

The Project Fund: APPENDIX 10

FINAL REPORT

PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES, SMALL-SCALE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND LARGE-SCALE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The total report may not exceed 8 pages (excluding Annex 1 – Budget Revision).

Aim:

The final report is the Danish organisation's report. Your reflections are important in terms of documentation and learning. It is therefore not the aim that the partner organisation completes the report on its own.

The final report can be used as a tool in your partnership to strengthen transparency and joint responsibility as described in "Position Paper No. 4. Partnership and Strengthening of Civil Society".

The final report is also an element in the Danish organisation's "track record" and can be taken into account in future assessments of applications from the Danish organisation with the same or other partners, as described in the Guidelines 2011.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Danish applicant organisation: | PUGAD | | |
| Project title: | Developing an Appropriate Framework to Philippine Municipal Fisheries Registration and Licensing (MFRL) | | |
| Journal nr.: | 11-944.MP.apr | | |
| Country(-ies): | Philippines | | |
| Period: | 1st. July 2011- 31st. December 2012 | | |
| Total budget: | DDK 566.244,43 | Actual expenditure: | 549.032,00 |

20th. of June 2013

Date

einerlyd duch@gmail.com

E-mail address

Person responsible (Signature)

Einer Lyd duch

Person responsible (Block letters)

1. Objectives and results achieved

- Explain in point form how the intervention has reached each objective and indicators and/or expected changes which have been described in the original application.
- Describe how the strategy has led to the results/effects which were described in the original application.
- Did implementation progress as planned? If there were activities which were planned but not implemented, describe in point form and give a short explanation (only for the period since the last status report).
- Describe significant problems, opportunities and/or contextual changes which have influenced the intervention in a positive or negative direction.
- Describe any changes and adjustments in the intervention’s strategy taken underway and what effect they had.

For phased projects: Describe how the experiences for this current phase can be used to improve/adjust the strategy for any future phases.

Explain in point form how the intervention has reached each objective and indicators and/or expected changes which have been described in the original application.

Describe how the strategy has led to the results/effects which were described in the original application.

- To come up with a set of policy critique on MFRL and advocacy guide on the appropriate framework for MFRL, the project has conducted the following activities:
 - A research study of laws and policy pertinent MFRL to has been reviewed. And the case study of the implementation of MFRL in 6 municipalities in Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao has been done from August to October 2012.
 - Simultaneous case study of relevant foreign experience in South Africa was conducted by Masifundise between January to April 2012.
 - The research and case studies were presented in the Multistakeholders Conference held in July 2012.
- All these knowledge documents and the workshop conducted during the Multistakeholder Conference formed the policy critique and basis for the design of advocacy guide for an “ appropriate implementation MFRL framework.

Did implementation progress as planned? If there were activities which were planned but not implemented, describe in point form and give a short explanation (only for the period since the last status report).

- The implementation of major activities progressed as planned. However, project evaluation was adjusted to internal assessment of what have been achieved because a full blown external evaluation would have made it superfluous, considering the project proposal for phase 2, where most of the lessons were already incorporated, was already submitted to CISU.

Describe significant problems, opportunities and/or contextual changes which have influenced the intervention in a positive or negative direction.

Problems

- Municipal Local Government Units (LGUs) appreciation and capacity in fisheries management is key to a more effective implementation of Municipal Fisheries Registration and Licensing (MFRL). If crucial decision makers in LGUs such as the Mayor and Municipal Agriculturist Office, where fisheries concerns is usually assigned, have low appreciation on the importance of MFRL, then it would be most likely be relegated to the sidelines. In the case studies of 6 municipalities, two out of six local government units (LGUs) did not have regular personnel responsible for fisheries concerns -- in which case job-order personnel are assigned whose tenure are only for short period of time. So the personnel assigned when the data gathering was done were not very familiar with the policy and record system pertaining MFRL. Two out of 6 LGUs did not have their own digital record of their fisherfolks registry, instead the registry records of one LGU was lodged to the BFAR region and the other one was uploaded online. If the municipality needed any data on the registry, it still has to go to BFAR. If the online registration program would bog down, one LGU has to encode its raw data all over again.
- To influence the implementation of MFRL to have a national-wide scope, one has to influence the Department where the municipal LGUs have direct line accountability. However, there is an existing institutional problem in relation to MFRL and municipal fisheries management as a whole: The Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) has no direct supervision over the municipal LGUs. LGUs are under the authority of Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG). This means that BFAR only has coordinative powers over LGUs and cannot discipline LGUs in case of non-compliance on the implementation of MFRL. DILG in turn has no expertise in fisheries management, thus has little appreciation of fisheries policy issues. Convening inter-agency meetings with BFAR, DILG, and other relevant agencies can be very difficult because of differences in their availability, not to mention varying degrees of appreciation of the MFRL issues. To address this difficulty one must be knowledgeable with the political and structural dynamics within and in-between agencies as there is no single simple way to influence the agencies to act together. Civil society advocates like Tambuyog and its partner Peoples Organizations (Pos) need to navigate the complex bureaucratic and political structures to achieve its development agenda on MFRL. So, the track Tambuyog took in response to these conditions was to be active in all official fronts and venue to voice-out its issues and proposals on MFRL among other development agenda.

Opportunities / Strengths

- Tambuyog and its partner Peoples organizations with local and national level representations in interface governance bodies are attempting to gain access in all fronts and venues to influence a nation-wide implementation of MFRL.
- At the local level, LGUs of the case study municipalities exhibited willingness to share the status of their MFRL system and records, including openness in discussing rooms of improvement of MFRL system and partnership with Tambuyog and fishers organizations.
- The presence of fishers organizations in the MFRL case study areas like the Badian-Zaragosa, SAMMACA, Golden Bay Cooperative, Malhiao Multi-Purpose Cooperative which are active in the FARMCs at the municipal level are considered strengths in the prospect of a promoting an enhanced framework of MFRL system or the Phase 2 of the MFRL Project.
- However, partnering with LGUs and Pos at the local level is very limited to effect a nation-wide implementation of MFRL. Therefore, advocates need to influence the key national agencies mandated to supervise and support fisheries management particularly BFAR, DILG which oversee

the affairs of LGUs, and Department of Environment and Natural Resources which oversee management concerns of mangrove forest, coral reefs, and other coastal ecosystems.

- At the national level, the Aquino Administration's increasing attention and provisions of budget to help the poorest sectors is a favourable context. It is a big opportunity for the fishing sector to voice out their concerns and assert their preferential rights claim over municipal fisheries.
- The National Anti-Poverty Commission has identified 609 municipalities with highest poverty incidence to be the beneficiaries of a maximum of P15 million each year Poverty Reduction fund from the Budget Department from 2014-2016. Two of the prospective municipalities particularly Unisan and Mulanay, where MFRL Phase 2 is planned to be implemented, belong to this 609 municipalities. Each target municipality is required to come up with a Local Poverty Reduction Action Plan (LPRAP). This LPRAP is additional opportunity for the municipal fisherfolks to integrate their development agenda – the implementation of LPRAP is set from 2014-2016 and will be partly funded by other national line agencies, in coordination of National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC).¹
- Miss Delfa Talaid of Tambuyog is the Fisherfolks Sectoral Representative in NAPC appointed by President Aquino.
- There are also the interface agencies particularly the National Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council (NFARMC) and National Agriculture Fisheries Council (NAFC) that ensure peoples organizations and non-government organizations participation for policy recommendation. NAFC is a recommendatory body for Fisheries Modernization, while NFARMC is for Fisheries Management. Sometimes concerns of the two bodies overlap. Tambuyog Executive Director is the Chair of the Committee of Aquaculture and Fisheries of the NAFC, while Tambuyog Deputy Executive Director is the NGO Representative in the NFARMC.
- Tambuyog's Executive Director, as President of Alyansa Agrikultura (Agriculture Alliance), an alliance of small scale farmers and fishers groups and advocate organizations, has been also engaging the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Fisheries.
- The following are among the recommendations and inroads related to MFRL that Tambuyog and its partners had put forward covering the project period :
 - **Fisherfolks registration related to climate change Adaptation Plan** - In the wake of the havoc that typhoon Sendong wrought in the coastal communities of northern Mindanao, a Congressional inquiry was made in relation to settlement areas of fisherfolks and how their communities can be capacitated to adapt to adverse weather conditions. A proposal was pushed by Tambuyog representative in National Agriculture and Fisheries Council (Mr Pepe Tanchuling) and National Anti-Poverty Council Sectoral Representative, Ms. Delfa Talaid, that fisherfolks registration should be pursued more seriously not only in relation to fisheries management, but also for the inclusion of the sector in the national and local "Adaptation Plan" where fisherfolks settlement and capacity building to increase their resiliency from climate change impacts are integral components.
 - **National Women Consultation by Philippine Commission on Women**- A national women consultation was conducted on February 2012 pursuant to the implementation of Magna Charta on Women. Tambuyog representative highlighted the need to include women-segregated data in the form used by BFAR and local governments for fisherfolks registration – as this would be a concrete expression of the recognition of the roles of women in fisheries. Moreover, a policy proposal was pushed and adopted in consensus that any local government

¹ NAPC is an oversight and recommendatory body composed of representatives of eleven basic sectors mandated to review, monitor, and recommend the integration of poverty reduction program in key government Departments.

- who would not comply to include women specific data in the registration system can be liable to be sued in the Commission on Human Rights.
- **Tambuyog and its network of ngos and fisherfolks has lobbied the Congress for more budget in Agriculture and Fisheries for the 2012 budget.** As a result the Philippine Congress allotted an additional of P500 million to the Department of Agriculture, apart from what it has requested. The Executive Director of Tambuyog, in his capacity as Chair of Committee in NAFC, shall lobby with the Department Secretary to allot even six percent of said amount to support pilot sites for the docking/ fishlanding facilities to develop municipal fisheries. A concept paper contextualizing and justifying how to further develop municipal fisheries by putting up docking/ fishlanding area, similar to the concept Malaysian model for small scale fishers, has been drafted. This type facility aims to consolidate the fragmented production, processing, and distribution of municipal fisheries. It will also result to generate better catch information as basis of more appropriate decision making. This draft shall be used as talking points for the lobby of budget from the Department of Agriculture.
 - The Executive Director of Tambuyog presented the declaration of unity agreed during the Multistakeholders Conference to the secretariat of the Congressional Oversight Committee on Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization (COCAFAM). It was agreed to elevate the report to the House Plenary session to endorse an Executive Order or Presidential Proclamation of a nation-wide implementation of MFRL.

Describe how the experiences for this current phase can be used to improve/adjust the strategy for any future phases.

- This particular project is the first phase of a planned two-phased project. The second phase is designed to promote an alternative MFRL framework developed as a result of the phase 1.
- From the experiences of this phase 1, the following lessons can be cited:
 - a. **From resource-rent based to Administrative Cost and Negotiated Permit Rates through the Municipal Fisheries & Aquatic Resource Management Council (MFARMC)**- As part of the lessons, the research permit fees/rates may not necessarily be tied up to the resource rent, particularly where resource rents have been evidently decimated. The fees can be based simply on the *normal return of specific fishing activities, as well as the recovery of the administrative cost of managing the local fisheries*. The principle of equity is paramount in the distribution of fishing permits. In this connection, there is a need to develop the capacities of fisherfolk association (or cooperative) in accordance with their central role in local fisheries development and in the advocacy for an equitable and community-based permitting system that should be adopted by LGUs in the municipal fishing grounds, in lieu of a system of individual transferrable quotas. This advocacy role can be effectively served if the fisherfolk association will exercise its negotiating capacities and leverage in, which is a multi-stakeholder consultative mechanism for the LGUs in fisheries policymaking.
 - b. **From Municipal-waters to fishing ground-based Intervention** - Municipal-waters-specific intervention in managing fisheries can be limiting, because it does not factor-in the ecosystem and fishing ground which could be shared by several municipalities. Therefore, intervention on MFRL should be pursued through common fishing-ground based approach which primarily considers the fisheries ecosystem more than the municipal waters political boundaries. Intervention should be made at the level of bays, gulfs, straits or any similar semi-enclosed water of body can be considered common fishing grounds. Management authority for this common fishing grounds can be through the Integrated Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Management Council as provided in the Fisheries Code.

- c. Municipal fisheries management packaged with social services intervention** - The incidence of poverty in fishing communities, registering 41%, is among the highest in the basic sectors in the Philippines. Reduction of fishing efforts in municipal fisheries cannot be fully feasible without addressing poverty in the municipal fishing sector. Social services like provision of settlement, free primary education, accessible health services, and the conditional-cash-transfer scheme, and credit-for - opportunities to fishing households will somehow cushion the impact of measures to reduce fishing efforts. The Aquino Administration’s increasing attention and provisions of budget to help the poorest sectors is big opportunity for the fishing sector to claim.

2. Adjustments of the intervention in response to the original letter of approbation from the Assessment Committee.

- Describe actions taken as a result of any “good advice” or suggestions concerning adjustments which were raised in the original letter of approbation from the Assessment Committee (It is not necessarily to fill this part out, if none were mentioned).
- If you have chosen not to follow the advice, state the reasons why.

3. Monitoring and learning:

- How has important learning been gathered, systematised and shared?
- How will it be used in the future by the Danish partner, the South partners and in the partnership?
- Has the Danish organisation participated in a Project Fund Workshop? Yes ___ No___

How has important learning been gathered, systematised and shared?

Learnings are gathered through the following several ways:

- 1) review of the monthly reports,
- 2) Coming up with a research report on the findings of the case studies of the implementation of municipal fisherfolk registration and permitting and the corresponding analyses and set of recommendations, and
- 3) documentation of the proceedings of the Multi-Stakeholder Conference on Municipal Fisherfolk Registration & Licensing.

Sharing of lessons is done through the publication of Multistakeholders Conference proceeding and Advocacy Guide on the promotion of “enhanced framework of MFRL” have been finalized and published. Another way of sharing the lessons of this project is being done in actual meetings with stakeholders at the local and national levels. Together with documentations of similar other activities, the research report and the conference proceedings represent the systematization of the experiences in phase one of this project

How will it be used in the future by the Danish partner, the South partners and in the partnership?

- For the South partners:

- For the of Tambuyog , the learnings will be used for the actual implementation of the “enhanced MFRL framework “ in specific areas and advocate the framework application at a nation-wide level.
- For the partnership: 1) the partnership can continue its support for the planned- second phase of the project which should aim to carry-through the lessons learned from phase one. The partnership can use the learnings from this project in exploring to address regional level policy issues that also affects the sustainability of small-scale fisheries. The partnership can engage on regional positioning on issues in relation to the FAO International Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries or the Free Trade and Investment liberalization trends like EU-ASEAN FTA which threaten to further worsen overfishing and favour to benefit a few private players, while decimating the resource base of small-scale fisheries. One strength here of the partnership is that Tambuyog is the Secretariat of a regional network of fisheries NGOs and National Federations of Fisherfolks with members from the countries of .Vietnam, Cambodia, Myanmar, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines.

Has the Danish organisation participated in a Project Fund Workshop? Yes x No

PUGAD visited San Fabian Dec. 2011, Unisan Febr. 2012 and Calatagan June 2012 where we had meetings with the LGU and the fishers organisation and 6 Pugad people participated in the Multistakeholder conference July 2012 and were quite active also in the different works hops

4. Partnership

Give a specific account of how the intervention has contributed to strengthening the partners and your partnership.

For projects over 2 million: Describe how the intervention has sharpened the partners’ profile and role as civil society actors (as described in A.4. in the original application).

- For Tambuyog, the intervention has increased its profile with national line agencies and local government units (LGUs) as an advocate of more appropriate system of MFRL. Tambuyog is carrying the agenda of the nation-wide implementation MFRL at relevant interface mechanism of civil society and government, like the: NAFC-Committee on Fisheries and Agriculture, National Anti-Poverty Commission, National Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Management Council, and the Committee of Fisheries in the Senate.
- The intervention serves as an additional push to national line agencies to improve their assistance to local government units to implement MFRL. But the power of line agencies, particularly the Bureau of Fisheries, over LGUs has been clipped because of the devolution of powers to the LGUs. Thus, line agencies find it hard to advance implementation of MFRL at a nation-wide scale, because some Mayors are unappreciative, if not reluctant, to implement. There is also little and sketchy data about the total number of municipalities implementing MFRL and total number of municipal fishers actually registered.

- Both Tambuyog and PUGAD are much more aware about the civilian societies involvement in the political processes and link it to address the demands from these sectors in the upcoming negotiation between the EU and the Philippines for an Economic Agreement, so we supply each other with knowledge and about the political situation in our countries respectively
- Tambuyog must keep dead lines especially regarding external auditing where to late response caused many problems.

5. Principal reflections – general considerations

- Looking back on the entire project implementation process, what are the most significant changes which have occurred?

- On the development of alternative framework:
 - Based on the input by the South African and Danish partners , there is a further clarification that the framework should not just be confined in addressing overfishing in municipal fisheries, but to *factor-in intervention addressing equity issues* prevalent in municipal fishing communities. In the “enhanced MFRL framework”, sharing of benefits as well as sacrifices by municipal fisherfolks, including increasing provision of social services and alternative livelihoods for the fishing communities, will be pursued to reduce fishing effort in overfished fishing grounds.
 - Other than taking into account the resource-rent in the computation of fishing permit fees , the alternative framework recommends other acceptable ways in which to base the rates of fishing permits, particularly : 1) the normal return to capital in fishing, 2) administrative cost in implementing registration, 3) public consultations, through MFARMC, as a way to build consensus in the schedule of rates for method-specific fishing.
- On the mindset of LGU officials and Fishers:
 - The registration of municipal fishers is not primarily for revenue generation of LGUs, but more for the delivery of social services and facilitation of opportunities necessary to make fishing communities less dependent on fisheries.
 - There is renewed enthusiasm among fishers and LGUs in implementing MFRL and related fisheries management efforts in the six (6) case study municipalities.

6. Information in Denmark.

(Fill out only if there is a budget line for “Information in Denmark”.)

- Describe in point form the implemented activities.
- Explain how the information work has reached the objectives described in the application.

May 2011 PUGAD participated in Tårnby Cultural festival and informed about the project for app. 100 persons.

In March 2012 PUGAD arranged a workshop with Africa Contact and Living Sea and also here we had a presentation of the project for about 25 persons who all work with these issues and among mother was the

American Professor of Marine Biology Seth Macinko from Rhode Island University and at the same occasion we were asked to send the project application and materials from the July Multistakeholder conference to Professor Svein Jentoft, Tromsø University, who is also a member of the FAO board, and finally we gave a full presentation at our annual general assembly for approx. 40 persons – and the activities are not yet finished

7. Summary of the accounts

| | | |
|---------------------|-----------|------|
| Total budget: | 566.244,- | d.kr |
| Actual expenditure: | 663.214,- | d.kr |
| Unused funds: | 6.082,- | d.kr |

8. Budget adjustments and changes

- State any budget adjustments made or any funds transferred from the budget margin during the period since the last status report and made without prior approbation from CISU (as described in the "Guide to the administration of grants from the project fund 2011" sections 5.1. and 2.).
- All adjustments must be justified and a revised budget submitted.

See attached paper regarding expenditure and in Dec. 2011 allowed to spend DDK 5.000,- for Tambyuog's visit in South Africa, in July 2012 for the Multistakeholder conference in Quezon City, Philippines for inviting a Malaysian representative and finally allowed to use all the budgetmargin due to more expensive roundair tickets from Cape Town to Manila and more workshops at the phase 1 in the project.
See attached paper documenting the use of the budgetmargin

9. Additional comments

We think we accomplished what we aimed for in the application and through the processes we discovered new opportunities via the government's Anti-Poverty commission and also the BFAR (Ministry of Fisheries), so we look forward for the 2nd phase which should give some manifest impact for municipal fishers