Community organizing and institution building* – to capacitate and empower communities to effectively implement biodiversity conservation projects for sustainable development
- *Resource management* – to establish community-based/peoples organizations capable of drawing up their resource management plans and of developing, managing, protecting, and conserving biodiversity according to the plan
- *Livelihood* – to develop and implement sustainable, environment-friendly, gender responsive, income-generating projects to improve the socioeconomic situation of households in the communities
- *Advocacy* – to ensure that community organizations know their rights and roles in conserving biodiversity and in advocating for sustainable development in partnership with other stakeholders; this component is strengthened through a tie-up with an FPE proactive grant project called Environmental Defense Program.

The CBRM strategy is implemented in FPE-selected priority sites throughout the country. Three criteria were used for site selection: (1) existing biodiversity/resource threats can still be minimized or controlled, (2) communities are ready for sustainable development projects due to prior institutional development experiences, and (3) communities have been most affected by development policies and programs.

Table 4.1. Development of the FPE biodiversity conservation program, 1992-2001

Year	Broad Program Strategies for Biodiversity Conservation	Major Project Types
1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protected area management and development - Development of organizational and technical competence - Community-based projects promoting sustainable use/ protection of natural resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protected area management - Environmental education and research - Community-based resource management - Technical skills and capability building
1993	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community-based biodiversity conservation (CBBC) - Research, development, and advocacy (RDA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CBBC: onsite conservation; community empowerment to support conservation activities - RDA: information database, capability building, education and communication, national and regional biodiversity conservation plans, indigenous knowledge and sustainable use/ management, and scientific technical backbone.
1993-1997	(same)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site-focused projects aim to “prepare for, implement, and evaluate community-based action and intervention for biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource management in identified priority sites.” - Responsive projects are initiated by NGOs/POs according to what they think need to be done in their specific areas but outside FPE’s priority sites. - Proactive projects seek to make strategic impact on major players and issues in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. - Action grants are quick responses and visible projects whose impact is intended to generate wider public awareness for environmental issues.
1998-2001	(same)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site-focused projects adopting the CBRM approach (combined with responsive projects) - Proactive projects - Action grants

Source: Quizon and Lingan-Debuque, 2001; FPE Annual Reports for 1998-2001.

In 1994, 45 priority sites were initially identified, but this number had leveled to 29 sites by 2001 after a screening and validation process was undertaken. A breakdown of these sites by type of environment and location is shown in Table 4.2 (see details in Appendix Table 1). Most (16 of 29 or 55%) of the sites are forests/watersheds.

Table 4.2. Number of FPE priority sites by type of environment and location

Type of Environment	Luzon	Visayas	Mindanao	Total
Forest/watershed	10	1	5	16
Marine/coastal	1	6	3	10
Both ^a	0	2	1	3
Total	11	9	9	29

^a Such as an island ecosystem or a combination of mountain and lake.

The CBRM projects in the 29 priority sites are called site-focused projects, an example of which is presented in Box 4-1.

Site-focused projects comprise one of three categories of FPE grants (see next section for additional information). These are multi-year projects that would normally span seven years (based on the CBRM framework) but could reportedly go up to 10 years in the priority sites. (Grant releases are done, however, on a yearly cycle.) Baseline data on the biophysical profile of the site is initially obtained through Rapid Site Assessment (RSA) as a preparatory activity to the two main phases of the site-focused project.

The ECO-Enterprise Strategy of FSSI

As a lending facility, FSSI has adopted Eco-Enterprise Development as its main program strategy; this occurred after about two years of funding experiences (Table 4.3). The strategy entails focusing on only a few well chosen enterprises of proven success and replicating them when appropriate by linking their proponents with the experts and by mediating deals between them. At first, FSSI identified the five eco-systems it wanted to concentrate its investments on. Then based on studies it had conducted, the foundation determined the enterprises that met three standards, namely: (1) they can provide maximum coverage and benefit to the community, (2) they are ecologically sound, and (3) they are economically viable.

In 2000, a new category of ECO-enterprises was made in response to new projects encountered; this brought the number of categories in its program strategy to six. The eco-system categories and their respective ECO-enterprises are:

<u>Eco-system</u>	<u>ECO-enterprises</u>
• Multi-ecosystem	- Microfinance
• Croplands/uplands/rivers	- Environmental and agricultural technology, viz., coconut fiber/dust production
• Forests and uplands	- Sustainable agroforestry
• Coastal and marine	- Seaweed production
• Urban areas	- Solid waste management
• Technology and services	- Machine fabrication, low-cost housing, and video telephony

Box 4-1. An FPE Site-Focused Project: Community-Based Biodiversity Conservation Project for Buasao Watershed in Abra

Proponent: Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG)

Buasao Watershed, with 56,030 hectares located 1,500-2,346 m.a.s.l., is one of the remaining rich terrestrial ecosystems in Abra Province. The Maeng tribe has claimed it as its ancestral domain. It is reported to be still rich with varied vegetation ideal for the habitat of faunal species like the Luzon deer, wild pig, Malay civet, Philippine Macaque, and Northern Luzon highland rat. FPE assistance to this project has spanned a total of 4.5 years to date for a total amount of P 6,346,988.00 (about P1.4 million/year).

1995-1996 – One-and-a-half year preparatory phase for rapid site assessment (RSA) study to get biophysical and social baseline information, planning for integrated area development, including community consultations, capability building for the IP groups, documentation of indigenous resource management system, and advocacy against mining.

1999-2002 (Phase I) – Mobilization of IPs to protect and conserve their ancestral domain through appropriate indigenous resource management systems especially by strengthening the *lapat* system, and to gain government recognition for their ancestral rights. Process evaluation was undertaken toward the end of its third year by the Cordillera Studies Center.

2002-2003 – Development of the Phase II proposal which would incorporate the results of the process evaluation. Phase II is the consolidation and phase over stage of the CBRM framework.

(Source: FPE handout)

Among these categories of ECO-enterprises, FSSI investments that directly address the environment appear to be only in three—i.e., forests/uplands, coastal/marine, and to some extent croplands/uplands/ rivers. All the enterprises are covered under the loans portfolio of FSSI: their proponents were approved for loans (with adequate collaterals) and, in some cases, were awarded a project grant for certain development activities (see below).

The ARM-HGA Strategy of PBSP

PBSP is a fund facility dedicated to addressing poverty alleviation in the country through the exercise of the philosophy of Corporate Social Responsibility by its member companies. In meeting this

Table 4.3. Development of the FSSI enterprise financing program, 1996-2000

Year	Program Approach/Strategy	Significant Activities/ Program Performance
1996-1997	Intervention matrix: 4 types of economic activities in 4 eco-systems that meet (1) maximum community coverage and benefit, (2) ecological soundness, and (3) economic viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financed one or a combination of economic activities (credit, production, services, marketing) of a winning or model enterprise in order to attain maximum impact on 4 ecosystems (upland, cropland, coastal, urban). - Experimented with types and combinations of financial instruments including collateralized loans, special deposits, grants, guarantees, and equity.
1998	ECO-enterprise focus (development entrepreneurship) 5 development portfolio: multi-ecosystem & 4 ecosystems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supported projects with high probability of success and maximum long-term community benefit. - Determined that technical and marketing assistance must be combined with financing aid in order for an enterprise to succeed. - Identified the enterprises under each ecosystem as: microfinance for multi-ecosystem, solid waste management for urban areas/ coconut fiber/dust production for croplands/rivers, seaweed production for coastal/marine areas, and sustainable agroforestry for forests/uplands. - Applied strict observance of policies in screening and appraisal process; set up loan loss provisions.
1999	ECO-enterprise development framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducted intensive assessment of the industry/ sector in terms of potentials and constraints, key market players and technology holders; searched for qualified partners or advised proponents on what worked. - Applied loans and equities as the main instruments, with grants in some financing packages. - Loans and multi-ecosystem enterprises predominated for new investments; microfinance and coconut-based enterprises got a significant portion of new approvals.
2000	-same-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Created new category of ECO-enterprises called Technology and Services which included machine fabrication, low-cost housing, and video telephony - Provided technical and marketing assistance to some projects particularly in solid waste management and sustainable agriculture, and leveraged funding support from other donor agencies. - Increased allocation for small grants

Sources: FSSI Annual Reports for 1998-2000.

socioeconomic goal, the foundation has adopted a number of program strategies in over three decades of its existence. Its major development strategy since 1991 is the Area Resource Management (ARM) in High Growth Areas (HGA) Program. The strategy represents a conscious effort of PBSP to locate programs and projects in high growth areas where the member companies operate, so as to facilitate their understanding and appreciation of PBSP’s social development programs and to lead them eventually to increase their participation and support for such programs. The ARM-HGA strategy aims to reduce poverty in these areas, safeguard the welfare of the basic sectors, address environmental issues adequately, and set up multisectoral mechanisms for policy dialogues.

Between 1996 and 2001, PBSP implemented the following development agenda in six ARM-HGA sites:

<u>ARM-HGA Site</u>	<u>Development Agenda</u>
• Laguna	- Workforce development Agricultural productivity improvement
• La Union	- Watershed management Upland productivity improvement
• National Capital Region	- Shelter development Urban poverty
• Cebu	- Watershed management Workforce development
• Cagayan-Iligan Corridor	- Watershed management Solid waste management
• Samal Island	- Watershed management Coastal resource management Workforce development

In pursuing the implementation of the ARM strategy in these high growth areas, PBSP actively obtained grants for projects from various donor agencies like the USAID, the Ford Foundation, and the Interchurch Organization for Development Cooperation.

Other Grant Categories

Having a strategic program focus appears to limit the nature and number of projects a fund facility could support. What FPE has done to address this concern was to maintain two other portfolios: the proactive projects and the action grants. FSSI, on the other hand, has created its project and small grants portfolios (see next section).

Proactive projects of FPE support one-time projects which design, study, and test interventions and mechanisms that support the foundation’s overall efforts for biodiversity conservation and sustainable development *outside* of the priority sites (where only site-focused projects are implemented). But in a few cases, a proactive project (like the Environmental Legal Defense Program of the Environmental Legal Assistance Center) could be found to complement site-focused projects and so its proponent is funded to expand the project to the priority sites. Ideas for proactive projects are reportedly conceptualized by FPE operations staff and disseminated to the public in a call for proposals. Action grants are “stand alone” grants that respond to opportunities for FPE to assist grantees’ activities that do not qualify for site-focused or proactive projects. These are for small, short-term project initiatives that cost no more than P150,000 each (see next section).

The project grants of FSSI provide funding to the enterprises receiving loans from the foundation in order to support such development activities as technical assistance, economic research, feasibility studies, product research and development, pilot production, and/or capability building. The small grants are,

however, given to NGOs for the same purpose as the project grants but at amounts not exceeding P50,000 each.

Approved Grants/Projects and Activities: FPE Case

The kinds of data available in the annual reports have limited the study to report only on FPE in this section. Table 4.4 presents information on the three FPE grant categories which have a total of 223 projects with 239 grantees within a three-year period (1999-2001).

Table 4.4. Selected data on the approved grants of FPE by year (1999-2001)

Category of Grants/ Type of Data	1999	2000	2001	Total
Site-focused projects				
No. of projects	13	24	13	50 (Ave-16/yr)
No. of grantees ^a	14	29	15	58 (Ave-19/yr)
Total amount	₱17,392,661	₱ 27,367,850	₱ 21,902,703	₱ 66,663,214
(% of column total)	(47%)	(60.3%)	(59.4%)	(56%)
Ave. grant/project	₱1,337,897	₱ 1,140,327	₱ 1,684,823	₱ 1,333,264
Proactive project				
No. of projects	15 ^b	12	8	35 (Ave-11/yr)
No. of grantees	19	16	8	43 (Ave-14/yr)
Total amount	₱16,205,949	₱ 13,764,564	₱ 9,683,927	₱ 39,654,440
(% of column total)	(44%)	(30.3%)	(26.3%)	(33%)
Ave. grant/project	₱1,080,396	₱ 1,147,047	₱ 1,210,490	₱ 1,132,984
Action grants				
No. of projects	39	50	49	138 (Ave-46/yr)
No. of grantees	39	50	49	138 (Ave-46/yr)
Total amount	₱3,142,250	₱ 4,265,591	₱ 5,263,495	₱ 12,671,336
(% of column total)	(9%)	(9.4%)	(14.3%)	(11%)
Ave. grant/project	₱80,570	₱ 85,311	₱ 107,418	₱ 91,821
Total	₱36,740,860	₱ 45,398,005	₱ 36,850,125	₱ 118,988,990

Source: FPE Annual Reports for 1999-2001

^a Certain grantees are repeated every year because site-focused projects are multi-year projects.

^b This figure includes 2 "special projects," a category not found in subsequent years.

Information from the table may be summarized as follows.

1. Most (56%) of the FPE grant monies from 1999-2001 were allocated for site-focused projects; only 33% went to proactive and 11% to action grants.
2. But on a per project average cost, the site-focused projects were only slightly higher (P1.3 M) than proactive projects (P1.1 M).
3. While action grant projects were most numerous (averaging 46/yr.) compared to the two other types, each cost an average of only one-fourteenth the average cost of a site-focused project.
4. Over the three-year period, the site-focused and action grant projects peaked in 2000 (almost double for site-focused projects), but proactive projects experienced a steady decline (from 15 in 1999 to 8 in 2001).

Table 4.5 shows an attempt to further classify the proactive projects and action grants where some 44% of the total FPE grant monies went from 1999-2001 (see preceding table). Although the classification may not coincide with the foundation's own typology, it does nevertheless present a rough indication of the nature of projects funded in the two categories by FPE.

The salient observations that may be gleaned from the classification are:

1. The top three types of activities that get funded as proactive projects and action grants are various forms of gatherings that increase stakeholders' knowledge or public awareness of environmental issues, build communities' capabilities to address or call attention to these issues, and enable people to advocate a position on the issues. The three categories represent about 74% and 67% of the total number of proactive and action grant projects, respectively. While these activities may be regarded as indirectly impacting on the environment, they seem to be necessary preconditions for various publics to effectively participate and implement conservation projects.
2. Direct conservation and protection activities which might be expected to immediately impact on the environment appear to constitute a small proportion of the total: only about 14% of proactive projects and 12% of action grants.
3. There are more types of activities accepted in the action grants category which are not in proactive projects, namely: advocacy campaigns, environmental media and art productions, project proposal/management plan preparations, and provision of alternative livelihood. Financing low-budget action grants in FPE appears to be a mechanism for catching a wide variety of environment-related activities from a wide range of stakeholders of the country's natural resources.

Table 4.5. Classification of FPE proactive projects and action grants by type of activity

Classification of Activity ^a	Proactive Projects				Action Grants			
	1999 ^b	2000	2001	Tot.	1999	2000	2001	Tot.
Various forms of gatherings for knowledge sharing, consultation, planning, and orientation (e.g., conferences, congresses, assemblies, workshops, round table discussions, fora, etc.)	6	4	5	15	14	14	17	45
Capability building, training, and experiential learning by cross visits	4	4	2	10	7	12	9	28
Campaigns and mobilizations for advocacy, environmental awareness, public education	1	-	-	1	6	9	4	19
Production of media/art materials, theatre/festivals/exhibits	-	-	-	-	4	6	5	15
Conservation and protection activities	3	2	-	5	5	3	9	17
Project proposal/plan preparation	-	-	-	-	2	3	1	6
Research/evaluation activities	1	2	1	4	-	3	2	5
Livelihood activities	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	3
Total	15	12	8	35	39	50	49	138

^a The classification does not necessarily coincide with that of the foundation; it is based on the project titles and may not be so accurate.

^b Includes two "special projects," a category not found in subsequent years.

Classification of Approved Projects by Broad Ecosystem Types

Based on the project titles and descriptions appearing in the annual reports, a classification was made of the various projects approved by PBSP, FPE, and FSSI according to four broad categories:

- Land-based ecosystem – including forests and marshland, but excluding the urban/brown environment
- Water-based ecosystem – i.e., marine and coastal environments
- Both land-based and water-based – as in an island ecosystem or where reference is to both mountain and lake ecosystems
- Others – means the project is not any one of the above or cannot be classified as land-based, water-based, or both due to insufficient data

Table 4.6 provides a breakdown of FPE projects by type of ecosystem over a three-year period. The figures show that close to half (49%) of its 223 projects were concerned with land-based/forest ecosystem and this category of projects obtained 50% of the total grant monies expended by FPE over the same period (see also Appendix Table 2).

In the case of PBSP, data available for year 2001 shows that only 16% of 201 projects were on land-based/forest ecosystem and the amount granted represented also about 16% of the total expenditures for the year. The majority (78%) of PBSP assistance went to other types which included poverty alleviation projects (see Appendix Table 3).

Table 4.6. Selected data on FPE and PBSP projects classified by broad ecosystem

Fund Facility/ Project Category	Land-Based	Water- Based	Both	Others	Total
FPE (1999-2001)					
Site-focused	32	10	8	0	50
Proactive	15	1	13	9	35
Action Grant	62	31	25	17	138
No. of projects (%)	109 (49%)	42 (19%)	46 (20%)	26 (12%)	223
Cost of projects	₱59,703,511	₱15,808,330	₱35,384,314	₱8,092,835	₱118,988,990
% of total cost	50%	13%	30%	7%	100%
PBSP (2001)					
No. of projects (%)	33 (16%)	10 (5%)	4 (2%)	154 (77%)	201
Cost of projects	₱26,616,019	₱5,482,652	₱3,554,825	₱128,705,950	₱164,359,447
% of total cost	16%	3%	2%	78%	99%

Source: FPE and PBSP Annual Reports, Appendix Tables 2 & 3.

Data for FSSI projects could not be classified in the same manner as those of FPE and PBSP because only percentages were available. Table 4.7 reveals the percentages of approved new investments for the years 1998-2000. As the figures show, hardly much (1%) was granted by FSSI to forest projects.

Table 4.7. Percentage of new program investments by ecosystem and year (1998-2000)

Ecosystem/ECO-Enterprise	1998	1999	2000
Multi-ecosystem/microfinance	38%	43%	25%
Urban areas/solid waste management	9	12	6
Croplands	0	3	5
Croplands/uplands/rivers/Environ'l & agric'l tech ^a	42	-	-
Croplands/uplands/marine ^a	-	42	13
Coastal and marine areas/seaweed production ^a	11	-	-
Forest and uplands/sustainable agroforestry	0	0	1
Technology and services/housing	-	-	50
No. of accounts approved, 1998-2000	6	9	17
Total amount approved, 1998-2000 (Php)	20,258,000	31,000,000	42,800,000

Source: FSSI Annual Reports

^aIn the 1999-2000 reports, the term "marine" replaced "river" in the category used and the coastal and marine areas category was no longer used.

Response/Approval Rate

Data regarding the proportion of approved projects against the total number of proposals received by a fund facility was obtainable only for FSSI. Table 4.8 reveals that FSSI received a total of 389 proposals (including grants) for funding from the time it started in 1996 up to 2000. More than half this number (about 57%) was approved. The response rate or percentage of approved projects ranged from 32% (on the first year of operations) to 94% (second year). The foundation had explained in its annual reports that most of the proposals were requests for grants which were beyond its mandate.

Table 4.8. Number of proposals and approved grants, and response rate by year in FSSI (1996-2000)

Year	No. of Proposals	No. of Approvals	Response Rate (%)
1996	75	24	32
1997	50	47	94
1998	89	41	46
1999	95	45	47
2000	80	63	79
Total	389	220	57

Source: FSSI Annual Reports

Two reports made in the December 2002 fund facilities' forum also give additional indications on the response rate. A representative of Peace and Equity Foundation (PEF) revealed that in its start-up year, the foundation received 236 proposals out of which only one-fourth (60) was approved. The majority was returned because they were either not qualified for a grant, lacked merit, needed to be redone, or lacked certain requirements (such as a business plan for a micro-enterprise proposal). The same response rate of 25% was reported by another foundation, PhilGerFund, which approved only 283 out of 1123 proposals received. One reason given for returning the proposals was that the proposed projects lacked sustainability.

Project Grantees: FPE Case

The proponents (or grantees) of approved FPE grants from 1999-2001, particularly those that have received more than one grant, are listed in Table 4.9 (see also Appendix Table 4). The table reveals the following information.

1. A majority or around 86% (205 of 239) of the grantees received a grant only once from 1999-2001, but their total grant allocation came to only 34% of the total FPE grant expenditures for the period.
2. Most or about 60% (P70.5 M of P118.9 M) of the total grant monies was awarded to only 8% (19 of 239) of the grantees.
3. These 19 grantees each received between three to 15 grants over three years from FPE; an additional 15 grantees received two grants each. The latter group got around 6% of the total grant monies of FPE.
4. The top three grantees that obtained the largest grants are:
 - Paglilingkod Batas Pangkapatiran Foundation, Inc. – P7.2 M for 5 projects
 - Haribon Foundation – P6.9 M for 15 projects
 - Miriam PEACE – P6.0 M for 7 projects

Some of the circumstances under which the grantees mentioned in Table 4.9 received more than one grant are:

- The awarded project was a multi-year site-focused project, e.g., the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (Box 4-2 above) was a grantee for this project type from 1999-2001 and obtained a total of P5,278,526. Multiple grant recipients are usually site-focused and proactive grantees.
- The grantee was given a combination of project types for one or more years, e.g., Green Forum–Western Visayas received 1 site-focused and 2 proactive grants in 1999 and another 1 site-focused and 1 proactive grants in 2000; Miriam-PEACE got money for 1 site-focused, 1 proactive and 1 action grants in 1999, 1 proactive and 1 action grants in 2000, and 1 site-focused and 1 action grants in 2001; the Legal Rights and Natural Resources received one action grant in 1999 and another one in 2001.
- The grantee with the most number of grants (15) was Haribon and this was because some grants were addressed to the main foundation (Haribon Foundation, Inc.) or to its units (Haribon-Palawan and Haribon-Tanggol Kalikasan).

Major Considerations in the Grantmaking Process

Eligibility for grants. Proponents of grants or projects in PBSP, FSSI, and FPE are members of civil society organizations that include development/environmental NGOs, CBOs or POs, church- and academic-based institutions, small business enterprises, and corporate foundations. PBSP has almost the entire range of these organizations among its project proponents or grantees. In FSSI's case, the proponents of approved loans and project grants are selected local enterprises; the grantees of its small grants are NGOs who request for small development assistance.

Table 4.9. Selected information on the FPE grantees from 1999-2001

No. of Grants in 3 yrs	Name of Institution	Total Amt Granted in 3 yrs	% of Tot in 3 yrs
15	Haribon Foundation Inc. (or its Tanggol Kalikasan or Palawan Off.)	6,923,700	6.00%
7	Miriam PEACE	6,050,312	5.00
6	Green Mindanao, Inc.	2,127,000	2.00
5	Philippine Association for Intercultural Development, Inc.	4,939,960	4.00
	Green Forum-Western Visayas	2,333,750	2.00
4	Paglilingkod Batas Pangkapatiran Foundation, Inc.	7,222,441	6.00
	Philippine Eagle Foundation, Inc.	3,715,732	3.00
	Concerned Citizen of Abra on Good Government	5,428,526	5.00
3	Environmental Legal Assistance, Inc.	4,236,500	4.00
	Lingap para sa Kalusugan ng Bayan, Inc.	3,485,893	3.00
	Pipuli Foundation Inc.	2,786,750	2.00
	Cagayan Valley Partners in People Development	1,527,135	1.00
	Center for Tropical Conservation Studies	2,684,100	2.00
	Luntiang Alyansa para sa Bundok Banahaw	3,091,110	3.00
	Mahintana Foundation Inc.	4,883,522	4.00
	PROCESS (Luzon & Panay)	1,602,703	1.00
	Rural Enterprise Assistance Center	3,529,700	3.00
	Sibol ng Agham at Teknolohiya, Inc.	1,224,080	1.00
	UPLB-Institute of Agroforestry	2,734,177	2.00
	Subtotal for 19 grantees, 1999-2001	70,527,091	59.00
2	Center for Alternative Rural Technology	69,400	0.00
	Center for Empowerment and Resource Development, Inc.	163,800	0.00
	Community Organization Multiversity	200,000	0.00
	Fisherfolk Self-Help Rehabilitation	1,718,550	1.00
	Kapulungan para sa Lupaing Ninuno	150,000	0.00
	Legal Rights and Natural Resources	228,215	0.00
	Mindanao Environment Forum	880,000	1.00
	MUAD Negros	123,000	0.00
	New Land Resources Management Cooperative	1,599,200	1.00
	Philippine Institute of Alternative Futures	220,000	0.00
	PhilDHRRA	200,000	0.00
	SAC (Dumaguete and Malaybalay)	199,600	0.00
	Ting Matiao Foundation	1,749,640	1.00
	Siliman University	250,000	0.00
UPLB Foundation	120,000	0.00	
	Subtotal for 34 grantees, 1999-2001	78,398,496	66.00
1	205 grantees, 1999-2001	40,590,494	34.00
	TOTAL for 239 grantees, 1999-2001	118,988,990	100.00

Source: FPE annual reports, Appendix Table 4.

Proponents of FPE projects, particularly for site-focused projects, have to meet the following eligibility criteria:

1. Must be a Filipino, non-stock, non-profit organization that is duly registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Cooperative development Authority, the Department of Labor and Employment, or the National Commission for Indigenous Peoples;
2. Has been in continuous operation for at least two years (three years for action grant proponents); and
3. With evidences of organizational capability and track record, such as well-established organizational structure, mandate and thrusts, management and staff expertise in project planning and implementation, competence in project management, area-based structure in the proposed project site, and financial systems and procedures.

Organizations unable to meet these criteria (like POs and new NGOs) may still qualify for assistance if they can partner with an eligible intermediary organization that is willing to serve as a primary proponent and project holder. The functions of this intermediary organization are to manage the project and funds as well as build its co-proponent's capability to be a primary holder.

Soliciting proposals. Project proposals are usually openly solicited through a call for proposals from the public at the beginning of the year. With regard to the site-focused projects of FPE, the availability of grants for conservation activities under this type of project was announced after the selection of priority sites in the 1990s. Prospective NGO and/or PO partners submitted proposals which were screened by the regional operations groups and the recommendees were forwarded to the board for approval. Since the intervention (CBRM strategy) in site-focused projects is predetermined by FPE, the proponents merely respond to this need.

Similarly, for proactive projects, ideas are reportedly also conceptualized by FPE operations staff and, once the board approves them, a call for project proposals is made. The regional operations groups conduct an initial assessment of the proposals and prepare a short list of proposed projects that they recommend to the board for selection and approval. Action grants, unlike the two other grant categories, are acted upon by the FPE executive director with recommendation from the regional operations groups.

Assisting in the design and revision of proposals. Proposals that are found meritorious but need to be reworked prior to approval are assisted by the foundations. The assistance is meant to convert the proposed project into an acceptable, feasibly-designed, or sustainable activity. It may be built into the project proposal as in the case of FPE's site-focused projects. It can also be provided as a separate grant as in the case of FSSI's project grants to enterprises assisted with loans.

To provide assistance, an assigned foundation staff conducts one or more visits to the proposed project area to discuss the needed changes in the proposal with the proponent based on the foundation's recommendations, and to guide the proponent on project design preparation and proposal write-up. This could take several exchanges of draft proposals over a period of several months.

Capability-building through trainings for grantees is also built into the project design. An informant relates that FPE has spent about P97 million on this activity in the last seven years. Reportedly a good strategy is to locate NGO partners who are good at institution building and who can be provided grants for training proponents of the foundation.

Fund facilities benefit immensely from immediately installing procedures for grant proposal preparation, submission, review and acceptance, as well as for grant project implementation, monitoring and evaluation. In setting up their own procedures, the foundations refer to existing manuals prepared by other institutions, a number of which are available in the net or circulated among grantmakers.

FPE advises that, especially for new players in grantmaking, there is no need to invent new tools of the trade when it is possible to simply pick up and modify. Out of the many useful tools, those that can be adopted readily include action planning, institution building, and various assessment manuals. The foundation's experiences get factored in the modification of existing manuals and other tools to render them more appropriate to its operations and particular clientele.

Screening and approving proposals. To facilitate technical review, FPE has recently developed and utilized a web-based evaluation mechanism which permits net posting of proposals and reviewers' comments. This mechanism has been found to hasten the appraisal process as slower reviewers are encouraged to keep up with faster reviewers and because sharing of appraisals quickly builds a common consensus on the approval or disapproval of an application. The expedient exchange of reviews reportedly enables the foundation to provide immediate feedback to proponents.

Another facilitating mechanism at FPE is conducting an initial screening at the regional level. FPE has involved the regional advisory councils (RACs) in the review of grant applications coming from their respective geographic coverage. The RACs are considered qualified to participate in the review of grant proposals and to make recommendations for their approval because it is composed of individual with diverse technical interests and expertise. This process of involving the RACs has an advantage of minimizing reciprocal accommodations among members in the approval of grant applications at the national level.

Other foundations create technical committees for screening project proposals/grant applications and selecting awardees. FSSI has an internal committee that is chaired by a board member and staffed by members of the support staff to attend to the task.

How to avoid delays in processing grant proposals is considered a challenge by the fund facilities because the causes of delay may come from either the grantees or the granting institution. On the part of grantees, processing delays are often due to (a) submission of incomplete requirements, (b) certain defects in the proposal like inappropriate logframe or antiquated baseline data provided, and (c) missing the deadline set by the funding facility for proposal review. Thus the foundations emphasize the need for compliance with all submission requirements to prevent delays. On the grantor's side, delays usually occurred in the early years of operation and are thereafter avoided as much as possible, but unavoidable circumstances may include difficulty of convening the collegial body of reviewers who are busy professionals.

How long does it take for a proposal to get approved? According to a report by PhilGerFund, it usually takes six months from submission to approval because this includes field investigation or validation. FPE informants revealed that new site-focused projects require a quarter (three months) for approval. This brief period is the result of three factors: (1) a quarterly collegial review process, (2) the presence of a standardized (CBRM) framework which shortens the project designing process, and (3) the use of a web-based proposal submission and evaluation process (as explained above). FPE's action grant proposals usually take only a week to get approval from the region, which forwards such approval to the executive director for final action.

Fund releases. According to some informants, the number of fund releases is generally dependent on the kind of activities proposed by the grantee. For example, in the multi-year site-specific projects of FPE, releases are usually done on a yearly basis or three times for a three-year project.

One-time fund releases are made by fund facilities in the following cases: (1) for grants that involve small amounts of P150,000.00 or less, like the action grants of FPE and the project/small grants of FSSI, and (2) for grants that propose activities with a short completion period like conferences and other mass gatherings, advocacy campaigns, or training sessions. The full or partial release of funds normally follows the signing of a partnership agreement.

Monitoring and evaluation of grant activities. Monitoring is done by the assigned program officer in the foundation. In practice, short-term projects with one-time fund releases do not require monitoring but are gauged on the basis of their completion reports. If the report is found unsatisfactory, the program officer visits the grantee to investigate the cause.

For multi-year or long-term projects, monitoring becomes an important task and is facilitated by quarterly reports from the grantees. In FPE, monitoring starts after the first quarterly report has been submitted or when there are reported problems that prevent the grantee from undertaking scheduled activities. Quarterly reports are validated in the field by the regional operations group. Validation includes checking how the fund is spent, whether the activities are done on schedule, or if the targets are met. If a scheduled activity is not held, its budgeted amount will be deducted from the next fund release; this is to ensure that the grantee does not keep more funds than what is necessary. In the case of proactive projects, three regular site visits are reportedly conducted for monitoring purposes: at the inception, about mid-project, and upon project completion.

Because monitoring funds are limited, FPE looks for indicative measures in the grantee's quarterly or completion reports to determine whether there is a need to validate the reports. Another strategy is for the program officer to piggyback monitoring functions for contiguous projects with a scheduled field visit to a particular site.

Impact of project-level performance is evaluated either through internally-devised mechanisms with the participation of grant partners (NGOs, CBOs and POs) and donor partners, or through external technical evaluators. For this purpose, the foundations point to the logframe as a useful tool since this instrument describes the goals of the project in addition to the means for attaining the goals and the indicators for measuring impact. They recognize that while they have been addressing project effects, they need to give more attention to determining the collective or cumulative impact of every foundation's work on their respective priority areas or of all foundations' work on the nation's environmental welfare. For example, issues such as have the foundation's forestry conservation projects done nationwide increased total forest cover, or have their environmental educational and institution building projects made communities less exploitative, wise resource consumers have yet to be tackled.

For FPE, the conduct of internal and external evaluations is reported by the Executive Director in annual reports and some information are also found in the 2001 FPE case study by Quizon and Lingan-Debuque, to wit:

FPE Internal Evaluations

- In 1998, the CBRM work was assessed to develop a more strategic vision.
- In 1999, CBRM strategies were reviewed with NGO and PO partners and further revisions were undertaken, such as the integration of gender and the development of regional ecosystem agenda enabling communities to meet basic needs while protecting and conserving natural resources.
- In 2000, both written and unwritten processes and procedures which guided the implementation of FPE policies and programs were reviewed and compiled into an Operations Manual that was approved by year end and that would be subjected to future refinements.
- In 2000-2001, regional assessments of CBRM projects were launched to ascertain how they address biodiversity conservation issues.

FPE External Evaluations

- In 1996, a Mid-Stream Review was commissioned to provide a comprehensive assessment of the FPE setup and systems, from the Board down to the RACs.
- Another (undated) study was funded to draw out the perceptions on FPE of its staff and its NGO and PO partners.

-
- In 2001, FPE set aside P800,000 for an external reviewer to undertake a 10-year evaluation of the foundation's activities. This study is expected to be completed by early 2003 but this has yet to be realized as of end of March 2003.

The monitoring and evaluation activities of FPE are part of the Project Development Monitoring and Evaluation Information System (PDMEIS) which is still being completed although parts of the system are already being used or tested in a limited number of projects for the purposes of assessing the proponent's capability and project performance. The PDMEIS is also being converted into a web-based system for accessibility and transparency purposes. This system recommends the use of certain tools for assessing four major aspects:

- Actors – PO Assessment tool (still being developed);
- Intervention projects – Log Frame which is now used in all projects;
- Environmental threats – Threat Reduction Assessment (TRA), a participatory tool which is being tried out in one project each in Visayas and Mindanao; and
- Conservation outcome – Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation (BIOME) based on a tool developed by DENR-PAWB which is participatory in nature and is presently used in two projects each in Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao.

Other than pointing out that FPE has undertaken these monitoring and evaluation activities, this study is unable to report the actual impact of its different projects on the environment due to the unavailability of data.

V. ISSUES AND BEST PRACTICES FROM GRANT RECIPIENTS

The grant proponents or grantees of NGO-managed environmental fund facilities consist of several types: individual developmental or environmental NGOs, individual POs, NGO-PO partnership or consortium, and PO federations. In a listing of FPE projects usually given as a handout to researchers, individual NGOs emerge as the largest group of grantees. However, interviews have revealed that the NGO-PO partnership as a type of grantee is becoming increasingly popular. In this partnership, the NGO partner is generally responsible for the management and accounting of project funds, and is in charge of building capabilities in the PO partner to co-implement and eventually sustain the project activities. The PO is usually both the subject and object of the project's development activities. In this chapter, however, only the issues and best practices of three private, non-profit environmental NGOs are discussed. These NGOs are Haribon, the Philippine Eagle Foundation, Inc. (PEF), and WWF-P.

Haribon is the oldest foundation at 19 years. It had a long history as a bird watching group funded by peace corps volunteers that later evolved into a nature and wildlife conservation society that was the local but autonomous partner of BirdLife International (a global conservation partnership committed to the protection of birdlife and its habitat in over 100 countries), before becoming a science and research foundation in 1984. As a foundation it deals with the study and conservation of Philippine flora and fauna and addresses biodiversity conservation for a sustainable society. Today Haribon is regarded as a pioneer in the Philippine environmental movement, and one of the most active if not the leading one among the environmental NGOs in the country. PEF, on the other hand, was established some 12 years ago principally to promote the survival of the endangered Philippine eagle as well as the forest biodiversity it represents. The youngest foundation is WW-F at seven years, although it traces its beginnings to WWF-International's concern for saving the Philippine eagle in the late '60s. As an independent associate of WWF-International, however, it began in 1996 with the registration of Kabang Kalikasan ng Pilipinas Foundation, which shortly thereafter went by its more popular name, WWF-P. It is presently involved in supporting coastal resource development and marine conservation efforts.

Sources of Revenue for the Foundation

An environmental foundation can have anywhere from five to eight sources of revenue as evident from Table 5.1. These sources are grants, support from international affiliates, donations, income generating activities, membership fees, gain on foreign exchange, trust and foundation, interest income, and miscellaneous income. In 2000, the top grossing revenue source was the grants for Haribon (91%) and PEF (64%); whereas for WWF-P it was the support obtained from WWF global organization (43%) plus grants (30%). PEF also drew a substantial part (21%) of its revenue from income generating activities. Membership fees collected by Haribon and PEF did not appear significant particularly in the former's case.

The practices of the three environmental NGOs reveal a combination of strategies to generate regular revenues for the continuing support of their administrative and project implementation activities.

The foremost strategy is to develop programs or projects that can qualify for grant monies from local environmental fund facilities like FPE or PBSP and from bilateral, multilateral, or international donor entities. To undertake this effectively and efficiently, NGOs create a technical office or unit within the foundation to attend to the task. For instance, WWF-P has a program development unit (their "think tank") with an experienced staff whose members develop, package, and market either program or project proposals. Because WWF-P possesses a good track record in implementing conservation projects, donors like European embassies and international foundations that are conservation-oriented also reportedly approach them with grant monies to establish new projects or support continuing ones. Haribon has technical people in its Terrestrial Ecosystems Program and Marine Ecosystems Program who create and

Table 5.1. Amount and percentage of revenue by NGO and type of source (2000)

Source	Haribon		PEF		WWF-P	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount ^a	%
Grants	₱29,540,214	91	₱7,669,164	64.2	₱39,635,889	30
Support from Int'l affiliates	1,119,259	3	-	-	57,229,177	43
Donations	255,173	0.8	-	-	18,373,900	14
Income generating activities	477,220	1.5	2,547,331	21.3	-	-
Membership fees	66,447	0.2	511,304	4.3	-	-
Gain on foreign exchange	723,394	2	292,326	2.4	-	-
Trust and foundation	-	-	-	-	14,416,771	11
Interest income	109,481	0.3	421,541	3.5	2,632,944	2
Miscellaneous	323,401	1	505,820	4.2	-	-
TOTAL	₱32,614,589	99.8	₱11,947,496	99.9	₱132,288,681	100

^a The figures in this column combine both unrestricted and restricted (i.e., donors specified a particular use) funds.

send proposals to prospective funding institutions. PEF, being a small NGO, has a community development officer who writes proposals together with the executive director of the foundation.

Another strategy is to have a northern link or to be affiliated with an international NGO network that provides financial support for a local but autonomous partner organization. Haribon has BirdLife International, a global conservation partnership with links in over 100 countries. BirdLife reportedly allocates at least P1 million a year for administrative support to Haribon. Similarly, WWF-P is an independent national organization of WWF-International, also a global entity. Subsidies from the WWF network organizations in fact comprised the foundation's largest source of revenue in 2000. Smaller, provincial NGOs like the PEF, is able to access WWF and Haribon funds for sharing their common concern for conserving the endangered Philippine monkey-eating eagle.

A third strategy is to expand the membership base of the foundation or to increase the number of it benefactors, especially corporate benefactors. Haribon presently has a membership base of 600 individuals, including foreigners, each contributing P900 annually. It is constantly searching for ways to enlarge its "membership constituency" like forming local chapters in the provinces and schools and engaging more corporate sponsors to the cause of conservation. WWF-P derives revenues from five types of corporate sponsors: (1) the corporate conservation allies who give between P1-3 million, (2) the corporate partners who donate P500,000 and above, (3) the friends of WWF who donate P25,000-P200,000, (4) the best of Manila sponsors who contribute P10,000-P700,000, and (5) the individual donors who give P1,500 or more. Each member of the WWF-P Board of Trustees also gives a yearly donation which may fall under any one of the foregoing classifications. A partnership program has been established in WWF-P to take care of its different categories of members, while a membership and an institutional partnership and development programs handle the same task in Haribon.

Cognizant that the financial pot is shrinking, the NGO grantees have also utilized leveraging and "counterparting" or "matching grants" as mechanisms for fund generation or augmentation. These mechanisms are similar to those also adopted by their donor fund facilities (in Chapter II) to tap more sources and thus be able to undertake projects at a much lesser cost to them. Very recently, WWF-P leveraged P540 million from the Netherlands Embassy for a 7-year National Sierra Madre Conservation Project. The foundation also has many LGU and NGA (e.g., DENR or DILG) stakeholders with whom it has existing memoranda of agreement for marine protection and who allocate counterpart funds or shoulder counterpart activities.

Income generating activities also provide additional revenue for the foundations. PEF charges visitors to its Philippine eagle center and gains from gate receipts and eagle adoption program. In 2000, both activities earned a substantial 21% of the total annual revenue. For Haribon, the major income earners are the paid seminar-workshops and training activities they conduct for interested publics as part of their conservation advocacy. These are mostly handled by its Tanggol Kalikasan office. In 2000, for example, these activities included: (1) teachers workshop held in UP Los Banos on Philippine biodiversity and conservation which piloted the training module developed by Haribon, (2) training seminar in Palawan for 98 prosecutors, judges, lawyers and observers on the protecting the Philippine environment by enforcing environmental laws and prosecution techniques, and (3) various basic environmental paralegal trainings for communities dependent on natural resources.

Foundation Thrusts and Projects

Being environmental NGOs, the three foundations are dedicated to the conservation and development of the Philippine environment but they have their own particular interests. Within the limits of their interests, they have developed programs and implemented projects that nevertheless cover a wide array of concerns. What appears common to all three foundations is their reliance on scientific data to underpin their conservation efforts and their utilization of community-based initiatives for sustainable resource management.

Haribon. As a local partner of BirdLife International, Haribon also believes that the loss of bird life is an indicator of an ailing physical environment affected by social, cultural, and economic factors. In order to stem this loss, it must necessarily address the conservation and protection of the birds' natural forest habitats. In the past two decades, the foundation has adopted an integrated, multi-disciplinary, participatory, and science-based approach to conservation that is focused on the green (non-urban) environment, and carried out through two programs—terrestrial and marine ecosystems.

As shown in the 2000 Annual Report of Haribon, the projects under these two program thrusts appear within the context of two (out of three) "missions," as follows.

Mission 1: Promote and undertake CBRM strategies in specific sites

- Mt. Isarog National park Conservation Project (Camarines Sur)
- Community-Based Coastal resource Management in Bolinao, Pangasinan
- Participatory Coastal Development Planning in Bolinao, Pangasinan
- Broad-based Coastal Management Training Program in the Philippines
- Seahorse Conservation Project (Bohol)
- Capiz Fishery Conservation and Management Project (Camarines Sur)
- PAMANA KA sa Pilipinas (a National alliance of CB marine protected areas)
- Basic Environmental Paralegal Training

Mission 2: Conduct scientific and socioeconomic research on natural ecosystems to promote sustainable approaches to development

- Research on Threatened Species and Priority Sites (Terrestrial ecosystems)
- A Study on Marine Protected Areas in the Philippines

Projects under the CBRM strategies usually integrate a whole range of activities, from conducting scientific researches and using the results to build databases, to conservation and protection work that incorporate livelihood, land tenure, and institutional issues, and down to environmental advocacy through mass education and training. Although committed to the conservation of birdlife, a majority of the Haribon projects were concerned with marine or coastal ecosystems (five of seven CBRM strategies) in 2000. But with regard to researches, both terrestrial and marine areas got equal priority.

The third mission of Haribon is to build a national constituency for biodiversity conservation. The projects here are on conservation education, training and advocacy. Most of the training is focused on understanding environmental laws to effectively protect the environment. The Tanggol Kalikasan office of Haribon actively leads in the pursuit of its third mission.

PEF. Because PEF was established to prevent the loss of the Philippine eagle and its forest habitat, the bulk of its work is therefore concentrated on this goal. Based on the 2000 Annual Report, the foundation's major programs for such purpose are:

- *Field Research* – A long-term program to gather data on the reproductive success, nesting density, home ranges, population estimates, habitat use, and other aspects of the eagles' biology in Mindanao and other islands. These data becomes the basis for hands-on management of eagles bred in captivity and released to the wild.
- *Conservation Breeding* – The goal is to produce eaglets that will be later released to the wild so as to complement wild eagle populations. In the past decade, 10 eaglets were produced in the program (60% by artificial insemination and 40% by natural pairing) with two mortalities. The program also provides health maintenance for the eagles and eaglets, and places an eaglet for adoption by a corporate partner who gives support for constructing a cage, annual maintenance, nation-wide ad campaign, and product promotions to raise additional funds.
- *Conservation Education* – Based in the Philippine Eagle Center, this is a wildlife educational resource where people from all walks of life are treated to lectures, film presentations, guided tours and conversations with eagle keepers to encourage public support for conservation initiatives. Among other tasks, the program produces varied educational materials and training modules; it also provides opportunities for students wanting a career in conservation to become PEF volunteers or interns.

The foundation has a separate program for community-based initiatives premised on the need to empower impoverished forest communities as part of the solution toward sustainable resource management. The communities addressed are those that live in or near eagle habitats. Some of its community-based resource management projects (in Pulangi Watershed, Bukidnon and in Arakan Valley, Cotabato) are funded by FPE (which also had financed several PEF staff development activities and meetings).

WWF-P. Before becoming a foundation, WWF-P was allied with the global WWF-International's cause to save the Philippine eagle. Since it became a foundation, its ultimate mission has been "to stop and eventually reverse the accelerating degradation of the environment in the Philippines" to be able to build a future where Filipinos could live in harmony with nature. It seeks to pursue the mission by (1) preserving genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity, (2) ensuring sustainable use of renewable natural resources, and (3) promoting the reduction of pollution, and wasteful exploitation and consumption of resources and energy.

While its mission and goals appear broad, WWF-P has dedicated itself to the conservation, protection, and development of marine and coastal ecosystems. The delineation of this scope was allegedly encouraged by the common love for scuba diving and marine life of the founding members/incorporators and concurrent trustees of the foundation. (There were seven, all-male incorporators, mostly Filipino citizens and belonging to corporate organizations. At present, there are 11 trustees and one of them is a female.)

The annual reports of WWF-P describe its dedication to marine and coastal resource development. In the 2000 report, the foundation cited eight major marine/coastal projects mostly found in Luzon, each with a field office:

- Mt. Guiting Guiting Sibuyan Island Project (Romblon)
- Patrol and Research in Tubbataha Reef Project (Palawan) – the Tubbataha Reef National Marine Park developed by WWF-P was acclaimed Asia’s Best and a UNESCO World Heritage site
- El Nido Marine Reserve Conservation Project (Palawan)
- Whaleshark Protection Project (Albay)
- Blue Crab Fisheries Project (Negros Oriental)
- Subic Bay Conservation Training Center (Olongapo, Zambales)
- Mabini-Tingloy Marine Biodiversity Conservation Project (Batangas)
- Balayan Bay Conservation Project (Batangas)

To date, a majority of the WWF-P projects are still in the marine and coastal areas but *three* of them have included protected forests adjacent to important marine areas, such as Mt. Guiting Guiting in the Sibuyan project and the protected area in El Nido Project. Their recent project is on the forest protected areas in the Sierra Madre mountain range.

Just like Haribon and PEF, WWF-P incorporates scientific research into its conservation projects. In addition, the foundation has explored and spearheaded the use of modern technologies for conservation purposes in many projects (Box 5-1). At times it also integrates into a conservation project alternative livelihood, health and sanitation, and education activities, such as those in the Turtle Island project.

Project Partnerships

For the purpose of implementing projects, the environmental foundations appear to have three sets of partners: (1) the donor partners who finance the projects, (b) the implementation partners who may consist of GOs, LGUs, other NGOs, and/or CBOs/POs, and (c) the client partners who can be CBOs, POs or whole communities expected to benefit from the project and to continue and make it sustainable.

Data on these types of partners are not always available in the description of projects in the foundations’ annual reports (for 2000) to make a comparison. Whatever is available for sampled projects of Haribon and WWF-P is given in Table 5.2. As the table indicates, a project may have from one to three donor partners and usually more than this range for implementing partners. The donor partners listed are possibly only those who have given restricted funds; they are foreign donors.

Box 5-1: A Blend of Modern Technology and Conservation in WWF-P Projects

➔ *Satellite Telemetry* was used to track and compile information on the nesting behavior and habitat of green sea turtles (locally known as *pawikan*) in the Tawi-Tawi project located in the southernmost part of the country. Scientific knowledge on the complex life pattern of the *pawikan* is now being factored into the communities’ motivations, decisions, and actions on environmental matters.

Geographic Information System (GIS) data guided the formulation of an action plan for the El Nido protected area. Such data was used to divide and classify the protected area into various zones, from maximum protection to multiple use areas, largely based on land cover, slope, level of degradation, functionality for the local community, and richness of biodiversity. The resulting management zone map was incorporated into the El Nido-Taytay Managed Resource Protected Area. It provides a more accurate basis for protective action or legislation, at the same time permitting communities to make traditional use of their forests.

GIS-based Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) was introduced to the Batangas Bay project, site of the 2nd busiest seaport in the country, major oil refineries of two of the largest oil companies, and development of a first-class industrialized area. These developments endanger the bay’s remaining coral reef ecosystem, mangroves, fishponds, bountiful fish supply, and nearby dolphins and whales. ESI maps were developed to pinpoint the sensitive ecosystems surrounding the bay and would become a valuable tool for clean-up operations by all sectors should there be oil spills in the bay.

South East Asia Marine Resources Information System (SEAMARIS) uses state-of-the-art computer geographic and modeling systems for data collection and dissemination. It is an interactive and user-friendly device for decision makers to gain understanding on the potential impact of specific policies on marine resources. Funded by WWF-U.S, SEAMARIS is considered a trailblazer in environmental policy making. Maps, statistics, and other data will be made available in the net or on CD-ROM for public circulation.

(Source: WWF-P 2000 Annual Report)

Table 5.2. List of donor and implementation partners by foundation and selected project

Foundation/Project	Donor Partners	Implementation Partners
Haribon-CBRM		
• Mt. Isarog project	• British Embassy Gov't of Lower Austria CARE-USA	• CARE-Philippines Bicol Upland Resource Dev't Fdn. PhilDHRRA DENR, DAR, NCIP
• CBCRM in Bolinao	• Int'l Dev't Research Centre (IDRC)	• UP Marine Science Institute UP College of SWork & CDev't
• Broad-based coastal mgmt training prog.	• (no data)	• DA-BFAR, DENR-CEP, DOST-PCMRRD, Int'l Center for Living Aquatic Resources Mgmt, IIRR
• Seahorse conservation project	• IDRC MacArthur Foundation	• McGill University, Canada Oxford University, UK LGUs, PAMANA KA-Bohol
• Capiz fishery conservation & management project	• B & Q, UK	• (no data)
• PAMANA KA sa Pilipinas	• Packard Foundation Friedrich Ebert Stiftung MacArthur Foundation	• PAMANA KA sa Pilipina
• Basic environmental paralegal training	• Friedrich Ebert Stiftung	• Several NGOs, POs and LGUs
WWF-P		
• Turtle islands project	• WWF-UK, British DFID	• (no data)
• El Nido project	• Netherland's Directorate for International Cooperation	• Phil. Rural Reconstruction Movement Other collaborating agencies
• Batangas Bay project	• Environmental Agency of Japan	• LGUs, Philippine Coast Guard, Philippine Ports Authority, Community leaders and others
• Sibuyan Island project	• Netherland's DFIC	• 26 landowners in joint program

Source: 2000 Annual Reports

There are actually so many more unrestricted donors who are local contributors to the foundations' causes that are not given in the table.

Partnership-building is a survival strategy of NGOs. Therefore, partnerships are not formed or established only for the purpose of doing a project. Outside of the advantages of project collaboration, there are certain other benefits gained from NGO-NGO partnership. Most of the benefits involve access to (1) information on available funding sources, (2) updates on development strategies for the environment, (3) knowledge on improved modes of service delivery, and (4) available tools for different stages of the project implementation process. Other benefits come in the form of opportunities for (1) upgrading skills through participation in seminar-workshops and training activities of the more experienced NGOs, and (2) sharing of lessons learned on different facets of NGO work.

For NGO-PO partnership, the NGO acquires a co-implementor in the project and an organization that is able to continue or sustain the NGO's conservation work in the area. In return, the PO stands to gain from participation in different project interventions that are expected to enable them to manage their natural resources in a sustainable way.

A major lesson learned in partnership is being able to discern the not-so-best practices of one's partners. Among the grantee NGOs, these practices include the "fly-by-night" or bogus existence of partners, their dole-out mentality, the manifestation of greed and self-interest that are often the causes of mismanagement or misuse of funds, and noncompliance with the partnership agreement. It is however claimed that organizations with such malpractices are few, they can be easily spotted by more experienced NGO partners, and their identities get to be known in the NGO network.

Designing the Conservation Projects

The design issues are where to conduct the project, what to include in the project, how to do the project, and with whom to conduct the project.

First, the task entails determining where the conservation project should be undertaken. For WWF-P, the criteria for site-selection are (1) it must be an environmentally important area, and (2) it is a biodiversity hotspot (“rich but critically threatened” area). The nature of the project site will most likely spell out the kind of conservation activities that must be undertaken there. Haribon’s project sites are where endangered bird species are endemic because bird absence as well as presence is an indicator of the health of a forest. Selection of both site and type of project is based on scientific or empirical evidence which is gathered according to accepted international standards. Haribon has recently published a book identifying the so-called biodiversity sites based on scientific data.

Next is to address how and with whom the project is to be undertaken. NGOs are in agreement that conservation projects are to be done with the participation of and in partnership with all concerned stakeholders in the site. The kind of stakeholders will depend on the type of program. For example, the enforcement of marine or forest protection program will mostly involve local government units and national government agencies with whom memoranda of agreement (MOAs) or partnership agreements (PAs) are established.

In conceptualizing and designing conservation projects, are the environmental NGOs constrained by the fund facility’s or donor agency’s agenda? Data on the type of projects approved as grants shows that this may not necessarily be true. For instance, fund facilities like FPE accept many projects indirectly related to conservation like education, training, and research or these concerns are made integral components to a conservation project. FPE also allots small grants for projects that are of greater interest to the project proponent rather than to the facility. Most often, however, the NGO proponent tries to avoid getting a rejected proposal by making sure it is submitted to an appropriate fund facility, that is, the proposed project falls within the program scope and priorities of the facility.

Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is an important component in the implementation process. Data obtained indicate that it is done at two levels: the project level and the donor’s level. At the project level, individual grantees (NGOs or POs) themselves undertake the task. In the case of partnership grantees, the NGOs usually assume greater responsibility for M&E than their PO partners. At the donor’s level are the local NGO-managed fund facilities that conduct their own M&E and ask their grantees to do the same, and the international donor agencies that require M&E for their grantees down the line.

According to a WWF-P informant, M&E was traditionally done to serve the grantee’s purposes. At present, however, grant administrators and donor institutions have become increasingly interested and involved in the process. This trend of joint assessment is viewed as beneficial to both parties, as it affords people who are removed from the day-to-day project implementation to obtain a deeper insight into and understanding of the factors eventually affecting project outcomes which implementers have to account for. This is especially advantageous for projects of longer duration. Donor involvement in M&E is facilitated by email and phone exchanges. Donor’s visit to the project site is seen as a necessary role of their status as one of the project’s stakeholders.

Having the necessary tools is an important consideration for M&E. As in the case of fund facilities, NGO grantees have also found the log frame to be a most useful tool not only for planning but also for M&E. For instance, Haribon requires it to be included in its proposals. The log frame reportedly allows the project proponent to focus on the scope of work to be done, to think logically about its activities and

methodology, and to identify potential problem areas. It provides a good basis for making periodic, usually quarterly, assessment of the project. For donor's annual project assessment, there are certain tools used, such as the organizational assessment developed by the Department of Agrarian Reform, and the conservation threat reduction assessment developed by the Biodiversity Support Program in Washington, D.C.

Based on the experiences of both Haribon and WWF-P, the presence of project baseline data also facilitates end-of-term evaluation. Changes in the level of social, organizational, or biophysical development which are reflected in the terminal evaluation of the project could be explained.

VI. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE TFCF

The preceding chapters described the general profiles of the Philippine NGO fund facilities covered by the study (Chapter 2), the various fund management and grant administration facets and practices of these fund facilities (Chapters 3-4), and the mechanisms and practices of selected grantees with respect to sourcing revenues, and developing and managing grant projects (Chapter 5).

The major findings culled from these chapters that have implications for the forthcoming operations of the TFCF, a newly established fund facility dedicated to tropical forest conservation in the Philippines, are presented in this final chapter along with certain recommendations. These are as follows.

1. There is a wide berth for the entry of a grantmaking institution like TFCF that is established exclusively for assisting tropical forest conservation efforts of NGOs and POs in the country.

- Of the three NGO fund facilities studied, only FPE was established solely to make grants for biodiversity or environmental conservation in the country. However, only half of its total grant monies from 1999-2001 went to assisting forest-related (land-based) activities.
- FPE allocated a substantial percentage (about 56% on the average) of its annual grant monies in 1999-2001 to site-focused projects that are located in 29 priority sites. But forest or watershed areas make up only 16 (55%) of these priority sites; these are found in Luzon (10), Visayas (1), and Mindanao (5).
- PBSP is also a major grantmaking institution in the country, but data for 2001 shows that its assistance in the environmental sector came to only about 22% of the total grant expenditures for the year, and only 16% of the total went to forest- or land-based activities.
- While FSSI provides some grants, it is a lending rather than a granting institution. The loan for sustainable agroforestry enterprise constituted a meager 1% of its total investment in only one year (2000) out of a three-year period (1998-2000).
- Of the three environmental NGO grantees studied, only PEF was wholly dedicated to forest wildlife (i.e., Philippine eagle) conservation. As for Haribon, while it was committed to birdlife conservation, its CBRM program for year 2000 was concentrated on marine/coastal ecosystems (six of eight), with only one CBRM project in a national park. Its scientific research endeavors were however equally divided between the forest and marine/coastal environments. In the case of WWF-P, its projects in 2000 were entirely devoted to marine/coastal development, but it has lately included protected forests in three of the present projects.

2. The TFCF could make a big difference if it were to concentrate its assistance on three (of six) mandated eligible grant activities proposed by eligible NGOs and POs, namely:

- (a) restoration, protection, or sustainable use of diverse animal and plant species;
 - (b) research and identification of tropical forest plant life to treat human diseases; and
 - (c) development and support of the livelihoods of individuals living in or near a tropical forest in a manner consistent with protecting such tropical forest.
- The study's findings show these three areas to be the major gaps in local grantmaking efforts. The first two activities were hardly among the supported grant activities, if at all, of the local fund facilities included in the study. The third activity had received minimal support even from an ecology-conscious lending institution like FSSI. It should be noted that the experiences of PEF and Haribon in protecting wildlife habitat and those of FSSI in financing ECO-enterprises

would be quite useful to TFCF if it were to engage in biodiversity restoration and protection, and in upland livelihood development and support.

- The CBRM program thrust of FPE and its substantial assistance for “indirect” conservation efforts indicate that it is already giving attention to the three remaining TFCF eligible grant activities: (1) training programs to increase the scientific, technical, and managerial capacities of individuals and organizations involved in conservation efforts, (2) development and implementation of scientifically sound systems of natural resource management, including land and ecosystem management practices, and (3) establishment, restoration, protection, and maintenance of parks, protected areas, and reserves. It may be reasonable to assume that FPE will most likely continue to assist these kinds of endeavors in the future because of the competitive advantage it now enjoys. Moreover, the last two activities are also intensively being addressed by the Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) and the National Integrated Protected Areas (NIPA) Programs of government through DENR.
- The abovementioned gaps may provide avenues from which the TFCF could draw out the “aggressive” initiatives and the key factors of success that will enable it to define its “superior strength” as a fund facility among its peers.

3. One of the major challenges of TFCF lies in addressing the capacity of NGOs and POs to implement direct forest and wildlife conservation work within its chosen sphere of activities. Certain indicators suggest that current NGO and PO grantees are mostly in the skills building or preparatory stage, and they have yet to attain that level of capacity needed to achieve such goals as protection, maintenance, and/or increase in forest cover and wildlife.

- In the absence of secondary evaluation data, this study used “nature or type of funded activity” and “proportion of funded land-based (forest) activities” as “substitute” indicators for determining whether the NGO and PO grantees possessed the capability for carrying out actual resource conservation and protection activities that meet forest conservation goals.
- Data shows that most of the activities proposed by grantees and funded by FPE from 1999-2001 in the proactive and action grant categories (74% and 67%, respectively) were indirect means for the attainment of biodiversity conservation goals. These supported activities were comprised of (a) various gatherings like conferences, seminar-workshops, congresses or assemblies undertaken for knowledge sharing or dissemination, consultation, orientation, or planning, (b) training or capacitating activities, and (c) advocacy or public education campaigns. While these activities are indeed important prerequisites to reach the end goals of conservation, by themselves they are a distance away from achieving such goals.
- Assuming that NGOs and POs possessed a higher capability for implementing conservation work, it would be reasonable to expect that they would seek funding for activities that directly addressed conservation goals. Findings indicate, however, that such direct activities only constituted a small proportion of the FPE-funded activities—about 14% of assisted proactive projects and 12% of supported action grants. These activities included anti-logging and confiscation of illegally-cut lumber, enforcement of environmental laws, cultivation of permaculture or vermiculture, and propagation of agroforestry seedlings.
- The site-focused projects of FPE which observed a wholistic framework for CBRM covered both indirect and direct means for achieving biodiversity goals. But the process that could lead to resource management and conservation on the ground (end goal) would stretch for seven to 10 years, with institution-building and other preparatory activities marking the initial years. Thus far, data on the site-focused projects seems to suggest that most if not all of the local communities involved in the site-focused projects had yet to reach this final phase of their projects.

-
- Data has also indicated that only 49% of the FPE grants in 1999-2001 covered land-based or forest-related activities. If less than half the grants are forest-related and most of the activities in this classification are indirect means to achieve forest conservation goals, these somehow reflect the possibility that the environmental NGO and PO grantees have yet to reach that desired level of capacity for implementing direct forest conservation activities that meet specific forest conservation goals.

4. Rather than remain a “sinking” fund, the TFCF should opt to be a sustainable fund facility by diversifying its revenue sources, particularly by engaging in leveraging strategies and eventually establishing an endowment fund.

- As a sinking fund, TFCF will receive its principal in 28 semi-annual payments over a 14-year period, from June 1, 2003 to December 1, 2016. But by the very nature of a sinking fund, its entire principal and investment income are expected to be disbursed over the designated period. Basing on a decade of the FPE experience, 14 years seem too inadequate a period within which to expect certain gains for the environment from assisted projects. The impact on forests and wildlife biodiversity may not be discernible or felt in such a short lifespan of the TFCF should this lifespan remain unchanged.
- The findings on programs and projects supported by the fund facilities generally indicate that forest conservation, protection, and development are long-term efforts and that the benefits expected from these efforts cannot be realized over the short-run. Evidently, there is no quick fix to biodiversity conservation and no direct route to sustained conservation efforts. So the entry into the playing field of another fund facility that can perpetuate its operations and provide continued assistance for certain focused environmental endeavors becomes a more realistic approach.
- Whether functioning as a grantmaker or a grantee, local NGOs have learned to sustain their operations by diversifying their sources of revenues, including getting (a) funds leveraged through co-financing, fund complementation, or partnership with other donor agencies, (b) grants from channels of official development assistance, and (c) private contributions from members and corporate patrons of the foundation.
- Cognizant that the endowment fund is a permanent capital that, when invested properly, provides a yearly income that could perpetually sustain an organization’s activities, older NGOs without endowment funds like WWF and Haribon have utilized a part of their unspent annual revenues to set up their own.

5. Finally, the study suggests the inclusion of the following tasks in the *action or operations research agenda* of local fund facilities:

- Evaluation of the impact of “indirect” conservation activities on the attainment of the end goals of biodiversity conservation. For instance, this question may be asked: To what extent have environmentally-aware publics or communities that have been capacitated or have received appropriate livelihood assistance been able to protect, maintain, and increase forest cover or plant and animal diversity?
- Development of key performance indicators for assessing the strengths and weaknesses in NGO and/or PO capabilities for indirectly or directly conserving, protecting, and maintaining both forest and marine/coastal ecosystems.

-
- Establishment of a common database system accessible to environmental NGOs and POs that assembles and periodically updates information on local environmental fund facilities including pertinent data on the grants they administer, maps out the location of their assisted sites, projects, and partnerships, and contains referrals to more specific information not available in the system.
 - Documentation of lessons learned in NGO-NGO, NGO-PO, and PO-PO partnerships in assisted biodiversity conservation work.

Appendices

Appendix A. MAJOR PROVISIONS ON THE TFCF

The following sections summarize and/or list the major provisions pertinent to this study's discussions on fund management and grantmaking which are found in the USG-GRP Agreements on the debt reduction and the establishment of the TFCF and the TFC Board.

- 1. *Type of the fund.*** The TFCF is a sinking fund that will receive monies from a debt reduction agreement between the USG and the GRP in accordance with the U.S. Tropical Conservation Act of 1998. This agreement allows for the termination of GRP's Old Obligation (involving eight loans for a combined principal of US\$41,377,34.63 as of October 1, 2002) in exchange for opening the New TFCA Obligation (with a new schedule of principal payments totaling US\$41,253,982.84). According to the New TFCA Obligation, the principal will be paid in 28 semi-annual payments together with the interests accruing to the Old Obligation. However, interest payments shall be made not to USG or its Agency, but to the fund that would be established as a result of the TFCA. At the closing of the Old Obligation on December 20, 2002, the GRP will make an initial interest payment that is equal to the Outstanding Interest or interest accruing to the Old Obligation from the signing of the TFC agreement to the closing date of the Old Obligation. (This was done as stipulated.) Then over a 14-year period beginning on June 1, 2003 up to December 1, 2016, the GRP shall deposit 28 semi-annual interest payments to the fund totaling US\$8,247,634.62.
- 2. *Other possible sources of monies.*** Apart from the stipulated interest payments, monies from other sources—such as public and private creditors of GRP and voluntary contributions from GRP, other governments, and nongovernment entities—may also be deposited in the fund. Any monies deposited in the fund as well as grants made from the fund will be tax free.
- 3. *Ownership of the fund.*** Deposits from GRP interest payments made to the fund are jointly owned by the Parties—USG and GRP—until these are disbursed as grants.
- 4. *Fund investment and disbursement by fiscal agent.*** A fiscal agent shall be appointed by GRP in consultation with USG by the closing date of the Old Obligation to take charge of investing and disbursing monies in the fund. GRP contract with the fiscal agent should specify its relationship with the board. The fiscal agent's responsibilities include: (1) issuing prompt, written notification to the board whenever GRP makes a deposit or if the deposit is overdue; (2) investing the deposits prudently until they are disbursed; (3) depositing returns on investment in the fund until disbursed; (4) ensuring that investments yield a positive real rate of return within acceptable limits of risk—this may include getting authorization from the Parties to convert into US dollars or other hard currencies all or part of the monies in the fund for investment purposes, or getting GRP to ensure that the value of the deposits in the fund is maintained in terms of an agreed price index; (5) developing with the board a provision for inclusion in grant agreements to recover and return to the fund any misused or misspent grant funds held by a grantee in default; (6) providing periodic reports to the board and the Parties on the status of investments; (7) disbursing grant monies from the fund to grant recipients pursuant to a grant agreement and in accordance with directions from the board, with no more than 10 Philippine business days elapsing between the fiscal agent's receipt of a direction for disbursement and the actual disbursement.
- 5. *Establishment of and membership in the TFC Board.*** The TFC Board—which is discrete and separate from any existing board, commission, foundation, or other entity—will be established by GRP in consultation with local NGO groups interested in forests. It shall have nine members, namely: two USG representatives, two GRP representatives, and five representatives of a broad range of NGO forest-related interests in the Philippines (including environmental NGOs, local community development NGOs, and the scientific, academic, and/or forestry organizations). In consultation with a range of NGO communities and with USG consent, the GRP shall appoint the five NGO representatives who shall constitute the board majority. (To date, five nominees and five alternates to

represent the NGOs in the board have already been proposed by the Philippine civil society forum to the GRP.)

Board members who represent the USG and the GRP will serve *ad honorem* and at the discretion of the naming Party. Board members representing NGOs will also serve *ad honorem* (except for reasonable administrative expenses which can be drawn from the fund subject to pre-agreed ceiling and auditing rules) and in their expert capacity for a four-year term but may be removed for malfeasance before their term ends. A member may serve consecutive terms if both Parties agree. A board member may not participate in the approval of a proposed grant if: (a) this approval will redound to economic benefits for the member as well as for anyone in the member's family, or for an organization in which the member is employed or affiliated and in which the member's family has direct financial interest; and (b) the proposed grant comes from the organization which the board member represents.

6. **Specific functions of the Board.** The TFC board has the authority from GRP to carry out administration and management of the fund, disbursements from the fund to support eligible projects, and oversight of activities financed from the fund.

With regard to general operations, the board's functions cover the following:

- a. Hire an executive director to coordinate and execute with guidance from the board all necessary actions required for the board to adequately function, including hiring necessary support with board approval.
- b. Meet at least once every three months.
- c. Adopt, by majority vote, bylaws and procedures for board operation subject to the Parties' approval. No disbursements of grant monies from the fund can be made prior to adoption of these procedures.
- d. Approve procedures and schedules for the grant process, including those relating to public announcements, grant applications and review, monitoring, and auditing.
- e. Establish and make public selection criteria for awarding grants, including means for evaluating the merits of applications and the chances of success of proposed activities.
- f. Draw sums from the fund necessary to pay for reasonable administrative expenses of the board, including auditing costs. Travel expenses and reasonable per diem for NGO members of the board may also be drawn from the fund (but such expenses for USG and GRP board members should be borne by their respective Parties). A ceiling for administrative expenses shall be set by the Parties and adjusted whenever needed, with the initial ceiling to be established within 120 Philippine business days of the entry into force of the TFC agreement.
- g. Annually present the following to the Parties based on a mutually agreed schedule:
 - (1) a plan and annual budget for the Parties' approval showing prospective activities and expected administrative and program costs, with the first plan and budget to be submitted within three months from the date of the board's establishment;
 - (2) a report on the previous year's grant activities, including multi-year activities, which provides (a) for each grant awarded, information on grant recipient, grant amount, activity funded, and status of implementation, and (b) information on the status of audits of randomly selected grants;
 - (3) a financial audit for the previous program year done by an independent auditor in accordance with generally accepted international standards, with the first audit to be presented one year from the date of the board's establishment or at such time as US\$1 Million in grants has been disbursed, whichever come first.
- h. Retain in the board's files its bylaws, written policies, operating procedures, summaries of proceedings, books, records, reports, and any organizing statutes, as well as maintain a permanent record of the decision criteria used in awarding each grant. Also grant to authorities of the requesting Party/ies access to all board documents, and make the board's bylaws, written policies and procedures, summaries of proceedings and decision criteria available for easy public inspection.

Within the grantmaking process, the board's functions are to:

- a. Issue a broad public announcement calling for grant applications, which states the purpose of the fund, eligible activities and applicants, criteria for selecting grant recipients, schedule of grants process, and other required procedures or formats established by the board;
- b. Receive grant applications for eligible activities from eligible entities and award grants after due evaluation;
- c. Endorse and present to the Parties for approval any proposed grants with life-of-project total in excess of US\$100,000. If one of the Parties disapproves the proposed grant, that Party should convey its disapproval to the board and the board will not award the proposed grant. If the proposed grants are not disapproved by either Party within 30 Philippine business days of presentation to the Parties' board members, they shall no longer be subject to disapproval.
- d. Publicly announce grants awarded by the board;
- e. Develop with each grantee a Grant Agreement outlining the terms of the grant;
- f. Monitor performance under grant agreements to determine if time schedules and other performance goals are being achieved. Grant agreements should provide for periodic progress reports from the grantees to the board.

7. **Eligible grant activities and recipients.** According to the agreement, the amounts deposited in the TFCF shall be used only to provide grants to conserve, maintain, and restore tropical forests in the Philippines through any one or more of the following six eligible activities:

- a. Establishment, restoration, protection and maintenance of parks, protected areas, and reserves.
- b. Development and implementation of scientifically sound systems of natural resource management, including land and ecosystem management practices.
- c. Training programs to increase the scientific, technical, and managerial capacities of individuals and organizations involved in conservation efforts.
- d. Restoration, protection, or sustainable use of diverse animal and plant species.
- e. Research and identification of tropical forest plant life to treat human diseases, illnesses, and health related concerns.
- f. Development and support of the livelihoods of individuals living in or near a tropical forest in a manner consistent with protecting such tropical forest.

Likewise, the agreement has specified the following to be eligible grant recipients:

- a. Nongovernmental environmental, forestry, conservation, and indigenous peoples organizations of or active in the country.
- b. Other appropriate local or regional entities of or active in the country.
- c. In exceptional circumstances, the government of the Philippines.

Priority is given, however, to projects that (a) are run by NGOs and other private entities, and (b) involve local communities in the planning and execution of such projects.

Appendix B. REFERENCES CONSULTED/CITED

On the Tropical Forest Conservation Fund:

The Civil Society Forum for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. 2002. *The Civil Society Forum on the Tropical Forest Conservation Act: A Venture into the Future of Forest Conservation Financing in the Philippines*. (Volume 1). Quezon City: Foundation for Philippine Environment. (Unpublished report)

The Civil Society Forum for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. 2002. Untitled Volume 2 – Compendium of Attachments and Annexes to accompany the Volume 1 Main Report. Quezon City: Foundation for Philippine Environment.

On Options, Issues and Practices for Establishing, Operating and Managing an Environmental Fund Facility:

Caucus of Development NGO Networks, Association of Foundations, and Philippines-Canada Joint Committee for Human Resource Development. 1997. *NGOs in a New Arena: Initial Reflections on Managing Fund Mechanism for Development*. Quezon City: CODE-NGO.

Council on Foundations. 2001. *Best Practices in Grants Management: A Project of the Grants Managers Network*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundations.

Council on Foundations, 2001. *Grantmaking Basics*. Washington D.C.: Council on Foundations. (Downloadable from <http://www.cof.org/grantmakingbasics>)

Guerin-McManus, Marianne. 1999. Structures typical of civil code legal systems. In Norris, Ruth (ed.), *The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds: A Resource Book for the Design and Operation of Environmental Funds*. New York: Pact Publications. Pp. 25-28.

Jacqz, Jane W. 1999. Preface. In Norris, Ruth (ed.), *The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds: A Resource Book for the Design and Operation of Environmental Funds*. New York: Pact Publications. Pp. 7-9.

Norris, Ruth (ed.). 1999. *The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds: A Resource Book for the Design and Operation of Environmental Funds*. New York: Pact Publications.

Red de Fondos Ambientales de LatinoAmerica y el Caribe (RedLAC). 1999. *Report on the Workshop on Capacity Strengthening and the Workshop on Monitoring and Evaluation*. Guatemala: RedLAC. (Downloadable from <http://www.redlac.org>)

Rosenzweig, Lorenzo. 1999 Environmental funds in the national context. In *The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds: A Resource Book for the Design and Operation of Environmental Funds*. New York: Pact Publications. Pp. 14-17.

Smith, Scott E. 1999. What is an environmental fund and when is it the right tool for conservation? In *The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds: A Resource Book for the Design and Operation of Environmental Funds*. New York: Pact Publications. Pp. 10-13.

Spergel, Barry. 1999. Trust funds in common law countries. In *The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds: A Resource Book for the Design and Operation of Environmental Funds*. New York: Pact Publications. Pp. 21-24.

Tavera, Carmen and Vasquez, Pilar. 1996. *Regional Consultation on National Environmental Funds (NEFs) in Latin America and the Caribbean: Profiles of the National Environmental Funds*. (Final Report). Cartagena, Colombia: Ecofondo (in collaboration with IUCN, The Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund, DAMARENA, MINAMBIENTE/Colombia, CARDIQUE, MacArthur Foundation and UNDP/C.S. Mott Foundation).

The World Bank-Global Environment Division. April 1995. *Issues and Options in the Design and Options of GEF Supported Trust Funds for Biodiversity Conservation*. Environment Department Paper #11. (Downloadable from <http://www-esd.worldbank.org/html/esd/env/publicat/edp/edp11toc.htm>)

Empirical Studies on Philippine and Foreign Environmental Fund Facilities:

Chemonics International Inc. 2001. *The Bangladesh Tropical Forest Conservation Fund: Preventing and Arresting Accelerating Species Loss in Bangladesh*. Task Order under the Biodiversity and Sustainable Forestry IQC (BIOFOR) submitted to USAID Bangladesh. Washington, D.C.: Chemonics International Inc.

_____. 2000. *External Evaluation of the Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation (IBF) Project: Yayasan Keanekaragaman Hayati*. Task Order under the biodiversity & Sustainable Forestry IQC (BIOFOR) submitted to Yayasan KEHATI and USAID Indonesia. Washington D.C.: Chemonics International Inc.

Quizon, Antonio B. 1989. A survey of government policies and programmes on non-governmental organizations in the Philippines. In Quizon, A. B. and Reyes, R. U., *A strategic assessment of non-governmental organizations in the Philippines*. Metro Manila: ANGOC. Pp. 1-17.

Quizon, Antonio B. and Lingan-Debuque, Ma. Teresa. 2001. *Advancing Understanding of Foundations in Southern Countries: Case Study of the Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE)*. New York: The Synergos Institute.

Mallari, Neil Aldrin D., Tabaranza, Blas R. Jr., and Crosby, Michael J. (with contributions from Myrissa Lepiten-Tabao and Genevieve A. Gee; in collaboration with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and Bookmark, Inc.). 2001. *Key Conservation Sites in the Philippines: A Haribon Foundation and Birdlife International Directory of Important Bird Areas*. Makati City, Philippines: Bookmark Inc.

Pielemeier, John and Williams, Margaret Jones. 2001. *Evaluation of the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica*. Final Report submitted to the Nature Conservancy and USAID.

Other References:

Community-Based Forest Management Office. n.d. *A Framework for Enterprise Development in Community-Based Forest Management*. Quezon City: Department of Environment and Natural Resources-CBFMO.

Lulock, David. A. 1997. *Improving Access to Financial Services in Forest Communities*. Prepared for USAID Manila. Quezon City: Development Alternatives, Inc.-Natural Resources Management Program.

Tesoro, Florentino O. 1999. *Community Resource Management as a Strategy for Sustainable Economic Development*. Prepared for USAID Manila. Quezon City: Development Alternatives, Inc.-Natural Resources Management Program.

Magazine:

Foundation News & Commentary. July-August 2002. (Published by the Council on Foundations, Washington, D.C.)

Annual Reports

Brochures

Websites

Appendix C. LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS

Foundation for the Philippine Environment (7)

1. Julio G. Tan, Executive Director
2. Jerome L. Montemayor, Executive Assistant
3. Leonardo B. Paat, Jr. Technical Officer
4. Fernando M. Ramirez, Regional Operations Manager-Luzon
5. Judah S. Aliposa, Regional Operations Manager-Visayas
6. Jose C. Sebua, Program Officer-Mindanao Office
7. Merlou O. Ocubillo, Staff Assistant-Mindanao Office

Philippine Business for Social Progress (4)

8. Ramon S. Derige, Associate Director, Operations Group
9. Caridad Corridor, Regional Manager-Visayas
10. Marisse Eleuterio, Program Coordinator
11. Darmy Cerence, Senior Program Officer-Bohol

World Wildlife Fund – Philippines (3)

12. Naderev M. Saño, Project Development Officer
13. Flor Punio-Lazaro, Director, Finance
14. Chrisma R. Salao, Grants Officer

Haribon (1)

15. Anabelle E. Plantilla, Executive Director

Philippine Eagle Foundation, Inc. (3)

16. Dennis I. Salvador, Executive Director
17. Jesus Amemita, Community Development Officer
18. Samuel Delloso, Community Development Officer

Informal interviewee: Valentino Q. Camino, Sr. Barangay Chairman, Ganatan, Arakan,
N. Cotabato

Appendix Table 1. Classification of FPE Priority Sites for Site-Focused CBRM Projects (2000)

Classification	Location
Land-Based	
1. Buasao Poswey, Watershed, Abra	Luzon
2. Malanas Watershed, Abra	Luzon
3. Mt. Balbalasang, Kalinga	Luzon
4. Dananao, Kalinga	Luzon
5. Northen Sierra Madre	Luzon
6. Mt. Bulusan, Sorsogon	Luzon
7. Mt. Banahaw, Quezon & Laguna	Luzon
8. Palanan, Complex Isabela, Cagayan	Luzon
9. Biak na Bato National Park, Bulacan	Luzon
10. Botolan, Zambales	Luzon
11. Mt. Mandalagan and Mt. Silay, Negros, Occidental	Visayas
12. Mt. Matutum, South, Cotabato	Mindanao
13. Mt. Malindang, Misamis, Oriental	Mindanao
14. Liguwasan Marsh, Sultan Kudarat, Maguindanao, North Cotabato	Mindanao
15. Mt. Sinaka, Bukidnon	Mindanao
16. Pulangi Watershed, Bukidnon	Mindanao
Water-Based	
1. Honda Bay, Palawan	Luzon
2. Coastal Areas, Northern Samar	Visayas
3. Lawaan-Guian Eastern Samar	Visayas
4. Coastal Areas of Aklan	Visayas
5. Nueva Valencia and Buenavista Coastal Areas, Guimaras	Visayas
6. Northwesr Panay, Peninsula	Visayas
7. Bohol Marine Triangle	Visayas
8. Tawi-tawi Bay	Mindanao
9. Lake Mainit, Agusan Del Norte, Surigao del Norte	Mindanao
10. Lanuza Bay, Surigao del Norte	Mindanao
Both	
1. Mt. Talinis and Twin Lakes, Negros Oriental	Visayas
2. Siquijor Island	Visayas
3. Dinagat Island	Mindanao

Appendix Table 2. Classification of FPE-Funded Project According to Broad Ecosystem Types (1999-2001)

	Name of Project/Ecosystem Type	Amount
1999/SITE-FOCUSED Land-Based Ecosystem		
1	Baggao Community Forestry Program	1,409,203.00
2	Biak-na-Bato National Park Conservation Project (Year 3)	1,324,150.50
3	Community Based Biodiversity Conservation of Busao Watershed and Mt. Poswey (Year 1)	1,767,842.00
4	Liguasan Marsh Integrated Conservation and Resource Management Project (Co-Financing)	1,350,000.00
5	Mount Matutum Integrated Conservation and Development (MICADEV) Project-Phase 2	3,149,647.00
6	Mt. Bulusan Volcano National Park Community Based Resource Mangement Project (Extension of Phase 1)	586,093.56
7	Panay Mountains Community Managed Biodiversity Conservation Program	908,850.00
8	Pulangi Watershed Integrated NGO/PO Community-Based Resource Management Project (Preparatory Phase)	1,013,000.00
	Subtotal 1999/SITE-FOCUSED Land-Based	11,508,786.06
1999/SITE-FOCUSED Water-Based Ecosystem		
9	Community-Based Coastal Resource Managemnet Project	1,631,220.40
10	Fisherfolk Integrated Self-help for Empowerment and Regeneration Project	944,750.00
11	Participatory Environmental Action for Coastal Empowerment (PEACE) (Year 1)	724,500.00
	Subtotal 1999/SITE-FOCUSED Water-Based	3,300,470.40
1999/SITE-FOCUSED Both		
12	Dinagat Island Community Resource Management Program-Phase 2 (Year 1)	2,086,800.00
13	Mt. Talinis and Twin Lakes Community-Based Biodiversity Projects (Phase 1 Extension)	496,606.00
	Subtotal 1999/SITE-FOCUSED Both	2,583,406.00
1999/SITE-FOCUSED Others		
	Subtotal 1999/SITE-FOCUSED Others	0
1999/PROACTIVE Land-Based Ecosystem		
14	Agroforestry Training Impact and Needs Assessment	100,000.00
15	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Capability Development Program	1,035,838.00
16	Exemplary Practices on Environment and Sustainable Development (PRRM)	199,000.00
17	Luzon Ecosystems Agenda (Luzon Partners and Regional (Visayas) Advisory Committees)	1,000,000.00
18	National Genetic Conservation Program: Integrated Seed-Banking Expansion (Year 2)	1,024,080.00
19	National Stakeholders Meeting (Ayta, Zambales)	394,250.00
20	Regional Stakeholders Meeting (Miriam- PEACE)	1,050,000.00
21	Showing Community-Based Resource Management Project for Sustainable Development in Zambales and Bohol (Co-financing w/ Keidanren Nature Conservation Fund)	313,212.00
22	Visayas Ecosystems Agenda (Visayas Partners and Regional (Luzon) Advisory Committees)	1,000,000.00
	Subtotal 1999/PROACTIVE Land-Based Ecosystem	6,116,380.00
1999/PROACTIVE Water-Based Ecosystem		
	Subtotal 1999/PROACTIVE Water-Based Ecosystem	0
1999/PROACTIVE Both		
23	Environmental Legal Defense Program for Negros (Twin-lakes/Mt. Talinis) (Year 1)	970,000.00
24	Environmental Legal Defense Program for Visayas and Palawan	1,987,000.00
25	Mindanao Ecosystems Agenda (Mindanao partners and regional (Mindanao) Advisory Committee)	1,000,000.00
26	Radio Communications Network Project	2,373,674.00
27	Training and Legal Assistance for Endefense Minadanao (Year 3)	2,258,895.00
	Subtotal 1999/PROACTIVE Both	8,589,569.00
1999/PROACTIVE Others		
28	Annual Partner's Meeting (Visayas Cooperative Development Center Inc.)	1,500,000.00
	Subtotal 1999/PROACTIVE Others	1,500,000.00
1999/ACTION GRANTS Land-Based Ecosystem		
29	Consultations among Stakeholders of Mt. Apo Natural Park	94,500.00
30	Cross Visit/Lakbay Aral (MUAD, Negros)	95,000.00
31	Developing CBCRM Reference Group and Capabilities for Monitoring CRM/ICM Initiatives	100,000.00
32	Environmental Sanitation in Tabuk	72,250.00
33	Higaonon Meetings	50,000.00
34	IPO Sub-Regional Congress	100,000.00
35	Jubilee Chain	50,000.00
36	Kontra Logging	27,000.00

	Name of Project/Ecosystem Type	Amount
37	KPLN General Assembly	50,000.00
38	Libjo Agro-forestry Demonstration Farm	100,000.00
39	Living with the Land: Interdisciplinary Effort for Adaptive Decision Making	20,000.00
40	Mt. Madalagan Livelihood Project	100,000.00
41	National Conference on Management of Mountain Ecosystems	31,000.00
42	Pagbabalangkang ng Kaplano	100,000.00
43	Paralegal Training and Campaign Planning	28,000.00
44	Permaculture Development Education Training Project	99,500.00
45	Project Preparation of Mountain Ecosystem in Mindanao	100,000.00
46	Rediscovering Earth Stewardship	70,000.00
47	Roundtable Discussion on Facilitate Access to GEF (Miriam- PEACE)	100,000.00
48	Stakeholders Action Environmental Protection in Camarines Norte	52,500.00
49	Strengthening the Manobo in Bukidnon	100,000.00
	Subtotal 1999/ACTION GRANTS Land-Based Ecosystem	1,539,750.00
	1999/ACTION GRANTS Water-Based Ecosystem	
50	Capability Training on Environment and Coastal Resource Management and Protection inTayabas Bay	100,000.00
51	Consolidating Fisherfolk Communitis and Local Government in Carcancarlan towards Sustainable Resource Management	100,000.00
52	Earth Day (Pasig)	70,000.00
53	Environmental Campaign and Earth Day Concert for a River's Birth	65,000.00
54	Tawi-tawi Celebes Sea Conservaiton Project	85,000.00
	Subtotal 1999/ACTION GRANTS Water-Based Ecosystem	420,000.00
	1999/ACTION GRANTS Both	
55	12th Philippine Environmental Congress	100,000.00
56	Biodiversity Protection and Conservation Media	100,000.00
57	Consultation to Validate Guidebook on Localizing Sustainable Development (PROCESS-Panay)	94,000.00
58	Education Campaign on IP Rights	41,400.00
59	Environmental Art Workshop	98,000.00
60	Firefly Brigade: Clean Air Campaign	50,000.00
61	Production of Environmental Education Modules and Activity Books	100,000.00
	Subtotal 1999/ACTION GRANTS Both	583,400.00
	1999/ACTION GRANTS Others	
61	CSCCSD 4th General Assembly (Civil Society Counterpart Council for Sustainable Development)	100,000.00
62	Production Assistance for FPE (Kaliwat Theatre Group)	100,000.00
63	Project Proposal Writing (AVCPRAD)	100,000.00
64	Regional Training of Speakers on Genetic Engineering for Mindanao (Southeast Asia Regional Institute)	99,500.00
65	Workshop of NGO-Managed Funding Mechanism and Donor-managed Fund Facilities (Caucus of Dev't NGO Networks)	100,000.00
66	Workshop on Making Sustainable Development Happen (SAC-Dumaguete)	99,600.00
	Subtotal 1999/ACTION GRANTS Others	599,100.00
	2000/SITE-FOCUSED Land-Based Ecosystem	
1	Arakan Community-Bsed Resource Management for Forest Corridor Development	1,000,000.00
2	Bolos Point Community-Based Resource Management Project	1,370,100.00
3	Community-Based Biodiversity of Buasao Watershed and Mt. Poswey -Year 2	1,796,346.00
4	Community-Based Resource Management at Sta.Margarita Baggao, Cagayan	1,499,200.00
5	Integ. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Ancestral Domains in the Zambales Mountain Range	1,650,000.00
6	Malanas Watershed, Mt. Pultoc, Mt. Agapang, Mt. Ticma,Mt. Lamonan and Mt. Balutictic of the Cordillera Mountian Range-Rapid Site Assessment	250,000.00
7	Matutum Integrated Conservation & Development Project -Phase 2- Yaer 2	1,894,955.00
8	Mt. Balbalasang Northern Sierra Madre Cordillera Region- Rapid Site Assessment	250,000.00
9	Mt. Bulusan Volcano National Park Community Bsed Resource Management -Phase 2- Year 4	1,300,000.00
10	Mt. Malindang Biodiversity Conservation	1,453,600.00
11	Northern and Southern Aurora Cordillera of Sierra Madre-Rapid Site Assessment	250,000.00
12	Northern Negros Mountain Range	249,500.00
13	Pagtaron-Tangkulan Range Communtiy-Based Resource Management	1,000,000.00
14	PAMB Capacity Building and Strngthening & Community-Based Resource Management for Mt.	2,661,300.00

Name of Project/Ecosystem Type		Amount
	Banahaw & Mt. San Cristobal	
15	Paranas Community-Based Forest Management	1,050,400.00
16	Strengthening and Enhancing Mansaka Cultural Communities for Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development in Maragusan Valley	480,000.00
	Subtotal 2000/SITE-FOCUSED Land-Based Ecosystem	18,155,401.00
	2000/SITE-FOCUSED Water-Based Ecosystem	
17	Bohol Marine Triangle Project OHOL MARINE TRIANGLE PROJECT	2,650,000.00
18	Lake Mainit Biodiversity Conservation Project- Preparatory Phase	1,000,000.00
19	Northern Samar Participatory Environmental Action for Coastal Empowerment	994,050.00
20	Stakeholders' Consultation for the Coastal Resources in the Province of Siquijor	119,000.00
	Subtotal 2000/SITE-FOCUSED Water-Based Ecosystem	4,763,050.00
	2000/SITE-FOCUSED Both	
21	Aklan Coast/Nueva Valencia and Buena Vista in Guimaras Province- Rapid Site Assessment	500,000.00
22	Advancing Biodiversity Conservation for Tawi-tawi Management	1,151,060.00
23	Master Plan for Mt. Talinis and Twin Lakes	1,350,000.00
24	Northwest Panay Biodiversity Conservation Project	1,448,339.00
	Subtotal 2000/SITE-FOCUSED Both	4,449,399.00
	2000/SITE-FOCUSED Others	0
	Subtotal 2000/SITE-FOCUSED Others	0
	2000/PROACTIVE Land-Based Ecosystem	
25	Community Land-use Mapping and Planning for Biak-na-Bato, Buasao Watershed, Baggao and Mt. Bulusan	559,628.00
26	Endefense Case Support for Mt. Matutum DENROS	350,000.00
27	Strategic Evaluation of Environmental Endefense as Proactive Program	449,500.00
28	Program to Enhance NGO/PO Agroforestry Capabilities for Food Security and the Environment	1,199,996.00
	Subtotal 2000/PROACTIVE Land-Based Ecosystem	2,559,124.00
	2000/PROACTIVE Water-Based Ecosystem	0
	Subtotal 2000/PROACTIVE Water-Based Ecosystem	0
	2000/PROACTIVE Both	
29	Environmental Defense Radio Communication Project- Phase 2	1,305,500.00
30	Biodiversity Conservation Priority Setting Workshop	1,000,000.00
31	Community Mapping Training for Mt. Malindang, Dinagat Island and Mt. Matutum	349,940.00
32	Community-Based Resource Management Workshop Evaluation	800,000.00
33	Environment Defense Activities and Policy Research	5,600,000.00
	Subtotal 2000/PROACTIVE Both	9,055,440.00
	2000/PROACTIVE Others	
34	Strategic Planning	550,000.00
35	Luzon RCC Consultation	100,000.00
36	RAC-Partners 2000 Meeting	1,500,000.00
	Subtotal 2000/PROACTIVE Others	2,150,000.00
	2000/ACTION GRANTS Land-Based Ecosystem	
37	A Bible Scan of Ecological and Environmental Disaster	100,000.00
38	A Roundtable Discussion of the Sustainable Forestry Management Bill	22,000.00
39	A Training Course on Watershed Planning and Management	100,000.00
40	Agroforestry Training	100,000.00
41	Ancestral Domain Management Plan Validation Information, Education Prior and Informed Consent	100,000.00
42	Bahanggunian para sa Bundok Banahaw	100,000.00
43	Boundary Conflict Resolution Through Community Mapping and Testimony of Elders	57,130.00
44	Capability Building for Local Watershed Development Managers	96,000.00
45	Community Assistance for the Ancestral Domain Management Plan in Sagada Mountain Province	49,500.00
46	Comprehensive Communication and Mobilization Program (NATRIPAL)	88,000.00
47	Confiscation of Illegal Cut Lumber and Fitches in Aurora Province	100,000.00
48	Gattaren Stakeholders Consultative Workshop (Cagayan Valley)	57,035.00
49	Great Jubilee Pilgrimage Against Hunger (Agrarian Reform)	100,000.00
50	Manual on the Process towards the Recognition and Development of Ancestral Domain Management Program	67,000.00
51	Orientaiton Seminar on CBFM in MT. Apo National Park	96,500.00

	Name of Project/Ecosystem Type	Amount
52	Pagsandiwa, Indigenous People's Theatre Festival	100,000.00
53	Pananaliksik, Dokumentasyon at Paglilimbag ng Bahangguninan para sa Bundok Banahaw	100,000.00
54	Pangangalaga sa Lupaing Ninuno ng mga Tagbanua	53,450.00
55	PHILDHARRA National Sustainable Integrated Area Development Conference	100,000.00
56	Rainforest Farming Training for Indigenous People-Mindanao	50,000.00
57	Regional Indigenous People's and Environment Month Celebration	100,000.00
58	SARAGPUNTA Leadership Training	41,530.00
59	Strengthening the Environmental Defense of Bantay Banahaw	82,356.00
60	The Philippine Rainforest Exhibit	100,000.00
	Subtotal 2000/ACTION GRANTS Land-Based Ecosystem	1,960,501.00
	2000/ACTION GRANTS Water-Based Ecosystem	
61	Aquatic/Marine Product Trading and Development	100,000.00
62	Continuing Capability Building Coastal Resource Management Planning/Project Development among NGOS/POS/LGUS	100,000.00
63	Exposure Exchange Visit to Advance Coastal Resource Management Initiatives	30,000.00
64	GANGU: A Study on the Indigenous Fishing Technology	100,000.00
65	IEC Materials for Coastal Component of OTRADEV CBRM	100,000.00
66	Lanuza Bay CBCRM Planning	100,000.00
67	MISORET Water Development and Management Framework Plan Formulation	99,900.00
68	Mobilization for Probe Team in Lanuza Bay	100,800.00
69	Multi-Sectoral Convenors Forum on Catubig River Basin	82,400.00
70	Northern Samar Skills Competition	60,000.00
71	Pahingalay sa Ilog Pasig	50,000.00
72	Para-legal Training (Samar)	100,000.00
73	Participatory Coastal Resource Assessment Trainer's Training Lanuza Bay	100,000.00
	Subtotal 2000/ACTION GRANTS Water-Based Ecosystem	1,123,100.00
	2000/ACTION GRANTS Both	
74	A Training Program for Peace, Sustainable Development and Earth Charter Values	100,000.00
75	A Video Documentary: Our Changing World	100,000.00
76	Bio-regional Development Planning	100,000.00
77	Meeting of Environmental Leaders	30,000.00
78	Prosecutors' Conference on Environmental Laws	37,000.00
79	Public Information Campaigns for Earth Day 2000	100,000.00
80	Samar Island Multi-Sectoral Consultation Workshop	150,000.00
81	Save Macani Island: An Advocacy Campaign	150,000.00
	Subtotal 2000/ACTION GRANTS Both	767,000.00
	2000/ACTION GRANTS Others	
82	Baguio City Solid Waste Management (Brown Envi.)	100,000.00
83	International C.O. Workshop	100,000.00
84	Mindanao Regional Congress (Pamanaka sa Pilipinas)	100,000.00
85	Mobilization Assistance (Kapunungan sa Pagpanalipod ug Pagpalambo sa Kinaiyahan, Inc.)	14,990.00
86	Stakeholders Seminar Workshop (kapunungan sa pagpanalipod ug Paglambo sa Kinaiyahan, Inc.)	100,000.00
	Subtotal 2000/ACTION GRANTS Others	414,990.00
	2001/SITE-FOCUSED Land-Based Ecosystem	
1	Biak-na-Bato National Park Conservation Project	2,646,162.50
2	Biodiversity Conservation Project for Mt. Malindag	1,333,150.00
3	Community-Based Biodiversity Conservation of Buasao Watershed and Mt. Poswey	1,464,338.00
4	Mt. Bulusan Volcano National Park Community Based Resource Management Project	1,452,000.00
5	MT. Matutum Integrated and Development Program	1,673,875.00
6	North Negros Forest Reserve Community Based Conservation Project	1,445,802.00
7	PAMB Capacity Building and Strengthening and Community Based Resource Management of Mts. Banahaw and San Cristobal	2,258,154.20
8	Pulangi Watershed Integrated NGO/PO Community Resource Management Project	1,452,732.00
	Subtotal 2001/SITE-FOCUSED Land-Based Ecosystem	13,726,213.70
	2001/SITE-FOCUSED Water-Based Ecosystem	
9	Fisherfolk Integrated Self Help for Empowerment and Regeneration	1,559,250.00
10	Guiuan Community Based Coastal Resource Management	1,462,240.00
11	Paranas Community Based Coastal Management	909,600.00

Name of Project/Ecosystem Type		Amount
Subtotal 2001/SITE-FOCUSED Water-Based Ecosystem		3,931,090.00
2001/SITE-FOCUSED Both		
12	Dinagat Island Community Based Resource Management Project	2,899,000.00
13	Mt. Talinis and Twin Lakes Community Based Biodiversity Conservation Project	1,346,400.00
Subtotal 2001/SITE-FOCUSED Both		4,245,400.00
2001/SITE-FOCUSED Others		
Subtotal 2001/SITE-FOCUSED Others		0
2001/PROACTIVE Land-Based Ecosystem		
14	FPE Participation to the Conference on Protected Areas	600,000.00
15	Program to Enhance NGO/PO Agroforestry Capabilities for Food Security and the Environment	1,434,181.00
Subtotal 2001/PROACTIVE Land-Based Ecosystem		2,034,181.00
2001/PROACTIVE Water-Based Ecosystem		
16	Lanuza Bay Area Integrated Coastal Resource Management Program	726,200.00
Subtotal 2001/PROACTIVE Water-Based Ecosystem		726,200.00
2001/PROACTIVE Both		
17	Community Based Resource Management Followthrough Workshop (Center for Participatory Governance)	420,000.00
18	Escalating Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Appreciation in the Regions	2,000,000.00
19	Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Priority Workshop Setting Proceedings Product Development	1,540,000.00
Subtotal 2001/PROACTIVE Both		3,960,000.00
2001/PROACTIVE Others		
20	FPE 10 Year Impact Assessment (*proponent still to be identified)	800,000.00
21	RAC-Partners-EAP 2002 Meeting (Paglilingkod Batas Pangkapatiran Foundation, Inc.)	2,163,546.00
Subtotal 2001/PROACTIVE Others		2,963,546.00
2001/ACTION GRANTS Land-Based Ecosystem		
22	Fact Finding Mission to Proposed Coal Fired Power Plant	100,000.00
23	IPRA Workshop: Surfacing Legal Issues	133,215.00
24	Northern Mindanao Antilogging Human Barricade Campaign	14,000.00
25	10th Annual Symposium and Scientific Meeting of the Wildlife Society	150,000.00
26	2001 Civil Society Assessment of the Implementation of the Agenda 21	150,000.00
27	Amyakmalew Challenge (Mahintana Foundation)	60,000.00
28	Assistance in the Production of the Sourcebook on the Sustainable Agriculture and Seed System	130,000.00
29	Biodiversity Monitoring System in Mt. Bulusan	147,800.00
30	Environmental Investigative Mission in Mauban Quezon	69,000.00
31	Establishment of CB Biodiversity in Rajah, Sikatuna Bohol (soil & water)	150,000.00
32	Exposure Trip to Rainforestation Project on the CBRM Follow Through Workshop	100,000.00
33	Flora of Mindanao Symposium-Workshop	100,000.00
34	Forest Protection and Law Enforcement Training Workshop	100,000.00
35	Project Proposal Development of Pulangi	150,000.00
36	Publication of Conference Papers (Cordillera)	66,000.00
37	Re-building a Collaborative and Concerted Forestry Policy Campaign	100,000.00
38	Region 2 Advocacy Against Mining	100,000.00
39	Rountable Discussion on the Assessment of NIPAS AND CPPAP	44,000.00
40	Training Workshop on Gender and Marketing for Small Enterprise Development Program	100,000.00
41	Vermiculture and Vermicast Project	139,160.00
Subtotal 2001/ACTION GRANTS Land-Based Ecosystem		2,103,175.00
2001/ACTION GRANTS Water-Based Ecosystem		
42	Arevalo Bay Stakeholders Consultation Workshop	100,000.00
43	Boundary Demarcation of Marine Sanctuaries in Batanes Protected Landscapes and Seascapes	141,970.00
44	Capability and Advocay to Save Taal Lake and Ecosystem	150,000.00
45	Capability Building of Magpa-suague River	99,550.00
46	First Conference Workshop on the Protection and Conservation of the Camotes Sea	100,000.00
47	Fisherfolk Integrated Self-help for Empowerment	150,000.00
48	Maqueda Bay Forum: Current Issues and Challenges	45,000.00
49	Marine Sancutary Development and Sustainability Biodiversity Conservation Natural Resource Management	150,000.00
50	People's Plan: Saving the people who save the river, an eath day 2001 celebration	121,900.00

	Name of Project/Ecosystem Type	Amount
51	Proposal for Boat Purchase	110,000.00
52	Rapid Aquatic and Resource Assessment Barangays Magsaysay & Helen in the Municipality of Loreto, Dinagat Island, Surigao Del Norte	145,000.00
53	Seminar Workshop on the Formulation of Fishery Management Plan for Calbayog City	81,000.00
54	Under Da Sea, IEC Thru Television	150,000.00
	Subtotal 2001/ACTION GRANTS Water-Based Ecosystem	1,544,420.00
	2001/ACTION GRANTS Both	
55	A Case Study on Eco Tourism on Jumabo Island	50,000.00
56	A Judges Conference- The Environment on a Scale	150,000.00
57	Banking for the Environment Investing for the Future: A Symposium Workshop	70,700.00
58	CBRM Follow Through Workshop- Transportation Cost	130,000.00
59	Consultation Forum on How to Operationalize the Environmental Agenda 2000	150,000.00
60	Earthday 2001:An IEC Campaign	150,000.00
61	Environmental Legal Assistance for the CSOS	50,000.00
62	Project for the Evaluation and Strengthening of Balik-Kalikasan, Environment Newspaper	150,000.00
63	Saving Biodiversity through People's Barricade	100,000.00
64	Seminar Workshop on Working Together for Sustainable Development and PA 21	150,000.00
	Subtotal 2001/ACTION GRANTS Both	1,150,700.00
	2001/ACTION GRANTS Others	
65	A song for Criazel, Tribute Concert (Task Force for Bases Clean Up)	10,000.00
66	Expanding Philippine Participation to the ESCAP Virtual Conference	120,000.00
67	Mindanao Social Development Week	80,000.00
68	National Genetic Conference Workshop-Mindanao (Sibol ng Agham at Teknolohiya, Inc.)	100,000.00
69	National Genetic Conference Workshop-Visayas (Sibol ng Agham at Teknolohiya, Inc.)	100,000.00
70	Training of Teachers in Project Learning and Wet	55,200.00
	Subtotal 2001/ACTION GRANTS Others	465,200.00

Appendix Table 3. Classification of PBSP Projects by Broad Ecosystem Type (2001)

Type/Project Title	AMOUNT
I. Land-Based	
1 Assistance to Business Sector Involvement in the CIC Watershed	49,800.00
2 Development of Watershed Stakeholder Consensus Mechanism Assistance Project	185,500.00
3 Reforestation for Agro-Forestry Development Assistance	382,262.50
4 Towards Watershed Development Agenda for NGOs in Northern Mindanao	280,900.00
5 Catbalogan ARM Reforestation and Agroforestry -- Year 5	262,504.13
6 Construction of Bagulin Multi Purpose Tribal Hall	300,000.00
7 San Antonio Agro-Forestry Project	1,000,000.00
8 Bato-Balani Foundation, Inc. Balikatan 2001 - Trees Amigos	25,000.00
9 Cebu Integrated Watershed Resource Management Program - Year 5	1,636,591.00
10 Sudlon 2 Reforestation Project Batch 3	209,950.00
11 Samal Island Watershed Protection and Development Project - Year 2	262,200.00
12 Employee Volunteers for the Environment Project	15,879.60
13 Bago Upland Resource Management Program	1,752,189.30
14 Bago City Environment and Natural Resources Executive Committee Institution Building Project Year 1	340,000.00
15 BURMP - DWHH / German Agro Action Forest Enhancement Project Year 1	655,850.00
16 BURMP - DWHH / GAA Reforestation Project Year 1	490,000.00
17 Ilijan Community Development Project - Supplemental Budget	26,172.00
18 Ilijan Forest Enhancement Project	231,000.00
19 Upland Resource Management and People's Development Assistance Project Years 2 & 3	9,761,895.00
20 Dalayap and Tugason Upland Farmers Production Assistance Project	383,800.00
21 Samar Field Office Integrated Farming Systems Training (upland farmers)	15,277.75
22 Vermi Production and Organic Fertilizer Distribution Project	400,000.00
23 Expansion of the Technology Caravan for HGA ARMs	500,000.00
24 Technology Caravan for the HGA ARM	300,000.00
25 Productivity Enhancement Project for the Tri People Women in Brgy. Nalapaan	110,000.00
26 Bandera Upland Productivity Improvement Project - Year 3	275,200.00
27 Nagkakaisang mga Tribu ng Palawan (NATRIPAL) Resource Center	300,000.00
28 T'boli Multi -- Purpose Cooperative Construction Assistance Project	300,000.00
29 BURMP - DWHH / German Agro Action Agro-Forestry Project Year 1	499,810.00
30 Building Up the Financial Sustainability of the Katutubong Samahan ng Pilipinas	2,512,698.00
31 Indigenous People's program - Phase II	950,000.00
32 KASAPI Endowment Fund	1,500,000.00
33 Sustaining Initiatives of KASAPI Yr 3	701,540.00
Subtotal Land Based	26,616,019.28

II. Water-Based		
1	Maqueda Bay Broodstock Development Project - Year 3	1,155,596.00
2	Maqueda Bay Mangrove Reforestation Phase 3 Project	300,000.00
3	Pandan Weaving Pilot Project (for fisherfolks)	100,000.00
4	Sta. Rosa Talima Mangrove Refo and Rehab Project	90,000.00
5	Documentation and Sharing of the Ragay Gulf Community-Based Coastal Resource Management Program	456,000.00
6	Save the Dugong of Samal Island Project - Year 2	336,075.00
7	Integrated Small Island Livelihood Alternatives in NE Palawan	2,000,000.00
8	Pangan-an Rainwater Catchment Project	100,000.00
9	Ragay Coastal Area Resource Management Program - Year 5	644,981.00
10	Yakan Multi Purpose Learning Center Project	300,000.00
	Subtotal Water Based	5,482,652.00
III. Both		
1	Catbalogan ARM Operating Budget - Year 5 (farmers and fishermen)	893,801.00
2	Typhoon Reming and Senyang Rehab Project (upland and coastal)	249,900.00
3	Social Development Management Center's Institution Building and Local Governance	2,270,124.00
4	Preparatory Phase for Olango Island Development Project	141,000.00
	Subtotal Both	3,554,825.00
IV. Others		
1	Bohol ARM Program Phase II - Year 2	2,165,848.00
2	Bohol ARM - Kabir Production Pilot Project	209,115.00
3	Bohol ARM Agri - Technology Dissemination	102,500.00
4	First Consolidated Bank of Bohol Foundation Irrigation Facilities Project	168,750.00
5	San Miguel Technology Center Enhancement Project Yr 1	355,000.00
6	Financial Sustainability Assistance Project for Three Farmer Groups in Laguindingan	383,800.00
7	Catbalogan ARM Health Services Project - Year 2	213,448.90
8	Catbalogan Program Supplemental Budget	180,682.00
9	Impact Assessment Study and Program Audit Support - Davao Del Sur	350,000.00
10	Mindanao Regional Operations Staff Salary Assistance Project	296,636.29
11	Child Labor Project in Region 1 - Development Phase	189,740.00
12	Operating Support for Philip Morris Outreach Project in La Union	548,933.00
13	Philip Morris School Building Outreach Program	1,777,627.00
14	Installation of Computer at the Center for Technical Training Excellence	2,000.00
15	Laguna High Growth Area - Year V	450,822.00
16	Liliw Farmers' Multi Cropping Project	600,000.00
17	Magtanim ng Gulay sa Liliw Multi Purpose Coop Multi Purpose Center	300,000.00
18	Medical -- Dental Mission, Bukal, Liliw, Laguna	88,094.00
19	Paaral Center for Technical Training Excellence Study Now Pay Later Educational Fund	900,000.00
20	Bacayan Credit Facility Project	160,000.00
21	Bacayan Multi-Purpose Center Project	300,000.00
22	Banilad Center for Professional Development Study-Now-Sponsor-a scholar-later Project	400,000.00
23	Brgy. Ermita Feeding Project	10,000.00

24	Lapu-Lapu City Science and Technology Education Center, Study Now, Sponsor a Scholar Later	400,000.00
25	Mactan Credit Facility Project	160,000.00
26	Management Training Institute Project - Preparatory Phase	400,000.00
27	Maomawan Agri-Trading Project	47,500.00
28	Marketing Support Project for Hillyland - Year 2	499,000.00
29	Maomawan Multi-Purpose Cooperative Chrysanthemum Production Project	116,000.00
30	Outstanding Farmer of the Year Contest	11,347.00
31	Pong-ol Sibugay Chrysanthemum Production Project	96,000.00
32	SUFALTRAS Vegetable Production Project	60,000.00
33	Tabok Credit Facility Fund	160,000.00
34	Center for Rural Technology Development Verification of Farming Technologies	1,668,292.00
35	Financial Sustainability Program for PBSP Partners in High Growth Areas	5,012,206.00
36	Technology Management Program - Yr 5	1,832,593.00
37	Bagong Pag Asa Day Care Upgrading Project	689.50
38	Muntinlupa Development Foundation Financial Sustainability Project	2,500,000.00
39	NCR-HGA Operating Support for FY 2000-01	273,424.00
40	Taguig Community Partnership for Health Assistance Project	250,000.00
41	Unilab Health Assistance Project	210,100.80
42	Water For Life Project	22,966.34
43	Decorticator Machine for Waste Recovery and Processing Assistance Project	200,000.00
44	Enhancing Community-Based Volunteers Philippine Family Planning and Maternal and Child Health Program - North Cotabato	139,500.00
45	Support for the End-of-Program Evaluation and Audit NCARM	400,000.00
46	Brgy. Sisi Elementary School Building Project	18,706.00
47	Financial Sustainability Assistance for the Association of Construction Workers	372,520.00
48	MCPI Product Distribution Project	40,000.00
49	Construction of MUAI Multi-Purpose Training Center Project	300,000.00
50	Construction of Reina Regente Multi-Purpose Center Project	300,000.00
51	Koronadal Training and Multi Purpose Center Assistance Project	300,000.00
52	Lumbangan Community Multi-Purpose Center	300,000.00
53	Macangcong Multi Purpose Cooperative Center	295,000.00
54	Notre Dame University Library Rehab Project	300,000.00
55	Oro Integrated Cooperative Entrepreneurship Hall Construction Assistance Project	300,000.00
56	SAMATIKU Training Center Improvement Project	300,000.00
57	San Isidro De Mannga Multi -- Purpose Cooperative	300,000.00
58	Sultan sa Baronguis Community Training Center	300,000.00
59	Asian Community Trust (ACT) Resource Desk - XI	156,800.00
60	CCA Education and Youth Development Support Project - Year 3	630,800.00
61	KAKASAKA-SUGBU Educational Support Project - Year 2	571,900.00
62	Bridge Financing for Payment of Loan to Preda	474,491.19
63	BURMP - DWHH / German Agro Action Health and Social Services Project Year 1	160,450.00
64	BURMP - DWHH / GAA Instiution Building Project Year 1	255,000.00
65	Rehabilitation Support to Bago Federation of Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Multi Purpose Cooperative	375,000.00
66	Supplemental Budget for the PPSE Program in Kapitan Ramon	198,188.00
67	Year 2001 Coca-Cola LRSH Program Admin Budget	652,700.00
68	Citibank Centers for Computer Education	2,651,400.00
69	Insular Life Computer Laboratory	600,000.00

70	An Impact Assessment and Program Measurement Study ABS-CBN	213,325.00
71	Archbishop of Manila for the National Congress of the Laity -- Pilipinas Kao	4,000.00
72	Barangay Malinao Chapel -- Pilipinas Kao	5,000.00
73	Bunawan Community Assistance Program	50,000.00
74	Center for Corporate Citizenship Program Development FY 2000 - 2001	1,147,496.00
75	Employee Volunteerism Survey	106,129.74
76	Kythe Foundation's Child Life Program - United Way International / Citigroup Foundation	500,000.00
77	People's Christ Centered Cooperative Institute Medical Assistance Project	58,855.75
78	Philip Morris, Phils School Building and Donation of Text Books for Tanauan	910,512.00
79	Project Blue Sky - Ateneo	202,973.83
80	Promoting HIV / AIDS Education - Prevention in the Workplace	51,000.00
81	San Jose Mangagawa Job Placement Apostolate -- Pilipinas Kao	55,000.00
82	Tagundin High School Alumni Foundation -- Pilipinas Kao	20,000.00
83	Tuloy Foundation's Alternative Education of Street Children and Out-of-School Youth Project - United Way International / Citigroup Foundation	1,920,002.00
84	The Lord's Flock Catholic Charismatic Ministry Foundation, Inc. - Pilipinas KAO	2,000.00
85	Master Teacher Training Program	271,572.88
86	RISE / Mindanao Upgrade of Teachers	61,600.00
87	Sa Aklat, Sisikat Reading Program -- Petron Foundation	1,000,000.00
88	FREED Rural Electrification Project Program Administration	640,000.00
89	Brgy. Saniag Water System Development Project	350,000.00
90	Datu Odin Sinsuat Coco Crusher and Server Machine Assistance Project	250,000.00
91	Dole Support to the Supplemental Feeding Program for Maguindanao	546,524.00
92	Enhancing Community-Based Volunteers in Promoting Family and Maternal and Child Health Programs - Jolo	116,250.00
93	Enhancing Community-Based Volunteers in Promoting Family and Maternal and Child Health Programs - Maguindanao	232,500.00
94	Enhancing Community-Based Volunteers in Promoting Family and Maternal and Child Health Programs - Zamboanga Peninsula	93,000.00
95	Expansion of Women in Enterprise Literacy Resource Center	300,000.00
96	Institution Building Assistance to PBSP-Mindanao Partners	500,000.00
97	Medical Assistance for Evacuees in Maguindanao	668,748.00
98	Needs Assessment and Community Organizing Project	2,177,906.00
99	Pineapple Production for Maguindanao Evacuees	155,302.00
100	Provision of Cold Chain Facilities in Support of the Immunity Project	150,000.00
101	Relief Assistance for Displaced Children in Mindanao	225,000.00
102	Support to the Supplemental Feeding of Children in Dawah Center Project	200,000.00
103	CNDR - Mt. Mayon	5,000.00
104	Mayon Volcano Relief Assistance	1,066,000.00
105	Relief Donations for Mt. Mayon Victims	76,500.00
106	Science Laboratory General Fund	276,792.12
107	Stella Maris Academy Science Lab	62,406.00
108	Capability Building Project for the Expansion Areas in Kapitan Ramon Yr 2	912,700.00
109	San Vicente I Capability Building Project: Terminal Year Silay City	570,925.00
110	7th 5-year Planning	30,000.00
111	Annual Membership Meeting	300,000.00
112	Communication Program for CEOs / NGOs / Partners / Public 2001	2,772,300.00
113	External Audit of the SMC / SMF-Agribusiness Community Livelihood	150,000.00
114	Festival of Trees 2000	1,860,382.63
115	Golf Tournament 2001	3,611,845.91

116 Institutional Financial Audit	1,157,000.00
117 Library Development / Enhancement	313,821.00
118 Membership Maintenance and Development in Mindanao Project	100,000.00
119 Mindanao Annual Membership Meeting	150,000.00
120 Membership Involvement Program Operating and Membership Servicing FY 2000-01	561,876.00
121 Office of the Group Directorate Membership and Corporate Involvement Program	595,400.00
122 President's Discretionary Fund	50,000.00
123 Resource Mobilization Program	100,000.00
124 Visayas Annual Membership Meeting	100,000.00
125 Asia Confers 1:Prospects for Tri-Sectoral Partnerships in Asia	1,024,140.00
126 CAFO's Programs for Asian Growth and Development	7,633,629.98
127 Capacity Building for South East Asian Civil Society Resource Organizations Through Professional Exchange	734,400.00
128 Capacity Building of Civil Society Resource Organization in Asia - Phase 2	1,275,000.00
129 Civil Society Forum on Asian Vision and the CAFO General Conference 2001	819,312.00
130 Capability Building Project for KAMAHARI Agri-Base Multi Purpose Cooperative--Extension III	5,000,262.91
131 Kamahari Building Fund	120,000.00
132 Supplementary Funding for KAMAHARI Capability Building Support	408,392.44
133 Western Batangas Agrarian Reform Communities Support Project	11,079,116.67
134 Donor Advised Fund II	7,705,966.45
135 Red Tab Foundation 2 - Business Planning	835,450.00
136 Red Tab Foundation Case Management Project - Year 2	612,260.00
137 Improving the Credit Management Processes of the SMEC program	1,980,000.00
138 Micro Enterprise Access to Banking Services Replication	2,200,000.00
139 Building Local Tri-Sectoral partnership for POSCYD Project	138,000.00
140 Board Governance Workshop	247,000.00
141 CARE Bangladesh Study Tour	808,286.95
142 Developing a Standardized Curriculum on HIV / AIDS-Philippine National AIDS Council -- Department of Health	1,000,000.00
143 Geographical Information Systems	324,000.00
144 Manualization Project on the Prevention and Control Disease in Mortuary Practices	1,000,000.00
145 Peer Councilors and Trainers Training on HIV / AIDS	89,700.00
146 Promoting Multi-Sectoral Community Based Initiative	200,000.00
147 Research project on People's Participation, Fiscal Autonomy and Development	600,000.00
148 Secondary Education Development and Improvement Project	2,259,752.00
149 Trisectoral Conference	171,000.00
150 Donors Forum on Local Governance	119,000.00
151 Governance on Local Democracy-Program Administration Budget	7,912,098.54
152 Recipient contracted Audit of the USAID GOLD 2 (extension period)	150,000.00
153 Drinking Water Supply to Peripheral Brgys of Vigan - Phase I	4,143,516.00
154 Engineering and Construction of Water Supply Distribution System	5,342,451.00
	Subtotal Others 128,705,950.82
Total (all types)	164,359,447.10

Appendix Table 4. List of FPE Grantees, 1999-2001

Master List #	NGO Name	Amount	Type	Year
135	ACPC Theatre of Environmental Network	100,000	AG	2000
17	Asian NGO Coalition for Reform and Rural Development	50,000	AG	1999
158	Associates for Community and Rural Development Foundation	99,900	AG	2000
26	AVCPRAD	100,000	AG	1999
180	Babilonia Wilner Foundation	150,000	AG	2001
206	Bacolod BCCO Diocesan Center	100,000	AG	2001
214	Balay Mindanao Foundation, Inc.	145,000	AG	2001
190	Banatay Dagat, Inc.	150,000	AG	2001
18	Banwang tuburan, Inc.	99,500	AG	1999
128	Basic Agricultural Land - Aerial Growers, Association, Inc.	100,000	AG	2000
187	Batanes Development Foundation	141,970	AG	2001
162	Baywatch Foundation, Inc.	100,000	AG	2000
89	BioResource Conservation Trust for the Philippines, Inc.	1,448,339	SF	2000
73	Bohol Development Foundation, Inc.	313,212	PA	1999
81	Cagayan Valley Partners in People Development	1,370,100	SF	2000
133	Cagayan Valley Partners in People Development	57,035	AG	2000
189	Cagayan Valley Partners in People Development	100,000	AG	2001
27	Catholic Media Network	100,000	AG	1999
6	Caucus of Development NGO Networks	100,000	AG	1999
36	Center for Alternative Rural Technology	28,000	AG	1999
39	Center for Alternative Rural Technology	41,400	AG	1999
120	Center for Empowerment and Resource Development, Inc.	82,400	AG	2000
200	Center for Empowerment and Resource Development, Inc.	81,000	AG	2001
194	Center for Environmental Awareness and Education	55,200	AG	2001
235	Center for Participatory Governance	420,000	PA	2001
216	Center for Rural Technologies, Inc.	100,000	AG	2001
86	Center for Tropical Conservation Studies	1,100,000	SF	2000
88	Center for Tropical Conservation Studies	150,000	SF	2000
226	Center for Tropical Conservation Studies	143,410	SF	2001
170	Central Mindanao University Integrated Development foundation	100,000	AG	2001
154	Central Visayas Fisherfolk Development Center, Inc.	100,000	AG	2000
48	Centrop, Siliman University	211,866	SF	1999
208	Cienda San Vicente Farmers Association	100,000	AG	2001
177	Civil Society Counterpart Council for Sustainable Development	150,000	AG	2001
165	Clenda San Vincente Farmers Association	50,000	AG	2000
174	CO Multiversity, Inc.	121,900	AG	2001
83	Community Management Institute	250,000	SF	2000
126	Community Organizers Multiversity	100,000	AG	2000
129	Community Organizers Multiversity	100,000	AG	2000
41	Concern Citizens of Abra for Good Government	1,767,842	SF	1999
173	Concerned Citizen Against pollution, Inc.	150,000	AG	2001
76	Concerned Citizens of Abra on Good Government	1,796,346	SF	2000
84	Concerned Citizens of Abra on Good Government	250,000	SF	2000
224	Concerned Citizens of Abra on Good Government	146,433	SF	2001
192	Cordillera Studies Center	66,000	AG	2001
1	CSCCSD	100,000	AG	1999
16	Cycling Advocates	50,000	AG	1999
67	Environment Legal Assistance Center, Inc.	1,987,000	PA	1999

110	Environment Legal Assistance Center, Inc.- Cebu	1,700,000	PA	2000
59	Environmental Assistance Center	350,000	PA	1999
107	Environmental Broadcast Circle	100,000	PA	2000
115	Environmental Legal Assistance Center - Cebu	99,500	PA	2000
20	Environmental Protection Internationals Phils	100,000	AG	1999
184	Environmental Science for Social Action	100,000	AG	2001
225	Federation Multi-Sectoral Alliance for Development Negros	1445802	SF	2001
209	Feed the Children Philippines, Inc.	150,000	AG	2001
238	First Philippine Conservation International	1540000	PA	2001
108	First Philippines Conservation, Inc.	1,000,000	PA	2000
90	Fisherfolk Self-Help for the Rehabilitation of the Seas, Inc.	994,050	SF	2000
43	Fisherfolk Self-Help rehabilitation of the Seas, Inc	724,500	SF	1999
241	FPE 10 year Impact Assessment	800000	PA	2001
118	FPE Initiated Workshop	800,000	PA	2000
119	FPE Initiated Workshop	550,000	PA	2000
188	Gabay Foundation, Inc.	150,000	AG	2001
152	GIOS Samar	100,000	AG	2000
42	Green Forum – Western Visayas	908,850	SF	1999
56	Green Forum – Western Visayas	98,750	PA	1999
72	Green Forum – Western Visayas	476,210	PA	1999
92	Green Forum – Western Visayas	500,000	SF	2000
104	Green Forum – Western Visayas	349,940	PA	2000
234	Green Mindanao /Lanuza Baywide Coordinating Council	726200	PA	2001
19	Green Mindanao, Inc.	100,000	AG	1999
100	Green Mindanao, Inc.	1,000,000	SF	2000
156	Green Mindanao, Inc.	100,800	AG	2000
167	Green Mindanao, Inc.	100,000	AG	2000
168	Green Mindanao, Inc.	100,000	AG	2000
50	Guiuan Development Foundation, Inc.	1,631,220	SF	1999
228	Guiuan Development Foundation, Inc.	1462240	SF	2001
185	Haribon – Palawan	150,000	AG	2001
9	Haribon Foundation	100,000	AG	1999
82	Haribon Foundation	250,000	SF	2000
240	Haribon Foundation	600000	PA	2001
80	Haribon Foundation – Tanggol Kalikasan	1,096,000	SF	2000
109	Haribon Foundation – Tanggol Kalikasan	1,700,000	PA	2000
114	Haribon Foundation – Tanggol Kalikasan	100,000	PA	2000
193	Haribon Foundation – Tanggol Kalikasan	150,000	AG	2001
220	Haribon Foundation Palawan	1559250	SF	2001
175	Haribon Foundation, Inc.	44,000	AG	2001
179	Haribon Foundation, Inc.	70,700	AG	2001
132	Haribon Foundtion – Tanggol Kalikasan	100,000	AG	2000
144	Haribon Foundtion – Tanggol Kalikasan	22,000	AG	2000
53	Haribon- Palawan	944,750	SF	1999
123	Haribon Tanggol Kalikasan - Palawan	37,000	AG	2000
21	Hugpong Kinalyahan Inc.	94,500	AG	1999
145	IEC Materials for Coastal Component	100,000	AG	2000
191	Infanta Integrated Community Development	50,000	AG	2001
210	Initiatives for Participatory Governance Samar	45,000	AG	2001
147	Jaime Ongpin Ffoundtion, Inc.	100,000	AG	2000
213	Justice Peace and Desk	100,000	AG	2001
10	Kalikasan Vigelantes ng Pangasinan	65,000	AG	1999
3	Kaliwat Theater Group	100,000	AG	1999

13	Kapulungan para sa Lupaing Ninuno	100,000	AG	1999
14	Kapulungan para sa Lupaing Ninuno	50,000	AG	1999
102	Kapunongan sa Pagpanalipod ug Pagpalambo sa Kinaiyahan, Inc.	1,000,000	SF	2000
157	Kapwa Upliftment Foundation	96,500	AG	2000
229	Katatapuran han Parag-uma Samar	909600	SF	2001
85	Kattapuran nga Pederasyon han Parag-ugma na Samar, Inc.	1,050,400	SF	2000
139	Katutubong Samahan sa Cagayn Valley	100,000	AG	2000
166	Kpunongan sa Pagpananaliod ug Pagpalambo sa Kinaiyahan, Inc.	14,990	AG	2000
54	Lakas na Alyansa ng Katutubong Ayta ng Sambales	99,500	PA	1999
68	Legal Environmental Advocacy Program	970,000	PA	1999
38	Legal Rights & Natural Resources	95,000	AG	1999
181	Legal Rights & Natural Resources	133,215	AG	2001
221	Lingap para Kalusugan ng Sambayanan, Inc.	1452000	SF	2001
45	Lingap para sa Kalusugan ng Sambayanan, Inc.	586,093	SF	1999
77	Lingap para sa Kalusugan ng Sambayanan, Inc.	1,300,000	SF	2000
182	Lingap para sa Kalusugan ng Sambayanan, Inc.	147,800	AG	2001
201	Lingkod Tao Kalikasan, Inc.	150,000	AG	2001
25	Llamera Agricultural Multi-Purpose Cooperation	100,000	AG	1999
124	Luntiang Alyansa para sa Bundok Banahaw	82,356	AG	2000
222	Luntiang Alyansa para sa Bundok Banahaw	1443454	SF	2001
79	Luntiang Alyansa sa Bundok Banahaw	1,565,300	SF	2000
62	Luzon Partners and Regional (Luzon) Advisory Committees	1,000,000	PA	1999
44	Mahintana Foundation	3,149,647	SF	1999
217	Mahintana Foundation, Inc.	60,000	AG	2001
233	Mahntana Development Foundation, Inc.	1673875	SF	2001
5	Makiling Center for Mountain Ecosystem	31,000	AG	1999
164	Malibago Tree Planters Association	57,130	AG	2000
33	Mandiga ob-Obbo Community	98,000	AG	1999
218	Mindanao Coalition of Environmental NGO Network	80,000	AG	2001
60	Mindanao Environment Forum	400,000	PA	1999
103	Mindanao Environment Forum	480,000	SF	2000
65	Mindanao Partners and regional (Mindanao) Advisory Committees	1,000,000	PA	1999
8	Miriam PEACE	100,000	AG	1999
40	Miriam Peace	1,324,150	SF	1999
58	Miriam PEACE	300,000	PA	1999
106	Miriam Peace	1,500,000	PA	2000
146	Miriam Peace	30,000	AG	2000
178	Miriam Peace	150,000	AG	2001
219	Miriam Peace	2646162	SF	2001
186	Molbog Indigenous Cultural Communities	110,000	AG	2001
96	Mt. Matutum Integrated Conservation and Development Consortium	1,894,955	SF	2000
150	MUAD	96,000	AG	2000
37	Multi Sectoral Alliance for Development - Negros	27,000	AG	1999
134	Museo Pambata Foundation, Inc.	100,000	AG	2000
95	Muslim Upliftment Association, Inc.	1,151,060	SF	2000
31	Muslimah Resources	85,000	AG	1999
143	Nagkakaisang mga Tribu ng Palawan	88,000	AG	2000
75	New Land Resource Development Cooperative	1,499,200	SF	2000
197	New Land Resources Development Cooperative	100,000	AG	2001
203	Omaganhand Farmers Multi-Purpose Cooperative People for Human Dev't	100,000	AG	2001
66	Paglilingkod Batas Pangkapatiran Foundation, Inc.	2,258,895	PA	1999
111	Paglilingkod Batas Pangkapatiran Foundation, Inc.	2,200,000	PA	2000

13	Kapulungan para sa Lupaing Ninuno	100,000	AG	1999
14	Kapulungan para sa Lupaing Ninuno	50,000	AG	1999
102	Kapunongan sa Pagpanalipod ug Pagpalambo sa Kinaiyahan, Inc.	1,000,000	SF	2000
157	Kapwa Upliftment Foundation	96,500	AG	2000
229	Katatapuran han Parag-uma Samar	909600	SF	2001
85	Kattapuran nga Pederasyon han Parag-ugma na Samar, Inc.	1,050,400	SF	2000
139	Katutubong Samahan sa Cagayn Valley	100,000	AG	2000
166	Kpunongan sa Pagpananaliod ug Pagpalambo sa Kinaiyahan, Inc.	14,990	AG	2000
54	Lakas na Alyansa ng Katutubong Ayta ng Sambales	99,500	PA	1999
68	Legal Environmental Advocacy Program	970,000	PA	1999
38	Legal Rights & Natural Resources	95,000	AG	1999
181	Legal Rights & Natural Resources	133,215	AG	2001
221	Lingap para Kalusugan ng Sambayanan, Inc.	1452000	SF	2001
45	Lingap para sa Kalusugan ng Sambayanan, Inc.	586,093	SF	1999
77	Lingap para sa Kalusugan ng Sambayanan, Inc.	1,300,000	SF	2000
182	Lingap para sa Kalusugan ng Sambayanan, Inc.	147,800	AG	2001
201	Lingkod Tao Kalikasan, Inc.	150,000	AG	2001
25	Llamera Agricultural Multi-Purpose Cooperation	100,000	AG	1999
124	Luntiag Alyansa para sa Bundok Banahaw	82,356	AG	2000
222	Luntiag Alyansa para sa Bundok Banahaw	1443454	SF	2001
79	Luntiag Alyansa sa Bundok Banahaw	1,565,300	SF	2000
62	Luzon Partners and Regional (Luzon) Advisory Committees	1,000,000	PA	1999
44	Mahintana Foundation	3,149,647	SF	1999
217	Mahintana Foundation, Inc.	60,000	AG	2001
233	Mahntana Development Foundation, Inc.	1673875	SF	2001
5	Makiling Center for Mountain Ecosystem	31,000	AG	1999
164	Malibago Tree Planters Association	57,130	AG	2000
33	Mandiga ob-Obbo Community	98,000	AG	1999
218	Mindanao Coalition of Environmental NGO Network	80,000	AG	2001
60	Mindanao Environment Forum	400,000	PA	1999
103	Mindanao Environment Forum	480,000	SF	2000
65	Mindanao Partners and regional (Mindanao) Advisory Committees	1,000,000	PA	1999
8	Miriam PEACE	100,000	AG	1999
40	Miriam Peace	1,324,150	SF	1999
58	Miriam PEACE	300,000	PA	1999
106	Miriam Peace	1,500,000	PA	2000
146	Miriam Peace	30,000	AG	2000
178	Miriam Peace	150,000	AG	2001
219	Miriam Peace	2646162	SF	2001
186	Molbog Indigenous Cultural Communities	110,000	AG	2001
96	Mt. Matutum Integrated Conservation and Development Consortium	1,894,955	SF	2000
150	MUAD	96,000	AG	2000
37	Multi Sectoral Alliance for Development - Negros	27,000	AG	1999
134	Museo Pambata Foundation, Inc.	100,000	AG	2000
95	Muslim Upliftment Association, Inc.	1,151,060	SF	2000
31	Muslimah Resources	85,000	AG	1999
143	Nagkakaisang mga Tribu ng Palawan	88,000	AG	2000
75	New Land Resource Development Cooperative	1,499,200	SF	2000
197	New Land Resources Development Cooperative	100,000	AG	2001
203	Omaganhand Farmers Multi-Purpose Cooperative People for Human Dev't	100,000	AG	2001
66	Paglilingkod Batas Pangkapatiran Foundation, Inc.	2,258,895	PA	1999
111	Paglilingkod Batas Pangkapatiran Foundation, Inc.	2,200,000	PA	2000

204	Sibol ng Agham at Teknolohiya Inc.	100,000	AG	2001
34	SIKAG Foundation	72,250	AG	1999
205	Siliman Univeisity - Angelo King for Research and Environment Mgt.	150,000	AG	2001
87	Siliman University	100,000	SF	2000
2	Socio-Pastoral Action Center Foundation, Inc.	52,500	AG	1999
199	Soil and Water Conservation	150,000	AG	2001
28	South East Asia Regional Institute	99,500	AG	1999
93	Tambuyog Development Center	119,000	SF	2000
223	Tanggol Kalikasan Lucena	814700	SF	2001
172	Task Force for Bases Clean up	10,000	AG	2001
183	The Crusade for Sustainable Development	69,000	AG	2001
130	The Secretarial Earth Day Network 2000	100,000	AG	2000
148	Tinambacan District Fisherfolk Federation	30,000	AG	2000
47	Ting Matiao Foundation, Inc.	284,740	SF	1999
227	Ting Matiao Foundation, Inc.	1464900	SF	2001
137	Ugnayan ng mga Magsasaka sa Quezon	100,000	AG	2000
127	ULAP/Community Organizers Multiversity	50,000	AG	2000
94	UNDP Global Environment facility	2,650,000	SF	2000
49	UNDP Small Grants Programme/Communities for Global Environment Foundation, Inc., Maguindanaoan Development Foundation	1,350,000	SF	1999
15	United Association of Higaonon Tribe in Mindanao	50,000	AG	1999
151	University of Eastern Philippines Coll of Agriculture	100,000	AG	2000
91	University of St. La Salle, Bacolod	249,500	SF	2000
195	University of the Philippines - College of Agriculture	130,000	AG	2001
131	UP College of Baguio Educational Foundtion	49,500	AG	2000
138	UP Los Banos - Institute of Agroforestry	100,000	AG	2000
12	UP Mountaineers, Inc.	70,000	AG	1999
23	UP Social Action Research and Development Foundation, Inc.	100,000	AG	1999
64	UPLB Foundation	100,000	PA	1999
24	UPLB Foundation, Inc.	20,000	AG	1999
105	UPLB Institute of Agroforestry	1,199,996	PA	2000
239	UPLB Institute of Agroforestry	1434181	PA	2001
61	Visayas Cooperative Development Center, Inc.	1,500,000	PA	1999
207	Visayas Management Consultancy, Inc.	100,000	AG	2001
63	Visayas Partners and Regional (Visayas) Advisory Committees	1,000,000	PA	1999
176	Youth for Sustainable Development Assembly	14,000	AG	2001
237	Escalating Biodiversity Conservation & Sustainable Dev't Appreciation in the Regions	2000000	PA	2001