

The Civil Society Fund

FINAL REPORT

PARTNERSHIP INTERVENTION, SMALL-SCALE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The total report may not exceed 8 pages.

Aim

The final report is the Danish organisation's report to the Civil Society Fund. 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 for the Civil Society Fund.

Danish applicant organisation	PUGAD		
Intervention titel	Caãacoty Building and Advocacy towards Fishing-Ground Based Management		
Journalnumber	14-1528-SP-sep		
Country(-ies)	Philippines		
Period	January 01, 2015 to June 30, 2017		
Total budget	1.936.041,-	Actual expenditure	1.895.857,-

S

24.marts 2018

Date

einerlyduch@gmail.com

E-mail address

Se vedhæftede underskrevne forside

Person responsible (Signature)

Einer Lyduch

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.

For Objective 1:

The project facilitated the organization of women fishers in the implementation of diversified fishery and non-fishery based supplemental livelihoods, at different levels of success.

- As first step profiling of 24 potential partner fisherfolks organization (**FFOs**) was done to determine their status, interests, and capacity needs not only in relation to development of diversified livelihoods, but also on resource management interest. Basic orientations on Community Based Coastal Resources Management, within the context of the effect of climate change, with emphasis on the women and men on its development were conducted. Then a series of business model canvass training-workshop were conducted to equip fishers with basic skills in planning and implementing primary and secondary livelihood/ enterprise development. Then a series of training on fish, seaweed, and other non-fishery based food processing, vegetable farming (Korean Nature Farming technology), mangrove nursery establishment, food processing, soap-making were conducted with selected women members of FFOs in the two areas. Project Community Organizers regularly encouraged, facilitated, and mentored the FFOs to plan a livelihood/ enterprise they are interested in.
- Of the 24 partner Fisherfolks Organizations (**FFOs**) with , only 19 were able to incubate, start up, replicate, and adopt supplemental livelihood projects. Out of the 19 which replicated supplemental livelihood projects, only 14 have sustained at different levels of development at the end of project duration. These 14 organizations can basically be categorized as functional community associations meaning they are able to plan, act, and mobilize in simple livelihood activities e.i. fish processing and non-fish based production and marketing. However the operations of their livelihoods projects have not yet reached the scale of livelihood/ business operations to be considered sustainable financially. If the investments on infrastructure, equipment, real cost of labor of members, which are oftentimes undervalued or forgone, are to be accounted, many of these livelihood/ business operation will lose out and cease. These FFOs have started to cooperate with each other in the promotion and marketing of their individual products as in the case of SNMPP, BEAUWENS, BMS, &SFAB during a provincial trade fair of agricultural products in Lucena City, July 2017. One FFO also supplies the raw fish materials needed by another FFO in a different municipality -- although the regularity of fish supply is still problematic subject to seasonality of fishing and market forces – due to high price of fish. There are supplemental livelihood projects developed by FFOs which have potential to be scaled up. FFOs need more support for

building their capacities on financial management, enterprise development, and marketing skills to be able to scale up to sustainable level. As to the effect of the livelihoods to the larger community who are not members of FFOs, some people, including children get additional income by marketing the products of the FFOs in the locality or other places.

- Aside from livelihood development aspect, these FFOs also have resource management objectives and activities e.i. coastal clean up, putting up mangrove nursery, mangrove planting, monitoring and reporting of illegal fishing, managing fish sanctuaries, as well as having representation in local fisheries governance bodies to voice out their concerns with LGUs and other government agencies.
- Six (6) demo sites up to the evaluation are applying vegetable Korean Natural Farming (KNF) were established and are being managed by FFOs, particularly women fishers members of BEAUWENS, SMMIY, KIFA, DAFA, BUFALLOO, MAFILP. Demo sites serve as sources of accessible food for members of FFOs as well as provide additional income. The established vegetable gardens are still dependent on free seeds from the government.

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

- The way the livelihood development was designed and proceeded in this project can be fairly characterized as being managed by separate, individualized, village-level based fishers associations thinking about and doing their own livelihood businesses.
- Just like what has been cited above, the FFOs have started to cooperate in the marketing and promotion of their products, and one FFO has supplied the raw materials used in the production of another FFO. What can be used in the future phase is to optimize this cooperation spirit among the FFOs and effect the integration or synergy of their economic activities where one livelihood activity can provide inputs or support the marketing needs of the other, targeting to achieve larger outcomes.
- The volume and predictability of fish supply in post harvest facilities must also be addressed to achieve economy of scale, in order to fully attain targeted value-addition, and cover the cost of voluntary labor and hidden cost of donated infrastructure. In the context of operating in an upscale business, strategy on the capacity building of key management personnel of an enterprise must also be enhanced to equip them in handling bigger and more complex responsibilities.

For Objective 2:

- A total of six (6) post-harvest facilities (including a docking site in Brgy Malhiao, Badian) were completed at the end of second quarter of 2017. The first post-harvest facility was completed in Brgy. Sta. Rosa (SNMMP, Mulanay). Four (4) other post-harvest facilities were completed in Brgy. Sildora (BMS, Agdangan), Brgy. Binagbag (SFAB, Agdangan) and Brgy. Punta (BEAUWENS, Unisan), and Brgy Bugas (BUFFALO, Badian).
- The FFOs, in coordination with LGUs and Tambuyog, were able to mobilize resources, particularly equipment and capital fund from other agencies like the DOST, BFAR, DTI

counterpart for the post-harvest facilities and associated livelihood projects.

- The concept of the nationwide Community Fish Landing Centers (CFLC) Project has been adopted by NAPC and BFAR in 2015, through the advocacy efforts of Tambuyog with the NAPC and DA-BFAR Secretaries. Five (5) project covered municipalities, specifically: Mulanay Agdangan, Unisan, Guihulngan and Badian are recipients of the construction of the CFLC project for 2015 & 2016, each amounting to 2.85 to 3 million pesos. All five municipalities have secured tenure of the foreshore land for the CFLC. The Badian and Guihulngan CFLCs have been already constructed but policies on their management remain to be formulated. Each LGU and BFAR will continue their assistance until to-be-established fisherfolks organization is organized and operates each CFLC

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

- Infrastructure development is closely linked with land use development. Delays in implementation often arise due to tenurial instrument issues and conflicts of ownership. While many of the land areas considered for the post-harvest facilities—whether Tambuyog or government-initiated—are within the public domain, environmental and land use issues often resulted in significant delays. Moreover, considering that the land is often owned by the government, unless donated by the local government to the FFOs, agreement among stakeholders on the ownership and management of the facilities must be reached before they become operational. For Tambuyog initiated infrastructure development, i.e. post-harvest facilities for processing of products of the communities, budget constraints and availability of contractors willing to undertake the work at a minimum profit was also a major hurdle.
- Lack of coordination among implementers—i.e. BFAR, NAPC and LGUs - in the construction of CFLC facilities Barangay Bulado, Guihulngan, Negros Oriental and Brgy Malhiao in Badian have resulted in delays in implementation and in the social preparation work for the community management of the facilities.

For Objective 3.

Tanon Strait Area:

- In order to enhance the GMP¹ for Tanon Strait Protected Seascape: Tambuyog, in coordination with BFAR, NAPC², DENR³ organized a Consultation-Workshop on Sept 14-17, 2016. The *Workshop Resolution* on Tanon Strait Protected Seascape (TSPS) signed and supported by major stakeholders have outlined the additional elements (actions, policies, strategies) absent in the General Management Plan (GMP) of TSPS. The resolution contents were submitted to the Executive Committee of the Protected Area Management Board for consideration.

Tayabas Bay Area:

¹ General Management Plan (GMP)

²National Anti Poverty Commission

³Department of Environment and Natural Resources

- A fisherfolk conference-workshop in Tayabas Bay was held on June 17, 2017. Several Conference Resolutions were formulated including a call on LGUs to review municipal fisheries ordinances and adopt a unified municipal waters ordinance for the Tayabas Bay, which will promote welfare by allowing cross-boundary fishing activities for all registered municipal fishers/subsistence fishers. Fisherfolks settlement is to be pursued as development agenda given opportunities of having former Executive Director of Tambuyog is currently the DENR Director for Region IV-A. Tambuyog has requested the identification of possible fisherfolks settlement area and is being acted upon by the DENR Region IV-A. A Closed Season on commercial fishing in Tayabas Bay was also included in the conference proposal for consideration of BFAR. BFAR has been considering the closed season and has conducted a consultation toward this end. The commercial fishing group in Tayabas Bay has been sending feelers of being amenable to the closed season, but also been campaigning with other fisherfolks and lobbying LGUs, and BFARs to have access inside the 10.1km municipal waters of LGUs in Tayabas Bay. How these matters would turn out remains to be seen.
- The results of the conference-workshop turned out to be more of a priority advocacy agenda by the municipal fishers themselves to come up with a more integrated management of the Tayabas Bay, rather than a more technically coherent and integrative management framework that has to be translated to a more operational plan supported by institutions like BFAR and the LGUs from municipal to provincial level, within two administrative regions of Region IV-A and Region IV-B.

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

- The Philippines has two main agencies responsible for the conservation, protection and management of fishery and coastal resources i.e. the (1) Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources under the Department of Agriculture (DA-BFAR) and the (2) Department Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). While the two agencies have defined objectives, issues on management of fishing grounds and coastal resources often result in conflict of jurisdiction. In general, BFAR is responsible for the management of the fish while DENR is responsible for the management of the fish habitat and marine biodiversity. BFAR and DENR have different policies and procedures regarding the establishment and management of marine protected areas. BFAR uses the provisions of the Fisheries Code in establishing fish sanctuaries in Tayabas Bay while DENR uses the National Integrated Protected Areas Systems Act (NIPAS) in the management and conservation of Tanon Strait Protected Seascapes which is a declared marine protected area. Under NIPAS, LGUs lose their jurisdiction over their municipal waters.
- At the local (municipal and provincial) level, the Local Government Units (LGUs) are vested with significant authority over their respective jurisdictions (municipal/provincial). The issue becomes even more pervasive in the case of Tayabas Bay which is under the shared jurisdiction of two regional administrative units, Region 4 (CALABARZON) and Region 4B (MIMAROPA). This requires collaboration between two regional offices of BFAR, DENR and DILG. The issue is further exacerbated by the lack of properly delineated municipal waters. Low awareness and appreciation among small fisherfolk leaders of the importance of a bay wide management plan for Tayabas Bay. Even before the project was implemented, there were

already previous initiatives in formulating bay wide management plans for both fishing grounds. Both LGUs and small fishers express apprehension in the effectiveness of bay wide management plans.

- Fishing ground-based management, a multi-sector concern, requires participation from all stakeholders with varied and often conflicting interests. One of the main causes of the depletion of fish in a common fishing ground is management policy incoherence among sub-governing bodies like municipal LGUs and lack of clearly delineated municipal waters. For example, if one municipality imposed a close season on the catching of sardines while ten other municipalities did not, the outcome of the close season will not be successful. If one fish landing area in a municipality would allow the prohibited landings of juvenile tunas, the conservation outcomes will not be met. The municipal waters are connected to one another and therefore requires collaboration for management. The persistence of illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing activities in some municipalities is in part due to the presence of vested interest among politicians in power who are also responsible for enforcement of fisheries rules. While efforts in conservation and protection abounds in the fishing grounds, an integrated management, i.e. fishing ground-based management is yet to be crafted in Tayabas Bay.

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

(Fill out only if “good advice” was given in the letter of approbation)

- 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.
- 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 Civil Society Fund Workshop? Yes ____
No ____

- A project evaluation has been conducted covering not only this project, which is Phase 3, but also Phase 1 and 2. A publication was also made about the accomplishments and lessons learned of this project. Copies of the publication were distributed to selected government offices, non-government organizations, and civil society networks, and uploaded in Tambuyog website.

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).
-
- Tambuyog has strengthened its position as a fisheries NGO on the aspect of the knowledge earned and lessons learned regarding fishery-resource related post-harvest livelihoods which is commonly the domain of women in fishing communities. And in doing the project, Tambuyog service was tapped by the NAPC and BFAR in the CFLC Project design, capacity building of field implementers of the CFLC Project in 525 sites nation-wide.
 - PUGAD on its part has gained profile in supporting marginalized fisherfolks women and men in the South to adopt diversified livelihoods to reduce poverty and cope with effects of climate change in coastal communities.
 - The partnership, through the project, advanced the position of municipal fisherfolks one step higher by having the government recognize the former needs as exemplified by their counterpart resources (land for site, equipment, and fund capital) in the livelihoods incubated and rolled out by fisherfolks. This project has also influenced the adoption of the Community Fish Landing Center Project in coastal municipalities, consistent with the objectives as part of fisheries modernization at the national level.

5. Principal reflections – general considerations

- Looking back on the entire project implementation process, what are the most significant changes which have occurred?
-
- From passive followers within male-dominated leaders and officers in fisherfolks associations, fisher women have taken lead roles in developing and managing livelihood projects. This have increased the women self-confidence in taking leadership roles in their respective FFOs. FFO women and men members also learned to value the cooperation efforts among themselves along various steps of the fish value-chain in order to achieve a livelihood objective, which is a far cry from their previous fragmented production system, or to-each her/his own business.

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.

PUGAD works with a total presentation of the entire project from phase 1 to phase 3, where we look at the outcome and sustainability of the project

7. Summary of the accounts

Total budget:	1.934.020	d.kr
Actual expenditure: please check Budget Variance file	1.895.857	d.kr
Unused funds:	38.163	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 Civil Society Fund” sections 5.1. and 2.).
 - All adjustments must be justified and a revised budget submitted.
-
- Insurance for the Project staff was requested last 2015 and approved by CISU. Actual implementation of insurance for project staff were done in 2016 and 2017.
 - Tambuyog requested to use “*projected underspending*” on approved budget item 2.1. to construct smaller and relatively low budget post-harvest facilities related to the new livelihoods developed by partner POs, particularly: smoked fish, fish rolls, fish balls, food production from seaweeds, ginger tea value-added products.

9. Additional comments