

Contents

1. Workshop Overview.....	3 - 5
2. Workshop Highlights	5-14
3. Evaluation of the Workshop by Participants.....	14-15

Annexes:

Annex-1	Program of Activities	17-21
Annex-2	Directory of Participants	22-24
Annex-3	Workshop I Output (Problem Analysis of Philippine Forestry Sector)	25-29
Annex-4	Workshop 2 Output (Evaluation of the ITTO Guidelines and FLR Manual).....	30-36
Annex-5	Workshop 3 Output (Field Trip – Application of FLR Concepts)	37-46
Annex-6.	Workshop 4 Output (Preparation of an FLR Action Plan for the Philippines).....	47-54
Annex-7.	Proposed Action Plan for FLR Implementation in the Philippines.....	55-57
Annex-8.	Responses to Daily Workshop Evaluation.....	58-60

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP ON ITTO GUIDELINES FOR THE RESTORATION, MANAGEMENT AND REHABILITATION OF DEGRADED AND SECONDARY FORESTS

1. Workshop Overview

Background

The workshop originated from an invitation of Dr. Manoel Sobral Filho, the Executive Director of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), for the Philippines to host and organize, with their assistance, a national workshop to further promote the restoration and rehabilitation of degraded and secondary forests pursuant to Council Decision 4(XXX). The invitation was coursed through a letter dated May 18, 2005 to the Director of the Forest Management Bureau (FMB) of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) of the Philippines. Said invitation was accepted by the Philippine Government through a letter of the FMB Director to the ITTO Secretary General dated July 26, 2005.

Workshop Objectives

The following are the objectives of the workshop:

- to gain a common understanding of the state of forests in the Philippines;
- to learn about the main concepts of forest landscape restoration (FLR);
- to gain a common understanding of the current status of FLR in the Philippines through various learning activities, including a field trip;
- to receive feedback on the existing tools – ITTO guidelines on the restoration, management and rehabilitation of degraded and secondary Forests (ITTO guidelines) and the ITTO/IUCN document entitled: Restoring Forest Landscapes – An introduction to the art and science of forest landscape restoration (FLR manual);
- to understand what else is needed for FLR implementation in the Philippines;

- to develop ideas and project concepts for FLR implementation in the Philippines taking into account the contents of the ITTO guidelines and the FLR manual.

Venue and Participants

The workshop was held at the Montemar Beach Club located in the municipality of Bagac in the Province of Bataan, Philippines on May 8-12, 2006 (Please see Annex-1 for the detailed program of activities).

It was attended by 19 participants coming from institutions/entities including the government sector, non-government organizations (NGOs) and the private sector, who are directly involved in the formulation and implementation of policies and strategies pertaining to the restoration, management and rehabilitation of degraded and secondary tropical forests. Of these number of participants, 7 are from the DENR, 2 are from the local government sector, 2 are from NGOs, 2 are from financing institutions, 1 is from the academe, 3 are from the private sector and 1 is from a government owned and controlled corporation (Please see Directory of Participants in Annex-2).

The workshop was facilitated by one international facilitator in the person of Dr. Sandeep Sengupta of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and one national facilitator in the person of Director Marcial C. Amaro, Jr. of the FMB-DENR.

Workshop Structure and Method

The workshop ran for 5 days wherein the following activities were undertaken to facilitate the learning process for the participants:

- plenary presentation;
- group work;
- field exercise, and;
- daily evaluation and review of previous day.

At the start of each day, the objectives for the day were laid down before the participants. The plenary presentation served as the means to introduce the participants to the topics for the workshop especially on the ITTO guidelines and the FLR manual.

The group work was meant to stimulate the participants to exchange ideas and present their various views on the assigned tasks. The 19 participants were divided into 3 groups before each group work. The composition of members for each group changed with each group work

so as to maximize participants' exposure to ideas from different people belonging to different sectors. Four group works were conducted throughout the course of the workshop. After each group work, their outputs were presented in plenary and subsequently commented on by the body.

The field exercise was conducted for the purpose of applying to the field level, the concepts that were learned in the classroom sessions, and determining whether these are applicable in the Philippine setting.

At the end of each day, an evaluation of the activities undertaken throughout the day was made to provide feedback for both organizers and participants on how well these were conducted. In this exercise, participants were made to fill up a workshop evaluation sheet that asked them to reflect on, and rate, the following:

- workshop content;
- workshop activities;
- individual participation;
- time-keeping;
- facilitation, and;
- whether the objectives for the day were met.

2. Workshop Highlights

DAY 1

Opening Program

The first welcome address was given by Mr. Ireneo Aberin, the Community Environment and Natural Resources Officer (CENRO) of Bagac, Bataan. He expressed that his office will be willing to provide whatever assistance within their means to contribute to the successful conduct of the workshop.

In the second welcome address, Mr. Godofredo de Guzman, the Environment and Natural Resources Officer of the Provincial Government of Bataan, gave a background on the destructive effects of the second world war to the once lush forests of Bataan. He cited efforts to rehabilitate these degraded areas by way of the DENR programs such as the contract reforestation program and the community-based forest management program. He pointed out that the area selected for the site visit of the workshop is but a testament to the productive partnership between the local government and the DENR at rehabilitating the forests. He also mentioned that an aerial seeding program using endemic species will also be undertaken soon in the province of Bataan.

The International Facilitator provided the background for the workshop by saying something about the history and composition of ITTO and IUCN. He further discussed the extent of forest degradation in the world and the important role that forests play in the lives of people in terms of economic and environmental values.

He also mentioned that the workshop is a collaboration between ITTO and IUCN and other partners to help restore, manage and rehabilitate degraded and secondary forests by promoting the concept of forest landscape restoration. It is also meant to determine how the FLR can be implemented in the Philippines. Lastly, he showed a short 3 minute film on FLR which was also presented at the last session of the UN Forum on Forests in New York.

The National Facilitator read the keynote address of the DENR Undersecretary Ramon Paje, which cited several past experiences in the attempt to re-vegetate degraded areas in the Philippine. Some of these include, the conversion of inadequately stocked natural forests into monoculture plantations and the failure to involve stakeholders in project planning and implementation. The problems encountered in these experiences only highlighted the need for a more comprehensive approach in forest restoration. The workshop is a welcome development in the sense that issues and concerns along this line can be properly addressed by introducing the participants to the concept of forest landscape restoration.

Paired Introduction of Participants

A paired introduction of participants was conducted wherein participants interviewed and introduced a seatmate and said something about their work and expectations from the workshop. The expectations of participants that came out from this exercise are the following:

- to know FLR concepts, its strategies and applications;
- to learn new techniques and approaches and how these can be applied in indigenous peoples (IP) areas;
- to reconcile FLR with existing approaches, drawing as needed on knowledge from outside;
- to generate critical mass for wider acceptance on FLR;
- to gain a deeper understanding of the word landscape as it applies to forestry;
- to enhance forest rehabilitation efforts through development of appropriate policies and framework;
- to widen network of people from different organizations doing FLR;

- to craft concrete mechanisms that will be used in FLR in the context of Philippine setting;
- to be able to completely understand the ITTO guidelines and to be able to bring it down to the local governments;
- to learn more about what is happening in the field outside the academe;
- to know more about FLR success stories; and
- to help our Philippine forestry institutions become aware of our lending programs for the environment.

Presentation on State of Philippine Forests

The National Facilitator presented a paper entitled: Overview of forests in the Philippines – their current status, functions, problems and challenges. It gave an overview of the situation of forests in the country including its major problems as well as the programs and strategies to address them. The paper is outlined as follows:

- land classification;
- forest cover;
- disposition and management of forestlands;
- significance of forests and forestry sector;
- forestry sector problem tree;
- sustainable forest management; and
- directions of the forestry sector.

Workshop 1 (Problem Analysis of Philippine Forestry Sector)

The presentation of the National Facilitator provided participants the background information for the first group work. In this activity, participants were grouped into 3 and were tasked to discuss, based on their own experiences: 1) The key problems facing the forest sector in the Philippines; 2) the direct and underlying causes of these problems; and; 3) possible solutions to these problems.

The three groups presented their outputs in the plenary after which some notes on some common points by the groups were made by the International Facilitator. These points include illegal occupancy and extraction activities, conflicting government policies, and lack of forest delineation as key problems. Common direct problems include weak enforcement of forest laws and regulations, weak IEC and lack of livelihood opportunities in the lowlands. The groups' outputs are presented in Annex-3. Further discussions were made on the meaning and importance of social preparation and the importance and relevance of forest delineation in forest management

Introduction to the Concepts of FLR

An introduction to the concepts of FLR was presented by the International Facilitator. Some of the items presented include, among others, the following:

- what FLR is and how does it differs from current approaches;
- defining features of FLR;
- what FLR does;
- definition of landscape
- understanding the landscape mosaic;
- elements of landscape functionality;
- local stakeholder involvement in planning;
- understanding trade offs;
- meaning of double filter;
- principle of adaptive management;
- multiple solution or tools approach;
- importance of policy framework.

DAY 2

Presentation on Overview of Forest Rehabilitation in the Philippines

The National Facilitator presented a paper entitled: Forest rehabilitation in the Philippines – An overview. The paper contained information on: change in forest cover, main causes of deforestation, evolution of national initiatives, major driving forces for rehabilitation and shifts in approaches, achievements and impacts.

After the presentation, some comments/questions were raised about the contents of the paper, to wit:

- There is a need to support the policy on rainforestation with another program to produce endemic seedlings due to the scarcity of wildlings belonging to these species. However, this problem is true only in Central Luzon but not in the Visayas and Mindanao areas where wildlings of endemic species are readily available.
- Rainforestation is implementable but needs first the propagation and planting of nurse trees in order to succeed.
- There are reforestation initiatives from other government agencies such as the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) and the Department of Finance which may have not been accounted for in

the paper. This was acknowledged by the paper presenter as one of the paper's limitations.

- The steep rise in reforestation efforts during the late 1980s is a donor driven phenomenon which is unlikely to be repeated in the future because of the changing priorities of donors.
- The energy farm program can serve as entry point for a PWPA (Philippine Wood Producers Association) initiative that recognizes the need to produce wood energy in the rural areas.
- The importance of governance as a driving force for FLR by tapping the support of LGUs.
- The academe has extant information on the effects of past reforestation efforts on hydrology, carbon sequestration and biodiversity which they can share.
- Some PWPA members are willing to provide investments in certain Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) areas but is still looking for a proper mechanism that will work on the ground level.

Presentation on the ITTO Guidelines and Manual on Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR)

A presentation was made by the international facilitator, the scope of which, included the ITTO guidelines and the FLR manual. Information shared about the first document include:

- rationale for developing the guidelines;
- scope of the guidelines;
- components of a typical tropical forest landscape;
- definitions of the various components of a mosaic;
- structure of the guidelines;
- management strategies, and;
- key messages from the guidelines to countries and decision-makers.

On the other hand, the presentation on the contents of the FLR manual include the following:

- key messages;
- limiting factor;
- what makes FLR different from other approaches;
- structure of the manual;

- practical tips and tools; and
- inviting feedbacks on the manual.

Workshop 2 (Review of ITTO Guidelines and FLR Manual)

The International Facilitator gave the instructions for the group work for the day which are enumerated in the following tasks:

- Task 1 - Discuss the applicability of FLR and how it can be applied taking into consideration the key stakeholders, what the main constraints are and what their needs are;
- Task 2 – Review the ITTO guidelines and FLR manual;
- Task 3 – Discuss and provide feedbacks on the ITTO guidelines and FLR manual by:
 1. discussing their respective strengths and weaknesses in terms of structure, content, format and usefulness;
 2. determining whether there are elements that are missing or which ones can be improved; and
 3. expressing their thoughts if they offer sufficient guidance for implementation in the Philippines setting, and if additional national/ context-specific guidelines are needed.

The participants were divided into 3 groups and proceeded with the tasks at hand. The outputs of the groups, in the form of an evaluation of the ITTO guidelines and FLR manual, are presented in Annex-4. Some of the findings and recommendations on the reviewed documents, include among others, the following:

- the ITTO guidelines is comprehensive enough to address restoration requirements to a given degraded tropical forests;
- there is a need to explain FLR more clearly by illustrating specific examples, or comparison with other restoration strategies;
- to improve FLR manual, there is a need to “laymanize” some technical languages for better understanding and appreciation of stakeholders, especially for the implementers at the field level;
- a second part containing tools and enumerating step by step processes should be added to the FLR manual;

- the strengths of the FLR manual are its excellent conceptual framework, good documentation and holistic approach in presentation;
- discussions on social preparation is lacking;
- FLR is applicable in the Philippines setting as long as proper zoning or delineation of second growth forest is done;
- the Identification of an FLR “champion” (advocate) in the project level to serve as catalyst to promote the adoption of FLR principles and strategies likewise needed; and
- there is a need for a Philippine specific manual to implement FLR activities in the country.

After the presentation of the outputs, the International Facilitator indicated that the feedbacks that came out of the exercise are valuable in making subsequent revisions for the manual. He also expressed his view that a localized version of the FLR manual should be done by Filipinos.

Introduction to Study Area

An introduction to the study area was presented by one of the participants, Mr. Edgar Laggui who is an employee of the DENR community office covering the study area. The contents of the presentation are enumerated as follows:

- historical background;
- location and area;
- site description;
- plantation development;
- demographic statistics; and
- problems encountered.

DAY 3

Workshop 3 (Field Trip - Application of FLR Concepts)

The whole day of Day 3 was devoted to the field trip and on the preparation of field trip reports. The participants were divided into three groups and each group was asked to analyze a particular land-use component within the same forest area. One group was tasked to cover an existing government reforestation project, another group was tasked to cover an area covered by an existing forest tenurial instrument while

the last group was asked to cover an area devoted to agricultural crop production by nearby residents. Their tasks for the field trip and the subsequent report preparation are the following:

- draw and describe the visited landscape and its individual land-use components;
- identify the key stakeholders in the landscape and how they interact with one another;
- identify the direct and underlying causes that have driven either forest degradation or restoration in the visited landscape;
- list the innovative land use practices that was observed, if any, and take photographs thereof;
- what they think the landscape will look like a) 5 year hence and b) 20 years hence, and why;
- what interventions are needed to improve the overall situation in the landscape;
- what have they learned on FLR from the site visited; and
- how useful were the ITTO guidelines and the FLR manual in terms of getting FLR started on the ground in the Philippines; if not what else is needed and how can the ITTO/IUCN help in this regard?

DAY 4

The groups presented their field trip reports in the morning of Day 4. The contents of these reports are contained in Annex-5. Discussions following the report centered on the need to mainstream FLR by including it in the national agenda. The National Facilitator responded that FLR can in fact be used as a tool in pursuing related concerns in the current national agenda. For example, the implementation of the present Upland Agriculture Program can make use of FLR strategies and approaches. In fact, based on what he saw on the ground during the field trip, it is his view that some principles of FLR, such as allowing trade-offs were already being used on the ground especially in the way the DENR and the provincial government have managed the people on the site. He also cited the forest occupant's innovative practices, which with some form of recalibration, can meet the twin objectives of protecting the existing forest area and providing for their livelihood following the double filter principle of FLR.

Another question was raised on how to define landscape in terms of size. To this, the International Facilitator responded that there is no hard and fast rule on this matter. It could be a watershed or micro watershed but depends on the overall objectives or goals for the forest area being restored.

The discussion later turned to the issue of decentralization and devolution. An idea was put forward that FLR can be more viable in the Philippine setting if the DENR would be able to share some of its administrative powers in forestlands. The National Facilitator responded by saying that sharing forest management responsibilities is one of the directions being taken by the current DENR administration. In fact, an on-going DENR management conference is in the process of identifying which functions should be further decentralized from the central office to the field offices. He further pointed out that the devolution of some forest management functions to local government units pursuant to the Local Government Code of 1991 has produced mixed results. Apparently, some of them have priorities, i.e. health, peace and order, public infrastructure works, other than the sustainable management of forests. Thus, the DENR is proceeding on this matter on a case to case basis depending on the LGUs capability to handle such functions.

Workshop 4 (Preparation of an FLR Action Plan for the Philippines)

In the afternoon of Day 4, the participants were grouped into 3 and were tasked to work on the following:

- What a Philippine-specific manual for FLR should include and look like;
- Brainstorming ideas for potential FLR projects in the Philippines, using the ITTO Guidelines and FLR Manual for reference as necessary, and;
- An action plan for FLR implementation in the Philippines.

The consolidated outputs of the three groups for workshop 4 is contained in Annex-6.

DAY 5

Presentations

Two presentations were made, one on the ITTO project cycle by Mr. Nonito Tamayo, one of the participants and Deputy Project Manager of the ITTO supported Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management in the Philippines. The other presentation was made by the International Facilitator on Global Partnership the contents of which are the following :

- what the Global Partnership is;
- the origin of the Global Partnership;
- its composition, manner of participation of members and how do they get out of it;

- its achievements and plans, and;
- how the the Philippines can link up to this Partnership.

Plenary Discussion

The National Facilitator guided the participants in coming up with a proposed action plan for FLR implementation in the Philippines. The plan has three objectives, namely: a) development of Philippine FLR Manual; b) promotion of Implementation of FLR in the Philippines, and; c) generation of support/assistance to FLR in the Philippines. The details of the action plan are presented in Annex-7.

Workshop Conclusion

Impressions from Participants

The workshop was concluded with 2 representatives from the participants, Ms. Loretto U. dela Cruz and Mr. Christopher B. Kuizon, providing impressions about the workshop. In behalf of the participants, they indicated that it had been a fruitful exercise in terms of learning a new concept that can fill a gap in the current approaches in forest rehabilitation in the Philippines. They also expressed their pleasure for meeting new people from different sectors who are similarly involved in the restoration of the country's forests. Ms. Dela Cruz was also extremely happy that of the 19 participants, 8 were her students at the University of the Philippine at Los Baños College of Forestry and was amazed at how far they have gone in the forestry profession.

Closing Messages from the International and National Facilitators

The International Facilitator gave his parting message the gist of which is for the participants to become advocates of FLR in their respective work stations. As the first group of people in the Philippines to have attended this type of workshop, they are in the best position to become the people they recommended as essential for the successful implementation of FLR in the Philippines. That is to become "FLR Champions". He expressed his thanks, first to the participants, then the National Facilitator and his support staff for the successful conduct of the workshop.

The National Facilitator gave his thanks to the participants, his counterpart facilitator and the support staff for making the workshop achieve its objectives. He again thanked the ITTO and the IUCN for their support for this National Workshop.

3. Evaluation of the Workshop by Participants

Based on the averaged results of the daily workshop evaluation by participants, the workshop was generally conducted excellently. Of the 6 criteria evaluated, only the time-keeping aspect was not rated excellent by the majority of participants. However, it was rated “good” by the majority which is still within acceptable level. The aspect most rated excellent by participants is the workshop content which was rated by 62% of the participants, followed by facilitation (59%), objective (58%), and activities and facilitation which were both rated excellent by 50% of the participants (Table 1). The daily evaluation sheets are contained in Annex-8.

Table 1. Overall Evaluation on the Conduct of the Workshop by Participants (Percentage of Participants)

ITTO National Workshop on FLR in Philippines Date: 8-12 May 2006	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content	62%	38%		
Activities	50%	49%	1%	
Participation	50%	48%	2%	
Time-keeping	37%	51%	12%	
Objective	58%	42%		
Facilitation	59%	41%		

ANNEXES

Annex-1. Program of Activities.



National Workshop on ITTO Guidelines for the Restoration, Management and Rehabilitation of Degraded and Secondary Tropical Forests

8-12 May 2006
Montemar Beach Club, Bagac, Bataan

Program of Activities

Day 0 (May 7, 2006)

Time	Activity
12.00 pm -12.59 pm	Assembly of participants at DENR compound (Visayas Ave., Diliman Quezon City)
1.00 pm – 4:00 pm	Travel to Montemar Beach Club
7:00 pm	Dinner (El Patio)

Day 1 (May 8, 2006)

Time	Activity
7:00 am	Breakfast (El Patio)
8.00 am – 9.00 am	Registration of participants (Samat A&B)
9.00 am – 10.00 am	Opening Program Background of FLR and introduction to the workshop on behalf of ITTO and IUCN (Sandeep Sengupta) 5-minute Film on FLR Introduction of Guest of Honour Keynote address and formal opening of workshop by Guest of Honour Vote of Thanks and Group Photograph

10.00 am – 10.30 am	Tea/Coffee Break
10.30 am – 11.00 am	Paired introduction of all participants
11.00 am – 11.15 am	Introduction to workshop objectives, structure and agenda, including objective of Day 1
11.15 am – 12.00 pm	Overview of forests in the Philippines – their current status, functions, problems and challenges (national facilitator) Plenary discussion
12.00 pm – 1.00 pm	Lunch (Samat A&B)
1.00 pm – 2.00 pm	Formation of 3 break-out groups to discuss, based on their own experiences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the key problems facing the forest sector in the Philippines; • the direct and underlying causes of these problems; and • possible solutions
2.00 pm – 2.30 pm	Report back by 3 groups to Plenary
2.30 pm – 3.00 pm	Tea/ Coffee
3.00 pm – 4.00 pm	Summary of main points presented by the groups Introduction to the concepts of FLR (Sandeep Sengupta) Plenary discussion
4.00 pm – 4.30 pm	Evaluation & Wrap up of Day 1

7:00 pm	Cocktail Dinner (El Jardin Lower)
----------------	-----------------------------------

Day 2 (May 9, 2006)

Time	Activity
7:00 am	Breakfast (El Patio)
8:00 am – 8:15 am	(Samat A&B) Recap of Day 1 and explaining objective of Day 2
8:15 am – 9:30 am	Current status and overview of FLR in the Philippines (national facilitator) Introduction of what is currently available to help FLR implementation (Sandeep Sengupta) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITTO Restoration Guidelines ITTO/IUCN Manual on FLR
9:30 am – 10:00 am	Tea/ Coffee break
10:00 am – 12:00 pm	Group work on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying stakeholders, constraints and needs for FLR implementation in The Philippines • Reviewing, discussing and providing feedback on the ITTO guidelines and FLR manual
12:00 pm – 1:00 pm	Lunch (Samat A&B)
1:00 pm - 2:00 pm	Continuation of group work
2:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Groups report back to Plenary Discussion/ Clarifications

<p>3:00 – 3:30 pm</p>	<p>Introduction to the field trip sites and on applying the guidelines/ manual in the field</p> <p>Formation of 3 field work groups, and instructions given for field visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draw and describe the visited landscape and its individual land-use components • Identify the key stakeholders in the landscape and how they interact with one another? • Identify the direct and underlying causes that have driven either forest degradation or restoration in the visited landscape. • List the innovative land use practices that you have observed, if any (take photographs if possible). • What do you think the landscape will look like (a) 5 years from now and (b) 20 years from now, and why? • What interventions do you think need to be made to improve the overall situation in the landscape? • What have you learnt on FLR from your field visit? • What do you think needs further clarification? • How useful did you find the guidelines and the manual – are they enough to get FLR started on the ground in the Philippines; if not what else is needed, and how can ITTO/IUCN help in this regard?
<p>3.30 pm – 4.00 pm</p>	<p>Groups start preparing for the field trip <i>(Groups take tea/ coffee break as per preference)</i></p>
<p>4.00 pm – 4.30 pm</p>	<p>Description of logistics for the field trip Evaluation & Wrap up of Day 2</p>
<p>7:00 pm</p>	<p>Dinner (El Patio)</p>

Day 3 (May 10, 2006):

Time	Activity
<p>7:00 am</p>	<p>Breakfast (El Patio)</p>
<p>8:00 am</p>	<p>Travel to Study Area</p>
<p>9:00 am– 3:00 pm</p>	<p>Groups work in the field</p>
<p>3:00 pm – 5:00 pm</p>	<p>Return from field sites</p>
<p>5:00 pm – 5:30 pm</p>	<p>Evaluation and Wrap up of Day 3</p>
<p>7:00 pm</p>	<p>Dinner (El Patio)</p>

Evening – 10 am on Day 4	Groups prepare PP presentations for plenary in Day 4
-----------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------

Day 4 (May 11, 2006):

Time	Activity
7:00 am	Breakfast (El Patio)
10:00 am – 10:15 am	(Samat A&B) Recap of Days 1, 2 & 3 and explaining objective of Day 4
10:15 am – 11:00 am	Report back from the first 2 field trip groups to Plenary
11:00 am – 11:15 am	Tea/ Coffee
11:15 am – 12:00 pm	Report back from 3 rd field trip group & discussions on field trip learnings
12:00pm – 1:00 pm	Lunch (Samat A&B)
1:00 pm – 3:30 pm	Group work on: (a) what a Philippines-specific manual for FLR should include and look like (b) brainstorming ideas for potential FLR projects in the Philippines, using the ITTO Guidelines and Manual for reference as necessary, (c) an action-plan for FLR implementation in the Philippines what support is needed from ITTO/IUCN in this regard
3:30 pm – 4:00 pm	Tea/ Coffee
4:00 pm – 5:00 pm	Report back from the 3 groups Plenary discussion
5:00 pm – 5:30 pm	Evaluation and Wrap up of Day 4
7:00 pm	Dinner (El Patio)

Day 5 (May 12, 2006)

Time	Activity
7:00 am	Breakfast (El Patio)

9:00 am – 9:15 am	Recap of Day 4 and explaining objective of Day 5
9:15 am – 11:00 am	The way forward for FLR implementation in the Philippines and next steps Introduction to the ITTO project cycle and project formulation process Plenary discussion on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prioritizing identified FLR project concepts in the Philippines • fine-tuning the action plan • identifying team to move the action-plan forward
11:00 am – 11:15 am	Tea/ Coffee break (Check out from room)
11:15 am – 12:00 pm	Overall Evaluation of Workshop
12:00 pm – 12:30 pm	Workshop conclusion & distribution of certificates/mementoes Vote of thanks
12:30 pm – 2:00 pm	Lunch

ANNEX-2. Directory of Participants.

A. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

<p>MS. LISA C. ANTONIO Executive Director Philippine Business for the Environment 2/F DAP Bldg., San Miguel Ave. Ortigas Center, Pasig City Tel No.: (02) 635-3670; 635-2650 Fax No.: (02) 631-5714 E-mail: ctem@csi.com.ph</p>	<p>MR. JAIME M. REYES Executive Officer, Environmental Unit Land Bank of the Philippines Land Bank Plaza, 1598 M.H. del Pilar Cor. Dr. Quintos, Malate, Manila Tel No.: (02) 405-7646 Fax No.: (02) 528-8472 Mobile No.: 09173453831 E-mail: jreyes@mail.landbank.com</p>
<p>MR. ROBERT JOEL C. WAGAN Policy, Plans and Program Officer League of Municipalities of the Philippines 2/F LMP Bldg., 265 Ermin Garcia St.,</p>	<p>MS. FRAULEIN M. PERPEDIA Community Development Assistant II Environment Natural Resources Office - Bataan</p>

<p>Cubao, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 913-5738 Fax No.: (02) 913-5737; 440-7306 Mobile No.: 0917-8033138 E-mail.: rjoelw_14@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Bulwagan ng Bayan, Capitol Compound San Jose, City of Balanga, Bataan Tel No.: (047) 237-1056/237-2946 Fax No.: (047) 237-2413</p>
<p>MR. DAVID F. AZURIN Project Supervisor/Forester Save the La Mesa Watershed Project Mother Ignacia Ave., Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 925-3333; 925-5555 Fax No.: (02) 410-9670 Mobile No: 0921-5944356 E-mail: kalikasan@pinoycentral.com</p>	<p>MS. NENA M. DAYNOS Chief, Range and Management Section DENR Region 8, Tacloban City Tel No.: (053) 321-3384/9071 Fax No. (053) 231-3386 E-mail: free8np@yahoo.com</p>
<p>MS. ESTER B. BATANGAN Advocacy Officer I HARIBON Foundation Suites 401-404 Fil-Garcia Tower Kalayaan Ave., cor. Mayaman St., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 436-4363/433-3476 Fax No.: (02) 924-8978 E-mail: ebbgamay@yahoo.com</p>	<p>MS. LORETTO U. DELA CRUZ Professor 2 College of Forestry and Natural Resources UPLB, College, Laguna Tel No.: (049) 536-2599 Fax No.: (049) 536-2557 E-mail: ludelacruz@yahoo.com</p>
<p>MR. CHRISTOPHER B. KUIZON RTD for Forestry DENR Caraga Region Ambago, Butuan City Tel No. : (085) 341-6250 Fax No.: (085) 341-7280 Mobile No.: 0920-4720954 E-mail: rtdf13@yahoo.com</p>	<p>MR. ARTHUR C. SALAZAR Chief, Forest Resources Development Division DENR Region 3, San Fernando, Pampanga Tel No.: (045) 961-4238/963-4651 Fax No. (045) 963-4646 E-mail: artnet272000@yahoo.com</p>
<p>MR. EDGAR D. LAGGUI Chief, Forest Management Specialist CENRO Bagac, Bataan Mobile No.: 0919-6815915</p>	<p>MR. NICER T. SAYON Forester In-Charge CARAGA Federation of Tree Farmers Guingona Subdivision, Butuan City Fax No.: (085) 342-6563 Telefax No.: (085) 342-6554 Mobile No.: 0921-5618125 E-mail: cftfdi_caraga@yahoo.com</p>
<p>MS. LINA M. MANALAYSAY Supervising Forest Management Specialist In-Charge, Reforestation Division Forest Management Bureau – FMB Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 927-2491 E-mail: lina_manalaysay@yahoo.com</p>	<p>MR. NONITO M. TAMAYO Supervising Forest Management Specialist Deputy Director, C & I for SFM Project & Chief, Planning & Technical Operations, SPISP Forest Management Bureau Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 927-48-73 Fax No. (02) 928-04-25 E-mail: nonie_tamayo@yahoo.com</p>

<p>MR. ERWIN B. MAGALLANES Environmental Field Superintendent Environmental Management Dept.–EDC Philippine National Oil Company PNPC Complex, Merritt Road Fort Bonifacio, Taguig City Tel No.: (02) 893-6001 Fax No.: (02) 840-1974 Mobile No.: 0917-5457797 E-mail: ebmagallanes@energy.com.ph</p>	<p>MR. MICHAEL P. PINEDA Operations Manager AWECA, City of San Fernando, Pampanga Mobile No. 0927-6856231</p>
<p>MS. SONIA B. RODRIGUEZ Accts. Management Specialist Climate Change Program Development Bank of the Philippines Sen. Gil J. Puyat Ave., cor. Makati Ave, Makati City Tel No.: (02) 818-9532 Fax No.: (02) 867-3054 E-mail.: sbrodriguez@devbankphil.com.ph</p>	<p>MS. MAILA R. VASQUEZ Forestry & Environment Coordinator Philippine Wood Producers Association 3/F LTA Bldg., Perea St., Legaspi Village Makati City Tel No.: (02) 817-6751; 812-1760 Fax No.: (02) 817-6884 E-mail: info@pwpa.org.ph mailav@netscape.net philforest@greendot.com.ph</p>
<p>MS. LOURDES C. WAGAN Chief, Forest Land Uses Division Forest Management Bureau – FMB Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 925-2140 Fax No.: (02) 920-0374 E-mail: ludycw@yahoo.com</p>	

B. WORKSHOP FACILITATORS

<p>MR. MARCIAL C. AMARO, JR Director Forest Management Bureau – DENR Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 927-4788; 928-1393 Fax No.: (02) 920-0374 Mobile No. 0917-8399359 E-mail: amaromarsjr@yahoo.com fmbdenr@mozcom.com</p>	<p>MR. SANDEEP SENGUPTA Workshop International Facilitator Project Officer Forest Conservation Programme IUCN Rue Mauverney 28 CH-1196 Gland Switzerland Tel No. +41 (0) 22 999 0000/01 Email: sandeep.sengupta@iucn.org.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

C. SUPPORT STAFF

<p>MS. MAYUMI QUINTOS-NATIVIDAD Chief, Forest Economics Division Forest Management Bureau – DENR Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 926-2141 Fax No.: (02) 920-8650 Mobile No. 0918-9344296 Email.: mayquin@mozcom.com</p>	<p>MR. ALEJANDRINO R. SIBUCAO, JR. Economist IV Forest Management Bureau – DENR Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 926-2141 Fax No.: (02) 920-8650 Mobile No. 0920-4505331 E-mail: arsibucdao@yahoo.com</p>
<p>MR. ALEX C. CHENG Senior Forest Management Specialist Forest Management Bureau – DENR Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 927-4788 Fax No.: (02) 920-3074 Email.: ahlecks@yahoo.com</p>	<p>MS. JUDELYN C. FRANCISCO Forest Management Specialist II Forest Resources Development Division DENR-R3, 3rd Flr. Jomafer Bldg. Dolores, City of San Fernando, Pampanga Tel No.: (045) 961-4238 Email: judz0215@yahoo.com</p>
<p>MS. LEYMINDA L. MARAÑON Economist I Forest Management Bureau – DENR Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 926-2141 Fax No.: (02) 920-8650 Mobile No. 0920-5444781 E-mail: foresterley@yahoo.com</p>	<p>MS. ELVIRA G. SABANDO Computer Operator Forest Management Bureau – DENR Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 926-2141 Fax No.: (02) 920-8650</p>
<p>MS. MARIA LOVELLA P. SEGAYO Economist III Forest Management Bureau – DENR Visayas Ave., Diliman, Quezon City Tel No.: (02) 927-4788 Fax No.: (02) 920-3074 Email.: lsegayo@aim.com Mobile No. 0920-5390676</p>	

ANNEX-3. Workshop I Output (Problem Analysis of Philippine Forestry Sector)

Group 1 Output

<i>KEY PROBLEMS</i>	CAUSES		POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
	DIRECT	UNDERLYING	
1. Illegal forestry activities and practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor/weak enforcement of forest laws and regulations ▪ Weak IEC ▪ Land speculation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poverty ▪ Rapid population growth ▪ Displacement from lowland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide livelihood ▪ Increase awareness thru incorporation in school curriculum in the elementary/ high school level ▪ Provide incentives to FL enforcers ▪ Delineation of forest zonline
2. Interpretation of Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA law)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unclear delineation of role and authority of DENR and NCIP re: IPRA Law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IPs affected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Harmonization of existing policies related to IPRA law
3. Lack of integrated area plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weak coordination/ dialogue among stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turfing/ overlapping of functions among stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integration/harmonization of programs/projects of stakeholders
4. Changing banner program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fast turn-over of key officials 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Passage of SFM Act ▪ Implementation of the Revised Masterplan
5. Forest areas become open access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cancellation of tenurial instruments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susceptibility to illegal conversion, occupation, harvesting, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction of appropriate alternative program or management scheme in lieu of the cancelled instruments

Group 2 Output

KEY PROBLEMS	DIRECT CAUSES	UNDERLYING CAUSES	PROPOSED SOLUTIONS
Forest Rehabilitation and Restoration is difficult as seen by slow growth and survival of tree species	Very adverse bio-physical conditions like low soil fertility, microclimate	Improper land-use i.e. continuous cultivation, soil erosion	Species-site Adaptability, Amelioration techniques
	Presence of Invasive Species		Come-up with scientific approach to forest restoration
	Inadequate Fire Protection management	Lack of funds	Prioritize forest fire protection program
Inappropriate incentive systems of forest dependent		Poverty	Provide sustainable livelihood to communities
No delineation of forest lines		CLUP does not integrate forest land-use plan	Integration of FLUP, use of appropriate technologies in land-use planning
		Lack of integrated sectoral development plans using landscape approach	
		Tenure security of forest dependent communities	
		Inadequate Social Preparation in Implementing CBFM	

KEY PROBLEMS	DIRECT CAUSES	UNDERLYING CAUSES	PROPOSED SOLUTIONS
		Conflicting land claims	
		Illegal occupancy in classified timberland areas	
Weak IEC		Lack values formation on the importance of forest resources	Create a mass-based tri-media program by tapping private and business sectors
			Integrate values formation and different programs
	Inadequate policy and Institutional arrangement	Political intervention and patronage	
	Fast Changing policies and leadership taking on different thrusts and direction		
		Growing population of forest dependent communities	
Inadequate resource accounting and valuation		Limited capacity in resource accounting and valuation	Capacity building and resource accounting and valuation

*** CLARIFY LANDSCAPE APPROACH TO FOREST RESTORATION**

Group 3 Output

PROBLEM	CAUSES	SOLUTIONS
1. Rampant illegal logging and poaching	✚ Lack of livelihood opportunities	IEC Involve them in development programs Provide alternative livelihood
2. Collection of wildlife species (birds and other species)	✚ Weak enforcement of forestry laws	Strict policies implementation
3. Influx of migrants in the uplands	✚ Lack of livelihood opportunities ✚ Skewed land distribution ✚ Lack of access to economic opportunities on the lowland	Hasten the completion of forestland boundary delineation
4. Difficulty in rehabilitation due to existing site condition	✚ Improper site species matching ✚ Poor quality seedlings and other planting materials	IEC Technology transfer

<p>5. Conflict in government policies (e.g. DENR, DAR, NCIP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Lack of coordination and linkages among various government institutions 	<p>Harmonization of policies</p>
<p>6. Conversion of forest areas into non-forest use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Lack of proper valuation of resources ✚ Lack of political will ✚ Policy conflict 	<p>The need to come up with comprehensive land use plan</p>
<p>7. Lack of financing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Uncertainty of policies ✚ Technical capability of investors ✚ Questionable credibility of borrowers (farmers) to loan 	<p>Passing of enabling laws (SFMA, TFL, etc) Capacity building</p>
<p>8. Hesitance/reluctance of individuals, corporations to invest in private</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Lack of incentives for tree plantation 	<p>Provision of incentives Streamlining of policies and processes Lee-way of management in the implementation of projects</p>

plantation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Long gestation ✚ Too many requirement ✚ High transaction cost (SOP) 	
9. Upland communities do not have a sense of ownership of project development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Top down planning ✚ Unclear roles of partners and stakeholders 	Proper Identification and involvement of the right stakeholders
10. Presence of wood cartel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Existing chambers do not allow entry of new players 	Need for policy to encourage free enterprise

ANNEX-4. Workshop 2 Output (Evaluation of the ITTO Guidelines and FLR Manual)

GROUP 1 Output

TASK 1

Applicability of FLR and How It can be Implemented in the Phils.

Key Stakeholders

- Forest-based tenurial instrument holders)
- Indigenous Peoples
- Illegal cutters/poachers, squatters
- Local government units
- Line Agencies (DENR, Department of Agriculture (DA) , Department of Energy (DOE), National Irrigation Administration (NIA), National Electrification Agency (NEA), others)
- Lowland & upland farmers
- Civic organizations
- Communist rebels
- Military groups
- Academe & research institutions
- Financing institutions
- Private sector (wood-based industry)
- Environmental groups

Main Constraints

- Multi-dimensional nature/characteristics of various stakeholders
- Lack of awareness on the FLR approach
- Lack of criteria for identifying suitable areas for FLR application
- Resistance & skepticism of upland stakeholders to join new govt. projects
- Conflicting policies of line agencies
- Inadequate technical knowledge required in the implementation of FLR
- Lack of sufficient knowledge on site level conditions

Main Needs

- Extensive/mass based IEC on FLR
- Stakeholder dialogues for participatory decision making/planning
- Techno transfer/capacity building for FLR implementers
- Harmonization of policies among line agencies
- Availability of funding sources for FLR projects
- Need for sufficient characterization of site level conditions

FEEDBACK ON THE ITTO FLR GUIDELINES

Strengths

- Guidelines, glossary and planning and management principles are comprehensive enough to address ease of application to a given degraded tropical forest with enough generalization, so as not to preclude certain types of landscape.
- It also addresses the socio-cultural, ecological and both the economic and institutional considerations of forest management.
- It also considers not only the site level-based stakeholders but also other stakeholders within the landscape.

For Improvement

- Need to explain more clearly the FLR by illustrating specific examples, or comparing it with other forest restoration strategies (e.g., watershed approach).
- In Annex 3, climate was the only basis used for species site adaptability and no consideration was cited on other site factors like soil requirements.
- It would help to include the provision of a legal/policy framework in making the availability of funding mechanisms to jumpstart the rehabilitation scheme (FLR).
- Provide examples of how laws were enacted to provide a national budget for the identified projects, as well as institutional

arrangements with the various local funding and sources of grants, soft loans to address the financial requirements of the same.

- Enhance discussion of Conflict Management approach (similar to the treatment given to the discussion on Stakeholder Analysis and Management)

FLR Manual
(Strengths)

- Site-level restoration strategies for degraded primary, secondary forests, and degraded forest lands are given
- M and E identified key indicators to assess success of FLR

FLR Manual
(For Improvement)

- Too general recommendations
- Need to laymanize for easy appreciation by stakeholders

Applicability in Philippine setting

- Need for more specific site-level strategies esp. in degraded forestlands/secondary forests rehabilitation
- Laymanize for stakeholders appreciation
- Need for a national or country-specific guidelines

GROUP 2 Output

TASK I









“Applicability of FLR in the Philippines and how it can be applied”

Conditions:













Yes, FLR is applicable in the Philippines provided that appropriate zoning and appropriate management prescription in degraded secondary growth forest be applied.

STAKEHOLDERS

PRIMARY FOREST LAND

-  DENR
-  Local government units (LGUs)
-  Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)
-  Academic and Research Institutions
-  Indigenous Peoples
-  Conservation NGOs
-  Department of National Defense (DND) in military reservation areas
-  Department of Tourism (DOT)

SECONDARY GROWTH FOREST

-  DENR
-  Business and Private Sector (forest licensees)
-  DAR
-  National Commission for Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) and IP
-  Telecommunication Companies
-  POs
-  Academic and Research Institutions
-  CBFMA Holders
-  Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)/Technological Education and Skill Development Authority (TESDA)
-  LGU
-  Department of Agriculture (DA)
-  DOT

DEGRADED SECONDARY FOREST

- ✚ DA
- ✚ DAR
- ✚ Business sector (agro-forestry, tree plantation, etc)
- ✚ DENR
- ✚ DTI/TESDA
- ✚ Peoples Organizations (POs)
- ✚ DOT
- ✚ Academic and research institutions
- ✚ Financial institutions
- ✚ National Power Corporation (NPC)

*Please clarify if FLR would include primary and secondary forest, degraded secondary forest, agriculture and marine ecosystems

MAIN CONSTRAINTS

POLICY

- ✚ Policy conflict in relation to resource use
- ✚ Policies that favor extractive use of forest resources
- ✚ Frequent changes of policies related to forest resource management and utilization
- ✚ Too many requirements in securing permits/ licenses

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

- ✚ Difficult/ complicated trade – off negotiations across sectors due to conflicting interests
- ✚ Conflicting and overlapping mandates of national government agencies (ex. DENR, DAR, DA, etc)
- ✚ Frustrations/ and/or low acceptability level due to failure of several government programs with multi-stakeholder’s participation.

LIMITED FINANCIAL SUPPORT

MAIN NEEDS

- ✚ Research and Development on FLR
 - ✚ Capacity Building to implement FLR
 - ✚ Integration of FLUP into the CLUP
 - ✚ Intensive IEC on FLR for appreciation for stakeholders
 - ✚ Resource mobilization
 - ✚ Enhanced mediation negotiation of trade – offs
- Feedback on ITTO Guidelines and Manual

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conceptual framework is excellent (balance of ecological integrity, socio-economic, environment security, etc) - Good documentation in showcasing successful FLRs - Holistic approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly technical (Who are the users of the manual?) - Not simplified for stakeholders - Need for guidelines in incorporating FLR in the operations of the stakeholders - Guidelines for social preparations - Identification of champions and mass based - Need for identification of critical plant biodiversity areas as identified by PAWB and some scientists

Given the dynamism of the multi-stakeholders interests, context-specific guidelines are needed.

GROUP 3 Output

“Applicability of FLR in the Philippines and how it can be applied”

STAKEHOLDERS	CONSTRAINTS (Inhibiting Factor)	NEEDS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Communities ➤ NGO ➤ LGUs ➤ Private Sector (Individuals, groups, Corporations) ➤ Academic Institution ➤ Nat.Gov. Agencies ➤ Religious sector ➤ Media ➤ Mining Industry ➤ Wood Industry ➤ Policy Makers ➤ Poachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty in convening all stakeholders in one forum • “ Fatigue” • Conflicting Policies • Conflicting Interests of Different stakeholders • Turfing • Target Oriented rather than Result Oriented • No Sustained Commitment “Ningas Cogon” to implement the project • Inadequate preparation to implement the program/project • Preference for economic returns rather than environmental concern • Highly politicized environment • Difficulty in coming up with a decision in managing the landscape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive understanding of FLR by the Stakeholder • Capacity building of stakeholders • Mechanism for conflict resolution • Guidelines/policies to the program (FLR) • Sharing of practices/lessons/ experiences by other countries implementing FLR • IEC • Complementation of expertise and resources of all stakeholders • Political will • LGU to play an active role in FLR implementation • Consultation and dialogues • Monitoring and evaluation • Facilitating skills

ANNEX-5. Workshop 3 Output (Field Trip – Application of FLR Concepts).

Group 1 Output

The FLR Journey of Brgy. Liyang

Yesterday, Today & Tomorrow

The assigned site is a 200-ha area within Brgy. Liyang. This embraces Sitio Kinainisan and Sitio Catmon. The major source of income is agricultural crops production. Key stakeholders include households (30-40), DENR, LGUs, potential SIFMA applicants/investors, non-local land speculators, other line agencies (DA, DAR, etc.), financing institutions, academe and business sector.

Interactions observed/recorded are as follows:

- Conflict between local and non-local claimants;
- Local communities driven by their own interests;
- Absentee claimants (landlord-tenant relationship);
- Relationship between DENR and communities, and;
- Threat from illegal poachers.

Degradation in the area is caused by the following: Bataan logging; encroachment and kaingin making of upland settlers; conversion to sugarcane plantation; grazing land; cultivation of land into agricultural purposes, and forest fires. There are restoration efforts conducted in the area, namely: National Forestation Program, SIFMA, AFFLA, and individual initiatives. Furthermore, there are innovative land use practices observed in the area such as boundary demarcation using eucalyptus and kakawate, tree plantations (SIFMA/FSP), agroforestry, and orchards.

Different scenarios under different circumstances as well as the monitoring and evaluation aspect are enumerated below:

Scenario Building (5 years)

With intervention

- Orchards
- Cashew and coconut plantations
- Tree plantation
- Abundance of firewood
- Cutflower production
- Silvipasture
- Green environment

Scenario Building (5 years)

Without intervention

- Grass fires
- Barren area
- Eroded soil
- Dried up rivers and springs

- Upland migration

Scenario Building (20 years)

With intervention

- Adoption of FLR in adjacent areas
- Well managed landscape
- Greener environment
- Organized communities
- Improvement of agribiodiversity

Scenario Building (20 years)

Without intervention

- Housing project
- Golf course
- Industrial park
- Rest houses
- Dislodged communities

Scenario Building (20 years)

Interventions

- Conflict resolutions
- Determine appropriate land-use
- Site-species suitability matching
- Financing
- Technology and product development
- Support services

Monitoring & Evaluation

- Baseline
- Develop impact M & E tool
- Feedback & planning

Impacts of M & E

Socio-economic Indicators

- Increased income
- Improved health
- Education opportunities
- Reduced land-use conflicts
- Complementation of resources among stakeholders
- Organized communities/ stakeholders

Ecological Indicators

- Increased wildlife
- Improved water quality & quantity
- Improved soil fertility
- Improved microclimate

Governance

- Organizational structure
- Policies, guidelines, resolutions
- Systems (administration, financial, conflict, etc)

Learnings

- Different land-uses can be adopted over the same site provided the different stakeholders agree to harmonize by using FLR tool
- Application of FLR addressed and recognized the functionality of the total landscape (human well-being and ecological integrity)
- Open cultivated areas if sustainably managed will reduce pressure on the forest
- Recognize the need for inter-disciplinary expertise

Needs

FLR can be adapted in the Philippines because there are already existing practices (multiple use concept and capacitated communities). However, there is a need for further enhancement of the existing system through FLR.

- Intensified IEC
- Capacity building of stakeholders
- Strong political will and commitment to implement FLR
- Simplified FLR manual and guidelines
- Good governance at the local level
- Networking and linkages
- Markets

Group 2 Output

Group 2 presented the **Integration of FLR Concepts in SIFMA Program for Degraded Forest Land Rehabilitation**. The site is located also in the Province of Bataan. The site is frequently burned grassland with large patches of bare soil. Obviously, it has low soil fertility level, moderately rolling topography and very susceptible to erosion. It lacks micro habitat for seed germination and is adjacent to the east boundary, which is the contract reforestation area. Land use components are as follows:

- Grassland – cogon and hagonoy;
- Small patches of mangoes and bananas at the lower portion, and;
- Small patches of kamote, radish and other short term crops.

The key stakeholders are SIFMA holders (Greenland Plantation and Wood Industry Inc., Mr. De Jesus and Mr. Triguero); caretakers (Mr. Danilo Medina, Ms. Rosi Medina, Mr. Demetrio Reyes and Ms. Betty Reyes); residents of Barangay Liyang, Pilar and Parang, Bagac; Local DENR; displaced claimant – Mr. Canete; Local Government Units (LGU)s – Bagac and Pilar; Department of Tourism (DOT), and; other identified claimants. The following are some observations on the interaction among stakeholders: a) absentee SIFMA holder claimant; b) lack of interaction between the SIFMA holder and the community; c) conflict between displaced claimant and SIFMA holder, and; d) lack of monitoring by DENR – reluctance of local brgy. officials to visit the area due to jurisdictional issue.

The direct and underlying causes of forest degradation are enumerated below:

- Direct Causes
 - Commercial logging
 - Road construction
 - Shifting cultivation (burning), short fallow period
 - Grazing land (burning)
- Underlying Causes
 - Poverty
 - Lack of livelihood at the lowland
 - Vested interest of few rich people
 - Lack of clear understanding of the objectives of the programs (DENR, i.e. 90:10 ratio)

There is no innovative land use practice observed. The different scenarios of the area under different circumstances are as follows:

Scenario 5 years from now (w/o intervention)

- More degraded grass land area
- More eroded area
- Lack of regeneration

Scenario 20 Years From Now (w/o intervention)

- Very dry area
- Dried-up stream/creeks rivers
- Severe erosion
- Very low biodiversity

- Decreased value of the land (i.e. aesthetic, etc.)

Site level interventions are enumerated as follows:

A. Participatory Decision Making (IEC)

B. Tree Plantation Establishment (SIFMA) – mixed plantations

Recommended Species:

- Mahogany
- Eucalyptus
- Kakawate
- *A. mangium*
- *A. auriculiformis*
- Indigenous – Alibangbang, Binayuyu, Anabiong
- Fruit trees - Mangoes, Bayabas, Kasoy, Santol, Duhat, Langka

C. Nursery Establishment

- Training/Capacity building for caretakers of SIFMA holders

D. Use of Soil Amelioration Technology

- Use of Bio-inoculation in the Nursery and starter complete fertilizer

E. Fire Protection Management

- Fire Protection Management Prevention
 - Information Education Campaign (IEC), fire patrol, look-out
- Pre-Suppression
 - Fire line construction
 - Reduction of fire hazard
 - Planting of suitable species for green breaks
 - Look – out tower
- Suppression (use of firefighting equipment)

F. Conflict Resolution and Management

G. Soil Erosion Control

- Use of natural vegetative strips (NVS) across the slope

Double filter objective is met in SIFMA by:

- Tree planting - enhances ecological integrity, and:
- Fruit tree and agricultural crop production - enhance human well-being.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of Site Level Impacts:

- DENR conducts M&E on the compliance of SIFMA Holders regarding the requirements of the program
- In addition, we propose that the program include assessment of the following site level impacts which show recovery of ecosystem integrity and restoration of ecological functions:
 - Biodiversity assessment
 - Improvement of soil characteristics
- Improvement of water quality and quantity

- Improvement of micro-climate
(This will require baseline data to determine site level impacts.)
 - Improvement of socio-economic well being of the stakeholders especially the community
 - Enhanced eco-tourism benefits
 - Increased value in the land

Group 3 Output

Catmon and Kinainisan Sub-Watershed, Pantingan Watershed

The area of Group 3 is located in Catmon Sub-Watershed, a tributary of the Panitian Watershed in Brgy. Parang, Bagac, Bataan. The populace is composed of Bataanons and migrants from Cavite, Laguna and Batangas.

THE LANDSCAPE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

- Area used to be a primary forest.
- After logging, migrants from neighboring provinces (Cavite, Laguna and Batangas) went to the area, settled and opened up lands for cultivation. Accordingly, “what you can clear will be yours” (*magasak mo sayo*)
- Fire aggravated the degradation/deterioration of the landscape.

PRESENT CONDITION

The present condition of the landscape is degraded with fragments of natural forest especially along gullies and the upper part. Other observations are as follows:

- Only small fragments of forest remains specially along gullies and the upper portion.
- Even hilly slopes are devoid of forest cover.
- Generally covered with grasses and shrubs.
- Erosion is not widespread.
- The landscape is dotted with cultivated farms planted with a variety of agricultural crops such as cassava, banana, coconut and some fruit trees like mango and cashew.
- In flatter areas especially along water bodies/rivers rice are cultivated.
- Except for the natural forest, almost all portion of the landscape, even the plantation developed by the government through contract reforestation, are claimed.
- There are areas that are even fenced although, accordingly everybody knows that the land is a government property.
- Although the area is degraded, a number of wildlife especially fauna abounds in the area. Several species of birds could still be found. According to members of the community, deer and wild pigs could still be hunted in the area.

Key Stakeholders

The key stakeholders are as follows: Local Government Units (all levels), tenure holders (SIFMA, CBFMA, CSC), untenured occupants, speculators, DENR, and other government agencies.

Causes of Degradation or Restoration

The direct and indirect causes of degradation or restoration are enumerated below:

- Direct
 - Logging
 - Conversion to agriculture
 - Forest fire
 - Poaching
 - Fuelwood gathering/charcoal making

- Illegal occupancy
- Indirect
 - Presence of access road
 - Absence of livelihood opportunities in lowlands
 - Open access condition of some portion of the area

Innovative Practices

Innovative practices in the area include coconut plantation mixed with fruit trees, and seasonal agricultural crops; Mango orchard; sanitation cutting (in plantation), and; only prunnings are used for charcoal making.

Landscape in the future

Landscape in the future are described as follows:

Landscape in the future without intervention:

- After five (5) years
 - Trees in the reforestation areas will decrease due to cutting
 - Increase in settlers
 - Forest fire continues
 - Natural forest will also be threatened
 - New plantations maybe developed especially in SIFMA areas
 - Agricultural areas will expand but productivity will decrease
 - Population in the upland will increase
 - Standard of living remains low

Landscape in the future with intervention:

- After 5 years
 - Trees in the plantation will be maintained and protected
 - Forest fires will be minimized
 - Natural forest will remain intact
 - New plantations will be developed by SIFMA holders
 - Agricultural areas will be maintained and will increase productivity
 - Family income will increase
 - Alternative source of livelihood available
 - Stakeholders are organized
 - Timber poaching controlled

Landscape in the future without intervention:

- After 20 years
 - Fully grown plantation already harvested or cut
 - Springs have dried up
 - Natural stands degraded
 - More houses in the area
 - Standard of living remain low or become worst
 - Forest fire remains a problem
 - Cultivated areas expanded

Landscape in the future with intervention:

- After 20 years
 - Fully grown plantation harvested and replanted/expanded and quality improved
 - Easements and other critical areas planted with appropriate species
 - Natural stand expands
 - Agricultural areas with increased productivity
 - Biodiversity enhanced
 - Increased standard of living
 - Macro climate improved
 - Water quality and volume improved
 - Increased family income

Site level interventions to improve landscape situation:

- Establishment of more plantations/orchards
- Introduction of high-value crops in identified agroforestry farms
- Environment-friendly farming technologies
- Implementation of measures to improve condition of natural stand (ANR, rainforestration, etc.)
- Maintenance/improvement of communal pasture areas
- Formation of patrol sectors/teams
- Formation of FLR council composed of different stakeholder representatives
- Establishment of alliances and/or tie-ups with individuals or groups outside of the landscape

Management of trade-offs:

- Zoning of the landscape
- Socio-economic profiling
- Issuance of appropriate land tenure instrument
- Organize the stakeholders
- Conduct of regular dialogues
- FLR Council

Monitoring

- Indicators -- Socio-economic Indicators
 - Participation of stakeholders in planning and decision-making
 - Security of land tenure
 - Increased productivity of farms
 - Viable alternative livelihood provided
 - Management of sites follow agreed upon used per zoning
 - Alliance and partnership building functional
- Indicators -- Environmental
 - Extent and quality of forest cover increased/improved
 - Biodiversity enhanced
 - Effective and appropriate SWCs
 - Effectiveness of forest protection activities
- Who monitors?
 - Team of stakeholders with DENR, NGO and other sectors

- When and frequency
 - To be done periodically, the frequency depends on the indicators to be monitored.

Learnings from the field

- The bigger the landscape the more complicated the FLR process will be
- Interaction among stakeholders is very critical in the FLR process
- The double-filter nature of the FLR might be compromised in some real-world settings
- Understanding of the social and cultural complexities and dynamics is very crucial in the FLR process

Needs further clarification

Consideration in defining the extent landscape.

Usefulness of the guidelines

Guidelines and the Manual are very useful. However, some items need to be contextualized in the Philippine setting and laymanized as well for easy appreciation by other stakeholders

ITTO/IUCN – technical and funding assistance

ANNEX-6. Workshop 4 Output (Preparation of an FLR Action Plan for the Philippines).

TASK 1: Development of a Philippine – specific FLR Manual that can really help practical implementation and scale – up of FLR in the Philippines.

A. Structure

Group 1

1. Proper Sequencing of topics, theory and concepts
2. Relationship between topics and sub – topics
3. Tables / Graphs / Annexes should follow immediately after the topic

Group 2

1. Source of book
(Guidelines and Manuals)
2. Philippine FLR manual
3. FLR CD (AVP on FLR)

Group 3

- Should be divided into coherent chapters or parts

B. Content

Group 1

1. Clear and specific mandate of each stakeholder (i.e. LGU, NCIP, DENR, etc.)
2. Mechanics / methodology should be clear and simple for easy understanding

3. Procedure on how to harmonize the various mandates of each stakeholders (i.e. recommending an FLR Council, etc.)
4. Presentation of success stories on various projects relative to forest restoration
5. Comparison between existing private/government sector restoration programs/projects

Group 2

1. Introduction
2. State of Philippine forest and Rationale of FLR
 - Concept and Principle of FLR
3. FLR and How does it differ from other approaches
 - Understanding the Landscape
 - Stakeholder approach
 - Steps involved in the implementation
 - Preparatory Stage
 - Site Identification and assessment
 - Profiling (Social and Bio-Physical)
 - IEC
 - Consultation/Dialogues
 - Participatory Planning
 - Identification and formation of Planning Team (representative from stakeholder)
 - Dialogue/negotiation/trade-off
 - identification of intervention / site level options and strategies
 - Scenario Modeling
 - Resource Mobilization
 - Writing the Plan
 - Affirmation of the Plan by the stakeholders
 - Implementation
 - Capacity building
 - Sharing of Lessons learned
 - Documentation
 - Implementation Guides
 - Species Site Adaptability
 - Nursery Techniques
 - Plantation development (agro-forestry, tree, orchard, etc)

- M & E

Group 3

1. All about FLR (definition of the concept, rationale/objectives, benefit, challenges, pre-conditions)
2. Overview of previous & current practices in the country and existing pertinent policies
3. How to's (steps, processes with caselets/examples) and needs
4. Problems/issues and potential challenges in using FLR

Annexes:

M and E Checklists

Analysis methods

Recommended Species (site-spp. suitability)

C. *Format*

Group 1

1. Size – half-size of the original / notebook size
2. Language – should be laymanize (English and Filipino version)
3. Text / diagram – used of illustrations / pictures that depict the topic

Group 2

1. Simple, laymanized language
2. Visuals (graphs, pictures, illustrations, caselets, etc)
3. Tools and methodologies and structured learning exercises

Group 3

1. Must be handy enough for practical use
2. Materials should be in thin film to withstand weathering
3. *Language should be in English and Tagalog with plenty of illustrations/ diagrams for ease of appreciation and use*

TASK 2: Brainstorm ideas for potential FLR projects in the Philippines, drawing from your own experiences till date and present your top 3 ideas to the plenary

Group 1

Mariveles Watershed FLR Project

Guinsaogon FLR Project

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS	OBJECTIVES	STRATEGY
Management of people in the place	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Watershed rehabilitation 2. Improvement of biodiversity conservation 3. Improve the socio-economic condition 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data baselining <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characterization of area • Socio economic profiling • mapping of area • Geo-hazard indexing 2. IEC 3. Community Organizing 4. Dialogue among stakeholders 5. Forest restoration activities 6. Monitoring and Evaluation

Angat River Basin FLR Project

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS	OBJECTIVES	STRATEGY
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Migration 2. Deterioration in water quality and quantity 	To provide Metro Manila with stable and quality supply of water in, domestic, industrial, agricultural and commercial needs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IEC 2. Relocation of affected communities within the periphery of the dam (trade-off) 3. Intensive forest protection activities

Group 2

Title: Caliraya Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR)

Specific Problem: Degraded grassland and Critical watershed; use for hydro electric power

Objectives:

- a. Restore forest function of the watershed
- b. Provide alternative livelihood to the community/ upland settlers
- c. Promote collaborative management among stakeholders (NPC, DENR, LGU, Communities, DOT, DOE, etc)

Strategies

1. Review baseline data
2. Identify forest restoration option
3. Stakeholders consultation/negotiation
4. Planning and implementation
5. Monitoring and evaluation

Group 3

Title: Restoration of Umiray Watershed

Problem: continuous degradation of the watershed caused by illegal logging and unsustainable farming practices by the occupants.

Objectives:

1. Sustainable water supply
2. Restoration of ecosystem functions and biodiversity
3. Socio-economic upliftment of the local people

Strategies:

1. IEC, consultation/dialogue
2. Participatory planning and decision-making
3. Watershed characterization
4. Biodiversity assessment, etc.

Title: Restoration of Atimonan National Park

Problem: Biodiversity in the park is threatened by illegal logging and land speculation

Objectives:

1. Enhancement of biodiversity
2. Rehabilitation of degraded areas
3. Improve socio-economic condition of the stakeholders particularly the local communities

Strategies:

1. Rainforestation
2. Capacity building
3. Provision of livelihood and practice of sustainable agroforestry
4. Intensive forest protection
5. Strengthening of PAMB

Title : Bacon-Manito Geothermal Reservation

Problem: Degradation of the reservation due to illegal occupancy and timber poaching

Objectives:

1. Rehabilitate the reservation
2. Close “open access” condition of site
3. Wean people from too much dependence on the forest resources

Strategy:

1. Plantation establishment
2. Rainforestation
3. Protection
4. Provision of livelihood
5. Issuance of appropriate tenurial instrument

Task 3: What are the top 5 things that you think need to be done next to promote FLR implementation in the Philippines (i.e. Action – Plan)

Group 1

1. Mainstreaming of FLR in the DENR – FMB Mandate
2. Capacitating of implementers and other stakeholders
3. IEC of FLR at all levels
4. Implementation of pilot projects (at least 3)
5. Replication of successful FLR projects nationwide

Group 2

1. Intensified IEC
2. Stakeholder Consultation and Dialogues and linkages
3. Identify champions for FLR
4. Inclusion in the priority agenda of GMA
5. Pilot testing

Group 3

1. Intensive tri-media campaign and on-site-level advocacies
2. Capacity building
3. Mandate application of FLR
4. Pilot-test FLR in selected areas
5. Publication and dissemination of success stories
6. Identification of FLR champions (doable in five years)

TASK 4: ITTO SUPPORT

Group 1

1. Cross – visit to other successful projects worldwide
2. Technical assistance on innovative practices

Group 2

1. Technical Assistance
2. Capability building
3. Research/studies

Group 3

1. Techno-transfer
2. Cross-visits/study tours
3. Updates on recent developments re: FLR in other countries
4. Enhance linkages especially with other donors

ANNEX-7. Proposed Action Plan for FLR Implementation in the Philippines.

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITY	TIME FRAME	OUTPUTS	RESPONSIBILITY CENTER(S)
Development of Phil. FLR Manual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Creation of National Working Group (WG) 	End of May	Special Order signed by DENR Secretary	DENR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review the applicability of the ITTO FLR (manual) to Phil. Conditions 	June-July	Series of meetings and workshops, etc.	National WG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of current relevant practices vis-à-vis FLR 	Aug.-Oct.		National WG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of Phil. FLR Manual 	Aug.-Oct.	1 st draft of the Phil. FLR Manual	DENR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutionalize FLR in the DENR 	Continuing	Policy guidelines	DENR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mainstreaming of FLR in the national development agenda 	Continuing	Policy document/ pronouncement	DENR

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITY	TIME FRAME	OUTPUTS	RESPONSIBILITY CENTER(S)
Promotion of the Implementation of FLR in the Phils.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preparation and dissemination of IEC materials 	3 rd wk of May	IEC materials/media (video, brochures, newsletters, websites, etc.)	National WG
		May		National WG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of champions/advocates of FLR 	Continuing	CSOs, OGAs, LGUs and other entities identified	National WG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stakeholder consultations, dialogues and linkages 	Continuing	Workshops, meetings, agreements, etc.	National WG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacitation' of implementers and other stakeholders 	Continuing	Training workshops, cross visits, etc.	National WG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification and development of pilot/test sites and replication 		Landscapes within priority watershed areas targeted for rehab in the medium term		

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITY	TIME FRAME	OUTPUTS	RESPONSIBILITY CENTER(S)
Generation of Support/ Assistance to FLR in the Phils.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Membership in Global Partnership on FLR 	June onwards	GPFLR partnership	National WG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Linkaging with local financial institutions (such as DBP and LBP) and foreign donors 	Continuing	Financial packages, pledges	National WG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sourcing from ITTO and IUCN some financial and/or technical assistance to implement specific activities 	Continuing	Approved and funded projects	National WG DENR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Linkaging and partnership with LGUs and private sector to support FLR implementation in pilot sites 	Continuing	Agreements, etc.	National WG

ANNEX 8. Responses to Daily Workshop Evaluation.

DAY 1 (May 8, 2006)	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content	53%	47%		
Activities	24%	76%		
Participation	18%	76%	6%	
Time-keeping		65%	35%	
Objective	35%	65%		
Facilitation	35%	65%		
Any other (please specify below): =venue to share existing initiatives related to FLR =speaker talks very fast =fruits, veggies... =time for swimming				

DAY 2 (May 9, 2006)	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content	50%	50%		
Activities	33%	67%		
Participation	28%	72%		
Time-keeping	28%	67%	5%	
Objective	50%	50%		
Facilitation	50%	50%		
Any other (please specify below): =Evaluation/assessment in plenary =Groupings assigned by specific chapters =FRUITS! =Overview to be brief, not a documentary film =Sticking to schedule would be preferable =Early swimming =Good work/ efficient organizing team				

DAY 3 (May 10, 2006)	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content	50%	50%		
Activities	50%	50%		
Participation	50%	50%		
Time-keeping	50%	39%	11%	
Objective	50%	50%		
Facilitation	50%	50%		
Any other (please specify below): =Lets stick to program schedule. please. =Better if we started our field trip early in the morning =Activity in general is enjoyable, esp the trip to Mt. Samat Shrine (educational) =I love the activity today =What about seafoods? =Makati sa dila bangus kanina, paulit-ulit food				

DAY 4 (May 11, 2006)	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content	65%	35%		
Activities	59%	35%	6%	
Participation	76%	24%		
Time-keeping	47%	53%		
Objective	65%	35%		
Facilitation	65%	35%		
Any other (please specify below): =Additional representative from PAWB and one more from conservation NGO =Surprise! we finished early =Analysis of the site can be done in 1day and another day for the analysis of the manual				

DAY 5 (May 12, 2006)	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content	94%	6%		
Activities	83%	17%		
Participation	77%	17%	6%	
Time-keeping	61%	33%	6%	
Objective	89%	11%		
Facilitation	94%	6%		
Any other (please specify below): = very educational = job well done				