Republic of the Philippines
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT BUREAU
Ninoy Aquino Parks and Wildlife Center, Quezon Avenue, Diliman, 1100 Quezon City
Tel. Nos.: *(632) 8924-6031 to 35* | Fax: *(632) 8924-0109, (632) 8920-4417*
Website: *https://bmb.gov.ph* | E-mail Address: *bmb@bmb.gov.ph*

MEMORANDUM

FOR : The Regional Executive Director
DENR Region 4-B (MIMAROPA)
1515 L & S Bldg., Roxas Blvd., Metro Manila

FROM : The Director
In concurrent capacity as Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Foreign-Assisted and Special Projects

SUBJECT : **COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE DRAFT PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN (PAMP) FOR CY 2020-2029 OF EL NIDO-TAYTAY MANAGED RESOURCE PROTECTED AREA (ENTMRPA)**

Pursuant to the existing guidelines including the Implementing Rules and Regulations of the ENIPAS Act, which provides that the PAMB shall review, update, and if necessary, modify the PAMP, at least every three (3) years, in accordance with studies, sound resources assessments, and surveys, and the social dynamics in the protected area, we are providing the following comments and recommendations on the submitted PAMP of El Nido-Taytay Managed Resource Protected Area (ENTMRPA):

1. Identification of management zones is a requirement for the development of programs and standards to achieve goals and objectives of the protected area. Please note that the identification and designation of SPZ and MUZ is a major component of the PAMP since all activities that shall be allowed, regulated/controlled, and restricted are dependent on the appropriate location of MUZ and SPZ of the protected area. Hence, zoning should be carefully prepared based on the data requirements indicated in BMB Technical Bulletin No. 2018-01 and BMB Memorandum dated 06 February 2020 on the Prescribed Primary and Secondary Thematic Datasets for the Preparation or Updating of Management Zones of Protected Areas and in consultation with the concerned stakeholders particularly the PAMB members.

2. Furthermore, please kindly adopt the correct color coding of the management zones as prescribed in BMB Memorandum dated 18 February 2020 on "Prescribed map template for the designated management zones of Protected Areas under the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS)"

3. The Executive Summary should provide information on the previous management plan and the present status of its implementation, highlighting the similar or different approaches and strategies to be undertaken for the updated management plan.

4. The draft Plan should provide annexes of the key documents such as biodiversity assessment, socio-economic assessment, highlights of consultations, maps among others.

5. The draft plan should enhance the discussion on the gender and development.

6. Kindly enhance the Monitoring and Evaluation Section in the Management Plan. This Section is an important component of the plan in order to document and measure overall performance and achievement of the desired results set out in the Management Plan.

Detailed comments and recommendations are provided in the attached Matrix for your reference and guidance.

Lastly, along with the updated PAMP, please submit also the accomplished checklist for the review of PAMPs as provided through BMB Technical Bulletin No. 2017-08. The said checklist serves as a guide for the DENR Regional Offices to facilitate the review of the PAMP prior to its submission to the Office of the Secretary through the BMB.

Your immediate revision of the Management Plan is hereby enjoined to facilitate the affirmation by the Undersecretary for Policy Planning and International Affairs following Rule 9.7 of the DENR Administrative Order No. 2019-05 (Implementing Rules and Regulations of RA 7586, as amended by RA 11038).

For information and further appropriate action.

MARCIAL C. AMARO, JR.

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT BUREAU

BMB202301667

Protected Area Management Plan Assessment Checklist				
(This tool is meant to facilitate the preparation and review of protected area management plans. It is not meant to restrict the process of preparation of management plans.)				
Name of PA		**EL NIDO-TAYTAY MANAGED RESOURCE PROTECTED AREA**		
Name of Assessor		Babylyn M. Cacao Juliana A. Balogo	Date Assessed	17-Mar-23
			Recommendation:	For revision of the draft Management Plan based on the comments and recommendations provided below including the logical presentation of the PAMP Outline as prescribed in BMB TB No. 2016-08.
Section		**Guide Questions**	**Yes/No**	**REMARKS**
Overall				
	1	Does the plan contain all the required parts/sections as outlined in the technical bulletin?	YES	
	2	Are the area's important biodiversity components/elements, its value(s) to people, and key threats/pressures/ issues/concerns identified and described in the Executive Summary?	YES	
	3	Is there a discussion describing the process adopted in the formulation/updating of the management plan?	YES	Chapter 2 of the Plan discussed the Management Process undergone in the preparation of the Plan.
	4	Does the plan include an annex of key documents such as biodiversity assessment, socio-economic assessment, minutes of meetings, highlights of consultation workshops, etc.?	NO	There is no Annexes attached. Kindly attached all relevant documents in formulating the Plan, such as biodiversity assessment, minutes of meetings/workshops, maps, among others.
	5	Does the plan use standard terminologies in protected area management?	YES	
Description of the Protected Area				
	6	Were both secondary and primary data adequately collected and used in the updating/formulation of the management plan? Were they adequately referenced (author, year, title, source, etc.) and made accessible/available?	YES	The results of BMS, BAMS and other study conducted in El Nido were used in updating the Plan
	7	Are the various ecosystem and sub-ecosystem types identified (even if only through remote sensing) and depicted on a map?	Partly YES	Various forest types were discussed, however not mapped
	8	Are the key threats/pressures identified, their abundance and distribution mapped?	Partly YES	Threats /pressure were identifed and discussed on pages 141-144 of the Plan. However, it was not mapped.

Section		Guide Questions	Yes/No	REMARKS
Biophysical	9	Are the key species identified, their abundance and distribution mapped?	Partly YES	Key species are identified, but not mapped. Please provide maps where the specific concentration/abundance and distribution of key species aside from the map of BMS and BAMS.
	10	If available, was the diversity index of the various sampling stations (properly computed and) adequately presented for use in management zoning and monitoring?	Partly YES	Areas with high biodiversity in El Nido is presented in Figure 15, however, the data/information used is way too old. It is suggested to cite the latest biodiverity indices of PCSD and to also discuss BI in Taytay part of ENTMRPA (if available).
Socio-economic	11	Are the key ecosystem services values identified, their (relative) abundance and distribution mapped?	Partly YES	The key ecosystem services and values of ENTMRPA were discussed and provided in Chapter 4 and Table 40. However, these were not refelected on a map, hence the need to include in the plan the maps reflecting the various ecosystem services.
	12	Does the plan contain a description of the conservation value of the protected area?	YES	
	13	Have the PA's current values been quantified either in peso terms or in relative terms?	Partly YES	Page 132 provides information on the partial valuation study in ENTMRPA which quantify values of ENTMRPA in annual economic benefits of over P200 million/year. Table 40 also provides the analysis on the resources of the protected area that has conservation and economic value.
	14	Have the PA's potential values been quantified either in peso terms or in relative terms?		
	15	Does the plan contain a description of the socio-economic conditions of men and women within and adjacent to the protected area and properly reflected in the map showing settlements and extent of economic and social activities?	Partly Yes	The draft plan provide the 1999 SRPAO results. These information should be updated based on the final results on SEAMS conducted in 2018.
Institutional	16	Are there discussions on the institutions that are active in the protected area, including their plans, programs and activities?	Yes	Table 39 in page 125 of the draft Plan provides the list of institutions and the ongoing and proposed project being and to be undertaken in the ENTMRPA. Also, Table 44 provides Assessments of Key Institutions and Groups with pertinent roles and function in ENTMRPA
	17	Have disaster risks and climate change adaptation been discussed?	Yes	The discussion on landslide and flood susceptibility in ENTMRPA were discussed in page 40-43. Also, climate change as one of the threats based on the METT results of ENTMRPA was discussed in the Plan in pages 144 to 149 .
	18	Have gender and development and indigenous peoples been discussed?	Partly Yes	The discussion on ethnicity was provided in page 106 wherein the Tagbanuas and Cuyonon are the identified indigenous peoples residing the park and based on the 2014 CBMS data. However, information should be updated, the results of the SEAMS conducted should verify the existence ofthe said IPs in the protected area. With regards to gender and development, there is a limited discussion that need to be further elaborated. The demographic information should be sex disaggregated and discussed the current roles of men and women in the protection and conservation of the protected area

Section		Guide Questions	Yes/No	REMARKS
	19	Are the human resources (quantity and capacity) currently available?	Partly Yes	The current human resources/manpower of ENTMRPA including the quantity and capacity of the personnel should be clearly discussed in the Plan not just presenting the organizational structure. This should be described and expalined
Situational Analysis				
	20	Have the various threats/pressures/issues/concerns to be addressed and the opportunities for optimizing potential values been identified by sector?	YES	The threats are discussed in pages 141 to 146. The result of METT were used in the identification of threats/ issues /concerns. The Plan should provide information on the issues/concerns in previous management plan and the present status of its implementation, highlighting the similar or different approaches and strategies to be undertaken for the updated management plan
	21	Are the sectoral criteria/process by which various threats/pressures/issues/concerns to be addressed were prioritized clear?	YES	
	22	Are there discussion on the implications and effects of the identified threats/issues/concerns?	Partly YES	
	23	Are there discussions on the policy implications or management interventions to address the identified issues and concerns?	YES	
	24	Are there maps showing the location of threats, biodiversity, and ecosystem values in and adjacent of the protected area and graphs showing trends, if available?	NO	Please attached map depicting the relative location threats.
Vision, Goals, and Objectives				
	25	Are objectives specific, measureable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART)?	Partly Yes	The discussion of the objectives and outcomes should be properly presented in the Plan as to the formatting of tables .
	26	Are there objectives that refer to: (1) ecosystem services values, (2) biodiversity, (3) social, and (4) threats and pressures?	YES	
	27	Are there objectives that refer to biodiversity-friendly development potentials (e.g., community-based, enterprise, irrigation)?	YES	
	28	Is each objective/desired result fully achievable based upon its supporting programs and activities?	YES	
Management strategies, interventions and activities				
	29	Are various strategies/options for addressing threats/pressures/ issues/concerns identified and adequately addressed?	YES	

Section		Guide Questions	Yes/No	REMARKS
	30	Did the selection of the management strategies and policy interventions consider the category of the protected area?	YES	
	31	Have climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures been integrated into the formulation of management strategies?	YES	
	32	Are there discussions on gender and development and IP concerns?	Partly YES	Please see comments on item #18.
	33	Are there specific strategies and interventions dealing with existing development (e.g., infrastructure, facilities, etc.)?	YES	
	34	Does the plan have a management zoning map?	Partly YES	The managment zoning map presented in the Plan should be rectified following guidance provided in BMB Technical Bulletin No. 2018-01. The process in the identification and designation of zones should be fully discuss. Please also be guided also on the proper color coding of the management zones as prescribed in BMB Memorandum dated 18 February 2020 providing map template for the designated managment of protected areas under the NIPAS.
	35	Was the protected area boundary delineated/demarcated?	Partly yes	The boundary was delineated, however, the boundary will be modified based on the result of the PASA being conducted.
	36	Do the strict protection zones cover at least 20% of each ecosystem type (e.g., 12 forest types, fringing reef, barrier reef, mudflat)?	YES	
	37	Is it clear what activities are prohibited/permitted/allowed in each zone (and sub- zone, if any)?	YES	
Human Resources and Institutional Arrangements				
	38	Is there an organizational structure presented and described in the plan?	YES	
	39	Is there a discussion on the functions and responsibilities of the key units in the organizational structure?	YES	
	40	Are there specific measures enhancing the capacity of PA staff as well as communities as de facto managers?	YES	Capability -building requirement for the PA staff was discussed in pages 149-151.
	41	Are the human resources (quantity and capacity) required quantified?	YES	
	42	Are the sources for bridging the gap between currently available and required human resources clearly indicated?	YES	

Section		Guide Questions	Yes/No	REMARKS
	43	Are the human time inputs and financial budgets for each activity realistic?	YES	
	44	Have the potential contributions/roles of the various sectors (e.g. NGOs, academe, religious groups, etc.) been taken into account in the planning of conservation advocacy and protection?	Partly YES	Contributions and roles of various stakholders, institutions and agencies were discussed in general, but can be further enhance to specify the possible commiments of concerned stakeholders, agencies and institutions (e.g roles of academe)
	45	Is there a coordination and networking mechanism established with the academe and indigenous peoples, if any?	Partly YES	
	46	Have the responsibilities for the various outputs clearly defined and have the requirements for delivering them been committed by those responsible for the outputs?	YES	
Logical Framework				
	47	Are the logical framework matrix and activity based cost adequately presented, discussed and included in the annex?	Partly Yes	The Logical Framework should be one of the annexes and should conformed with the matrix as provided in BMB TB No. 2016-08.
	48	Does the objective tree/log-frame have a clear and logical basis on a hierarchy of cause-effect chain?		
Financial Plan				
	49	Was there an analysis of the needed finances relative to the usual (e.g. past 5 years) or guaranteed financial inputs?	Partly Yes	Chapter 6 of the Plan provides the discussion on Financial Plan. However, the discussion on the financial gaps/short fall could be further elaborated. Please refer to Annexes D and D-1 of the BMB Technical Bulletin No. 2016-08 as guide particulatly on the Financial Planning Process and Activity-Based Cost Accounting, respectively
	50	Is the plan budget requirement realistic?	Yes	
	51	Are there realistic plans to bridge any shortfalls/differences (e.g. generation of resources, complementation and streamlining of multiple plans)?	Partly Yes	
	52	Have implementation arrangements for the plan been defined?	Partly Yes	Chapter 7 provides the implementation plan. However, discussion on the implementation of management focus aside from the funding requirements should be further discussed. Provide also the breakdown of the proposed work plan per management focus
	53	Is there an implementation work plan which includes a breakdown of the proposed 5-year plan?	No	

Section		Guide Questions	Yes/No	REMARKS
Monitoring and Evaluation				
	54	Is there a monitoring plan matrix that includes outcomes, outputs, activities, inputs, identifying clear indicators, frequency, method, where to monitor, and responsible person?	Partly Yes	Chapter 8 of the draft Plan discusses the monitoring and evaluation and Table 72 provides tools and frequecies as well as the responsible persons involved in the M&E. However, communication strategies including reporting procedures should be provided and discussed
	55	Have communication strategies been identified, including the state of the protected area reporting?	No	
	56	Has the process for adjusting the operational plan based upon monitoring and evaluation results been made clear?	No	