

**UNDP EEG and GEF**  
**Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Project Implementation Review (PIR)**  
**2010**  
**ENABLING ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Reporting Period = 1 July 2009 to 30 November 2010

**PLEASE COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS**

**1. Basic Project Data**

Official Project Title:

The Philippines: Enabling Activities for the Preparation of the Second National Communication on Climate Change to the UNFCCC

Project Summary (as in PIMS and Project Document)

In brief, the purposes of this project are to assist the Philippines with the enabling activities necessary to undertake an improved national greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory, to plan for actions for the mitigation of climate change and adaptation to its potential impacts of climate change, and to prepare the country's Second National Communication (SNC) to the Conference of the Parties (COP) of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The *main components* of the SNC formulation project are: (a) evaluation of national circumstances; (b) updating of the inventory of GHGs for the year 2000; (c) assessment of needs, barriers and opportunities for both adaptation and mitigation technologies and methodologies and to build capabilities to be able to perform such activities; (d) assessment of potential impacts of climate change in selected areas of the Philippines and prioritization of adaptation measures; and, (e) preparation of the Second National Communication of the Philippines and submission to the COP. In addition, public awareness activities and stakeholder consultations will be cross-cutting along the overall course of this exercise therefore, the preparation of the Second National Communication is expected to enhance general awareness and knowledge on climate change-related issues in the Philippines, and help highly to take them into account in the process of national planning and policy formulation.

Country The Republic of the Philippines	PIMS Number	PIMS 2952 CC EA: Second National Communication
	Atlas Project Number	Award ID: 00034897 ATLAS ID: 00037339

**Project timeframe:**

Date of Delegation of Authority Letter	9 May 2006	Planned Project Duration	36 months
Project Document Signature Date	20 July 2006 (Govt) 2 August 2006 (UNDP)	Original Planned Closing Date	2009
Date of First Disbursement	2 February 2007	Revised Planned <sup>1</sup> Closing Date	March 2011

<sup>1</sup> Please explain any entry here in section 8

Is this the Terminal APR/PIR?	YES		NO	✓	Date Operationally Closed (if applicable)	
-------------------------------	-----	--	----	---	---	--

**Project documentation and information:**

List documents/ reports/ prepared about the project.	Project Document, AWP Monitoring Tools, Narrative Reports, Inception Report, Terms of Reference for implementation of Project Components, Memoranda of Agreement, Component Technical Reports, Updated Greenhouse Gas Inventory Manual, Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment Toolkit, Audio Visual Documentary on Vulnerability and Adaptation, Draft SNC on climate change
List the Website address (URL) of project.	No official website was set-up due to lack of resources. However, a dedicated online portal and archive was established for the greenhouse gas inventory for internal use by the Project Team members.

**2. Progress towards addressing project priorities and in delivering expected products**

Questionnaire on Status of Implementation of National Communication Project.  
Submitted SNC Questionnaire in October 2010.

**Important note: Since the questionnaire was recently completed there is no need to do it again. However, we strongly advise you to look at the results of this recent questionnaire as one of the inputs to complete the section below "Rating of the Project Progress"**

**Rating of Project Progress**

Please rate the project progress as per the following nomenclature: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). **An explanation of this nomenclature is provided on page 4 of this document.**

	<b>2009 Rating</b>	<b>Comments<sup>2</sup></b>
National Project Manager/ Coordinator  Ms. Joyceline A. Goco	MS	Delays in the submission of major component reports affected the work schedule for integration and publication of the SNC and the disbursement of corresponding payments, with some outputs and other NC areas requiring remedial action as well as additional substantial work in terms of further research, consolidation and verification. The remaining task is the finalization of the SNC, its publication and submission to the UNFCCC COP, consequently moving the final closing date to the first quarter of 2011, taking note that the undermanned Implementing Agency will have to perform the associated residual technical and administrative duties, including preparation of remaining project reportorial requirements, in view of the end of contracts of the project management unit support staff in June 2010.
UNDP Country Office  Ms. Amelia Dulce Supetran Team Leader, Energy and Environment Unit	MS	Despite the setbacks that the project encountered, the only task that is remaining is the editing, publication and submission of the SNC to the COP which will all be completed at the end of the first quarter of 2011.
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor		

### Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

Where a rating of MU, U or HU is noted above describe the actions to be taken to address this:

<b>Action to be Taken</b>	<b>By Whom?</b>	<b>By When?</b>

### 3. Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project or the project work schedule has been adjusted since project approval please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes.

<b>Change</b>	<b>Reason for Change</b>	<b>Scope of delay (mo)</b>
Delivery Dates of	GHG Inventory: The important task of collecting, consolidating and cleaning whatever data are available before it can be utilized for	GHG Inventory due in June 2009;initial

<sup>2</sup> Comment on the rating for 2009 and also on any observable trends from 2006 – 2009.

<p>Technical Reports by the Thematic Groups (Responsible Parties for the Key Components), affecting the integration phase of all components into the SNC document</p>	<p>the inventory remained a challenge. Further sector-specific consultations in Quarter 1 of 2010 were deemed necessary to ensure the veracity of the data used.</p> <p>The recipe and reference manuals for each inventory sector that were submitted in April 2010, require further substantial work than expected to produce the final updated GHG Inventory Manual in order to meet its objective as a tool for institutionalizing the inventory process and as an effective knowledge product of the Project.</p> <p>Mitigation Analysis: this necessitated further research work even as the projections of future business-as-usual and mitigation scenarios were based on LEAP and on simplified growth assumptions only and were limited to 2 major emission sources in the energy sector alone.</p> <p>Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment: Data and information collection from both national and local sources is one of the main causes of delay, which includes such challenges as proprietary issues, delayed availability of climate (change) scenarios; inconsistency of methods of compiling and managing information systems in the local government levels; difficulties in obtaining data on costs of projects; lack of awareness of data keepers on which projects could be classified as adaptation; unavailability/mismatch of data (e.g. no disaggregation according to vulnerable groups, crop yields vs weather/climate data, incomplete historical health data to array against 30yrs of weather data, etc.); and limited past researches in relation to climate change impacts.</p> <p>Public Awareness and Education: After several consultations and meetings with the Responsible Party, the UNDP CO, the Project Steering Committee and the Implementing Partner, sufficient period for revisions was given to allow the satisfactory compliance with the agreed TOR. The contract was however terminated and a pro-rated payment scheme was rendered based on the resulting quality of deliverables after revisions. To maximize the national consultation in November 2009 and as an IEC undertaking, an exhibit and the Seal the Deal Campaign were carried out, while SNC info kits based on the findings of the component teams were developed and distributed. Further, the development of a 20+-minute audio visual documentary on climate change vulnerability and adaptation in the Philippines was initiated in 2010 and is currently being utilized as an IEC tool. The TOR was also adopted by the MDGF Spanish Grant-supported "MDGF 1656: Joint Programme on. Strengthening the Philippines'. Institutional Capacity to Adapt to Climate Change" for the development of the National IEC Programme and Communication Plan and other awareness raising activities.</p>	<p>inventory results presented in November 2009, Final Technical Report submitted in April 2010, leaving little time for consolidation into the SNC document</p> <p><i>This major component was combined with the GHGI Thematic Group</i></p> <p>Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment: V&amp;A Report due in June 2009; initial results presented in November 2009; Final Reports completed in January 2010</p> <p>Public Awareness and Education: Outputs due in April and June 2009; Final Reports were only submitted in October 2009 after several meetings and revisions</p>
<p>Integration/</p>	<p>Delayed submission of component reports pushed consolidation</p>	<p>Target Date: June</p>

December 2010

Preparation of the SNC	work, including coordination for editorial and publication tasks, further down the timeline. While a draft SNC has been written, the process of integration also requires significant time for verification of references, cross-checking of information and updating of other relevant data required by NC guidelines. Time for lay-outing and printing will also need to be considered anew and accommodated within the first quarter of 2011.	2010 New target date: Published SNC in Q1 2011
------------------------	--	---

**4. Financial Information: cumulative since project started to 30 June 2010.**

<i>Name of Contributor</i>	<i>Amount committed in Project Document<sup>3</sup> US\$</i>	<i>Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2010 US\$</i>	<i>Expected Total Disbursement by end of project US\$</i>
GEF Contribution	\$15,000 for the self-assessment + \$405,000 for the project	\$317,072.20 (per Combined Delivery Report)	\$15,000 for the self-assessment + \$405,000 for the project

**5. Good Practice in this reporting period.**

Were any problems encountered? If so, how were they addressed?

<i>Problem</i>	<i>Solution</i>
Concerns regarding the data used for compiling the GHG inventory from the LULUCF sector, affecting the finalization of the 2000 National GHG Inventory results	As with the previously stated problem on data ownership, attribution and access in the preceding APR/PIR, this problem was resolved through the intervention of senior-level officials of the Implementing Agency to ensure the close coordination of the Component Team with the responsible government agency on forestry statistics in the verification of data and assumptions made. This further underscores the effectiveness of the DENR as the Implementing Agency as a coordinating technical entity.
The recipe and reference manuals for each inventory sector that were submitted require further substantial work than expected to produce the final updated GHG Inventory Manual. Note that the same Responsible Party was able to publish the first GHGI Manual for the 1994 GHGI Inventory, although some sector team experts tasked to this particular output may not have participated in the first.	Engaging a technical writer to polish the GHGI manual proved to be valuable strategy at this time in order to meet its objective as a tool for institutionalizing the inventory process and as an effective knowledge product of the Project.
Delayed provision of climate scenarios due to lack of dedicated hardware for running the model and lack of knowledgeable personnel with ample training in the use of downscaling software	The generation of climate scenarios is considered a breakthrough for the country, which the SNC Project was able to achieve despite the obstacles. Fortunately, an opportunity opened up for the responsible national government agency to acquire additional faster computers and a few key personnel

<sup>3</sup> Committed amounts are those shown in the approved Project Document. In the case of national communication enabling activities, the total amount would be \$420,000 in most cases (e.g. \$15,000 for the self-assessment + \$405,000 for the project)

	<p>to undergo training under another climate change project, which helped to facilitate the process. To assist future V&amp;A assessment activities, documentation of the technical procedures undertaken under the SNC was one requirement to promote knowledge building and increase local expertise by serving as a tool for local government units in the conduct of simple V&amp;A assessments in their localities.</p>
<p>Underperformance of the Responsible Party for the Public Awareness and Education Component</p>	<p>Timely and direct communication of the results of reviews of expected outputs and reminders; transparent consultation process with the Responsible Party, the UNDP CO, the Implementing Agency and the Project Steering Committee; admission of lapses by the Responsible Party and provision of ample time for corrective action to comply with the TOR even as this will negatively affect the work schedule so as to salvage outputs that can still be used for the SNC; adoption of the TOR by another climate change project; development of a pro-rated payment scheme; adjustments in succeeding project activities to ensure that IEC activities are undertaken considering the new constraints such as the conduct of an exhibit in tandem with the national consultation, development of an SNC information kit and the production of a 20+-minute audio visual documentary on climate change vulnerabilities and adaptation in the Philippines.</p>

**General Comments:**

Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?

Addressing the *basic* requirements for meeting the NAI NC guidelines is still a significant challenge for the Philippines despite achieving varying degrees of success over the years in key areas relevant to climate change. In the case of the GHG inventory compilation for example, while there are major attempts to build capacity to do the computations for the GHG emissions, and to describe ways to find the data, the task is not always straightforward and requires a sustainable flow of resources; for instance, submission of required data by data providers is not fully institutionalized and compounded by factors such as lack of enforcement, inadequate coordination and business confidentiality issues. Availability of more disaggregated activity data including lack of published data based on surveys and the absence of emission factors also make it difficult to move to a higher tier approach (even as the intent to do so is expressed). Uncertainty assessment has not been possible as well due to unavailability of the associated uncertainty values for activity data and emission factors. Therefore, bridging activities like the conduct of separate studies/ research/ surveys are vital and need to be fully supported in order to make better sense of the already limited data and further improve the estimates and analyses, which is applicable not just to the inventory work but also to other components of the NC.

In addition, other sources of support or at the least, determining the predictable share of the SNC project funding to be allocated for NC-related support activities organized by the NCSP at the outset needs to be seriously considered, particularly for the expedited enabling activities. NCSP activities are deemed as vital as a platform for further learning, sharing of experiences and networking among NAIs to enhance their NCs.

What would you do differently if you were to begin the project again?

Viable institutional arrangements to cover basic key roles of relevant government institutions and significant stakeholders in the preparation of NC and its various components, which should include mechanisms for data sharing and processing as well as effective management, technical and administrative support to the Implementing Agency, need to be in place, to ensure smoother operations and keeping troubleshooting tasks to a minimum.

While the strategy to integrate the mitigation analysis and the GHG inventory compilation proved to be useful, a mitigation analysis of each inventory-significant sector is considered more beneficial. However, the SNC Project also recognizes the significant lack of in-country capacity in this area. Given limited resources, mitigation potential may have to be evaluated in tandem with adaptation potential.



Rating of Project Implementation: Based on the original project document, please rate the implementation progress of the project according to the following scale.

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few which are subject to remedial action.
Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.