

# Philippines Case Study

## Analysis of National Strategies for Sustainable Development

This document is one of 19 country case studies that form the knowledge base for a synthesis report entitled “National Strategies for Sustainable Development: Challenges, Approaches, and Innovations Based on a 19-country Analysis.” The synthesis report and country case studies are available electronically at:

<http://www.iisd.org/measure/capacity/sdsip.asp>  
<http://www.gtz.de/rioplus/download>

June 2004

### Notice to Reader

Information in the country case studies was obtained primarily from publicly available sources (e.g., Internet and literature sources) and, where possible, was supplemented through interviews with government officials. The information was up-to-date as of May 2004. Every effort was made to ensure that official national sustainable development focal point contacts had the opportunity to provide feedback on the research, but such contacts were not successful in all cases. **This case study is in an unedited, working paper format.**

These case studies are made publicly available to add to the national sustainable development strategy knowledge base. The project’s research partners accept responsibility for any inaccuracies or omissions. The views expressed in this working paper do not necessarily represent the views of the funding partners.

The research partners welcome your comments on this country case study. Please e-mail comments to Darren Swanson at [dswanson@iisd.ca](mailto:dswanson@iisd.ca).

*This National Sustainable Development Strategy research project is a collaborative effort. Its research partners are the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), the Canadian consulting firm Stratos Inc., and the Environmental Policy Research Centre of the Freie Universität Berlin (FFU). The study has been funded by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ; commissioned by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development – BMZ), the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Department of Foreign Affairs Canada, and Environment Canada. Advisors to the project include IUCN – The World Conservation Union and the UN Commission on Sustainable Development.*

Prepared by:  
Mireia Tarradell  
Environmental Policy Research Centre  
Freie Universität Berlin  
Innestr. 22, 14195 Berlin, Germany  
[tarradell@glogov.org](mailto:tarradell@glogov.org)  
<http://www.fu-berlin.de/ffu>

## 1 Introduction: Philippines Description

The Republic of the Philippines is one of the largest island groups in the world, numbering more than 7,100 islands located in Southeast Asia, between the Philippine Sea and the South China Sea, east of Vietnam. The archipelago consists of seventy-three provinces and Manila is the capital city. After approximately 350 years of colonial rule (by Spain and USA later), the Philippines inaugurated in 1946 its independent republic. Democratic alternation between the political elite was interrupted in 1972 to experience constitutional authoritarianism for more than a decade. With the new regime in 1987 civil liberties have been restored.

### *Economy*

The figures for overall GDP and GDP per capita are, respectively, US\$379.7 bio. and US\$4,600 (2002 est). The country faces a pervasive poverty problem, with almost 40% of the population below the poverty line<sup>1</sup>. The UNDP Human Poverty Index is 14.8, placing the country as the 28<sup>th</sup> poorest among 94 developing countries. The GINI index is 46.2, placing the Philippines among the top 34 countries in the world for unequal income distribution. Manufacturing, the most important production sector, accounts for around 25% of GDP (textiles, pharmaceuticals, chemicals, wood products, food processing and petroleum refining). The economy is mainly oriented towards the domestic market, despite the development since the 1970s of labour-intensive export manufacturing (electronics and automotive parts). The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for the Philippines in 1998 were 1.0 metric tons per capita. Agriculture, fishing and tourism are other important sectors. The informal sector is estimated to employ in the Philippines for up to twice as many people as the formal sector. And overseas employment represents a major source of income for Philippine households. One of the fundamental reasons for the failure of the Philippine economy to take off along with similar economies in East Asia lies in the distribution of land (CIA World Fact Book 2003, WB 2003, UNDP 2003, EIU 2002).

### *Society*

Since January 2001 President Macapagal-Arroyo occupies the presidency after civilian coup, backed by the military, until elections take place in May 2004. The Philippines is a pluralist democracy, with an executive presidency, a bicameral Congress and a Supreme Court that can rule on the constitutionality of government actions. The constitution introduced in 1987 provides of a single six-year presidential term. The president is chief executive, head of state and commander-in-chief. The legislature is bicameral, with a Senate of 24 members elected 'at large' (on the nationwide ballot) and a House of Representatives composed of 208 members directly elected by district and up to 52 members chosen by party list (CIA World Fact Book 2003). One of the problems faced by the Philippines is the level of official corruption

---

<sup>1</sup> Poverty Line or Poverty Threshold refers to the cost of the basic food and non-food requirements (valued in Philippine peso). In the Philippine official methodology, the poverty line may be viewed as the minimum income required to meet the food requirements and other non-food basic needs (National Statistical Coordination Board 1997). The annual per capita poverty threshold was estimated at PhP11,906 (US\$211.362) in 2002. With this threshold, a family of five members should have a monthly income of PhP4,961 (US\$88) to meet its food and non-food basic needs (NCSB 2004).

that have resulted in, inter alia, the exploitation of the nation's natural resources for the profits of foreign capital and domestic elites (PHILNET-WSSD 2001).

The archipelago has a population of 84 million and its growth rate is 1.9% (both 2003 est) creating a drag on development and exerting severe pressure on the environment. With an average population density of 282 inhabitants per sq km, higher population density is located in metropolitan Manila, whereas other southern islands are sparsely populated, and where there are located some armed conflicts and terrorist groups. The Human Development Index (HDI) value for 2001 was 0.75, ranked 85<sup>th</sup> of 175 countries (EIU 2002, UNDP 2003, WB 2003).

### *Environment*

The land mass consists of 300,179 sq km, of which 49 % is classified as forest (although only 21% is under forest cover) and 34% is under agricultural cultivation. The role of natural disasters has increased over time, signaling the rise in environmental degradation. Major problems are floods in lowlands, loss of biodiversity, air and water pollution, but also damage of marine and coastal resources, coral reefs and mangrove areas. With the largest area of developed estuarine fishponds in South-east Asia, sustenance fishing has been in overall decline reflecting the overfishing of inshore waters. *El Niño* and *La Niña* episodes have caused respectively, protracted droughts and hurricane devastation in many parts of the country. The Philippines ranks number 117<sup>th</sup> with an Environmental Sustainability Index (ESI) of 41.6 (EIU 2002, NCSD 2001a).

### *Note to readers*

This study draws mainly from governmental reports. Sporadically, secondary sources have also been used such as evaluation reports for the UNDP's Capacity 21 Programme, a third party report on the Philippine Council for SD of the World Resources Institute or the evaluation report by the Philippine NGO Network for the WSSD.

**Table 1: Profile by Selected Indicators**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Value</b>
Human Development Index (and ranking)- 2001	0.75 (85 <sup>th</sup> )
Human Poverty Index (and ranking)- 2001	14.8 (28 <sup>th</sup> )
Environmental Sustainability Index (and ranking)- 2002	41.6 (117 <sup>th</sup> )
GHG Emissions- 1998	Metric tons per capita of CO <sub>2</sub> 1.0.
GDP and GDP per capita- 2002 est.	US\$379.7 bio. and US\$4,600

Source: CIA World Fact Book 2003, UNDP 2003, WB 2003

## **2 Content of the National Sustainable Development Strategy**

Initiatives on sustainable development in the Philippines can be traced back as early as the 1980s. The first concentrated move towards SD in the Philippines began in 1987 with the drafting of the *Philippine Strategy for SD* (PSSD). The overall goal of

the strategy is ‘to achieve economic growth with adequate protection of the country’s biological resources and its diversity, vital ecosystem functions and overall environmental quality’. This strategy focus mainly on two of the three dimensions of SD, i. e., the economic and the environmental. The PSSD was presented at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, UNCED, in Rio de Janeiro, Brasil. Following the adoption of the PSSD the government kicked-off a broad consultation process, that ended in 1996 with the adoption of the national plan of action for SD, entitled *The Philippine Agenda 21: A National Agenda for Sustainable Development for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (PA 21) by Memorandum Order n° 399 (Philippine Council for Sustainable Development 1997). This process benefited also from the creation of the semi-governmental body, the so-called *Philippine Council for Sustainable Development* (PCSD), in 1992. Although the Philippine government calls the PA 21 its national plan of action for SD it actually acts as the SDS as integrates to a certain extent a social dimension that was generally overlooked in the PSSD. In short, the PA 21 is a wide-ranging multi-dimensional strategy, which calls to integrate SD concerns in all decision-making structures not only within the government but also in civil society. The so-called *Enhanced Philippine Agenda 21* will be completed by June 2004 and will then be presented to the Philippine Council for SD for approval (Encabo 2004).

### *Strategy Content*

The PA 21 advocates a fundamental shift in development approach and aims at introducing an ecosystem-based and people-centred approach. It envisions ‘a better quality of life’. It is structured along 3 major axis: the Principles of Unity (chapter 1), the Action Agenda (chapter 2) and the Implementation Strategies (chapter 3). The first chapter presents 15 SD guiding principles, namely, Primacy of Developing Full Human Potential; Holistic Science and Appropriate Technology; Cultural, Moral and Spiritual Sensitivity; Self-Determination; National Sovereignty; Gender Sensitivity; Peace, Order and National Unity; Social Justice, Inter-, Intra-Generational and Spatial Equity; Participatory Democracy; Institutional Viability; Viable, sound and Broad-Based Economic Development; Sustainable Population; Ecological Soundness; Biogeographical Equity and Community-Based Resource Management and Global Cooperation.

The action agenda is based on the key concepts of integration, multi-stakeholdership and consensus building, and operationalization to be applied to the 5 specific ecosystems identified (i.e., forest/upland, agricultural/lowland, urban, coastal/marine and freshwater ecosystem). Two extra sections call for an improved management of biodiversity and mineral resources. The strategy unfolds, for the critical issues of SD for the next 30 years, implementation strategies, as well as, time-bound qualitative and process related targets, in relation to the institutions involved (all stakeholders, including donor institutions, are identified). The action measures are preponderantly circumscribed to the environmental field and categorized into short-term 1996-98; medium term 1998-2005 and long-term 2005-2025 (see table 2). It adopts two-pronged strategies to map out the action agenda: creating the enabling conditions to (a) assist the various stakeholders to build their capacities towards SD and (b) directing efforts at conserving, managing, protecting and rehabilitating ecosystems. Managing the transition to SD calls also for interventions across ecosystems: integrating SD in governance, providing enabling economic policies, investing in

human and social capital, mapping out a legislative agenda and addressing critical and strategic concerns (population management, human health, food security, human settlements and land use).

**Table 2: Overview of the Action Agenda**

Ecosystem	Concerns / Strategies
<i>Forest</i>	<p>Management of: degraded upland areas, production forests, non-timber resources; institutional capacity and policy reforms/ 57 specific strategies.</p> <p><b><i>Some targets and timeframe</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Promote indigenous knowledge and technologies: 30 tribes covered (1997-2000)</li> <li>-Valuation of goods and services reflecting full social and environmental costs of forest and its products: start ENRA initiatives (see Table 4) (by 1998)</li> <li>-Enhance forest conservation: 5 million hectares of forest maintained (before 1998)</li> <li>-Manage remaining forest in sustainable manner: 2,486,000 has. of production areas delineated and managed (1998-2005)</li> <li>-Develop wood-based industry: unefficient mills are phased out and new mills are created with increased efficiency and matched to sustainable supply sources (2000-15)</li> <li>-Develop non-wood industry: 65,000 hectares of rattan (1997-2015) and 35,000 has. of bamboo (2000)</li> <li>-Implement an integrated Watershed Management Program in five critical areas (1996), in 5 more areas (2000), in 10 additional areas (2010)</li> </ul>
<i>Lowland/ Agriculture</i>	<p>Implementation of an Agrarian Reform, creation of a National Land Use Policy, management of marginal lands, water quality and food security, pesticides/fertilizers, economic incentives for sustainable agriculture, stakeholder participation in planning and management / 47 specific strategies.</p> <p><b><i>Some targets and timeframe</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Launch a nation wide program for sustained increase in domestic food production (1995-2000)</li> <li>-Provide support services to include incentives (irrigation, credit, acces to roads) to encourage private sector participation, i.e.: irrigation infrastructure development (1996-2000)</li> <li>-Increase economic incentives for SD: access to credit by SME facilitated (1996-2005)</li> <li>-Implement programs that provide security of tenure: community-based projects implemented (1996-2005)</li> </ul>
<i>Urban</i>	<p>Capability in urban admnistration, management of urban population growth, Human Settlements and living conditions, uncontrolled land development, management of hazards, quality of air and water, basic services / 99 specific strategies.</p> <p><b><i>Some targets and timeframe</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Formulate procedural guidelines on integrating EIA into planning and dissemination (1996-98) -Removal of nuclear energy from all plans, programs, policies (1997)</li> <li>-Unleaded gasoline used: in Metro Manila (1998 ) and nationwide (2000)</li> <li>-EIS system improved to include risk assessment (1999-2005)</li> <li>-Develop mechanisms for better access of the urban poor to financial institutions for low cost housing (2006-25)</li> <li>-Promote relocation of existing industries in urban areas by providing incentives and enabling conditions (2006-25)</li> <li>-Provide fiscal incentives for importation of components of non-conventional energy systems and accessible financing for renewable energy projects (2006-25)</li> <li>-Mass transport systems established and road network improved (2006-25)</li> </ul>
<i>Coastal and</i>	Policy/legal issues; uncoordinated/conflicting use of ecosystem's resources; shore

<i>Marine</i>	and water quality; poverty; livelihood options; basic services; revaluation of resources; capacity-building / 43 specific strategies. <b><i>Some targets and timeframe</i></b> -10% of degraded area rehabilitated per year (depending on existing local situation) (since 1996) -Comprehensive Coastal Zone Management Plan implemented to include marine protected areas, community-based resource management and eco-tourism (1997)
<i>Freshwater</i>	Creation of national policy framework for SD of ecosystem; harmonization of development plans affecting this ecosystem; institutionalization of integrated water management; water quality / 25 specific strategies. <b><i>Some targets and timeframe</i></b> -Quantity and quality of water resources assessed on a regular basis (1997 onwards) -Establish mechanisms for integrated water management institutionalized across sectors (1997-98) Source: Philippine Agenda 21

The last chapter identifies the key players: basic sectors (e.g., farmers, landless rural workers, fisherfolk, indigenous peoples, urban poor) and the intermediaries (e.g., national and local government units, business and private sector, NGOs, church-based organisations); and presents the next steps for action: the process of *localizing PA 21*, a short-term plan for *Information, Education and Communication on SD* (1996-98) aiming to create an environment conducive to the pursuit of PA 21 through coordination of well-informed key segments of society. The executive branch and legislative branch at the national level and the local government units (LGUs) are responsible for this programme, i.e.: mobilizing society, facilitating participation, providing advocacy to LGUs and enacting policies that integrate SD. Finally a description of possible financing means (market-based instruments and command-and-control measures are proposed).

#### *Coordination and Linkages with Other Strategies or Planning Processes*

Designating the Board of the *National Economic and Development Authority* (NEDA), the central planning agency in the Philippines, as the lead government agency for the PCSD rather than the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), has been considered a satisfactory strategy to introduce SD in the Philippine system of national planning. Politically, NEDA was seen as multi-sectoral, and its processes perceived to be more credible (Reyes 2002). The fact that both national planning in the Philippines has a high component of multi-sectoral integration and that the PCSD Secretariat is located in the NEDA premises (and depending legally) has facilitated the work of the PCSD to introduce the SD framework in national planning. At the start, PCSD, and the participation of NGOs in it, was a cultural shock to the NEDA functionaries steeped in the traditional economic development mind-sets, but becoming afterwards a principal stakeholder in promoting SD (Reyes 2002). Recent years have seen considerable expansion in the membership of NEDA, making it more multi-agency and multidisciplinary, thus facilitating a more integrated decision-making process. Other related bodies to PCSD are the *National Anti-poverty Commission* (NAPC), *Social Development Committee* (SDC) of the NEDA Board and the *Commission on Population* (POPCOM) (UNESCAP 2001).

The strategies set out in PA 21 built on the objectives and principles contained in the Rio Declaration, the PSSD, and the *Philippine Ecological and Human Security*

*Programme* (EHSP) serving as the blueprint for the country's medium- and long-term development plans. Through Memorandum Order N° 33, NEDA was directed to integrate the Philippine Agenda 21 into the *Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan 1993-1998* (MTPDP) which is the master plan for development in the Philippines. Its guidelines stipulated that environmental/ecological considerations should be accorded priority attention. The environmental sector is subsumed under the agro-industrial development chapter which treats all the economic production sectors in an integrated manner. At the most broadest level, the *Philippine National Development Plan for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Plan 21), or *Long-Term Philippine Development Plan 2000-2025* (LTPDP), which sets the broad development directions of the country and has served as the basis for the detailed plans of the sector agencies, uses Philippine Agenda 21 as its overall guiding framework making that also MTPDP 1999-2004 integrates SD concerns (UNESCAP 2001).

Moreover, in consideration of the devolution and decentralization of powers through the Local Government Code of 1991, E.O. N° 15 also directed that the PA 21 be integrated into the plans and programmes of Local Government Units (LGUs) at all levels. To this end, the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) issued a memorandum in 1995 which provides the guidelines to LGUs for the integration of the goals and objectives of SD in local plans. In the context of the PA 21 localization initiative, the PCSD has been supporting local initiatives on the creation of local councils for SD (for localization initiatives see page 16 and section 3.2).

Furthermore, the PA 21 also has been integrated in the sectoral plan *Social Reform Agenda* (SRA). Two years after the initial implementation, the SRA was expanded to include an ecosystem perspective and add a fourth dimension of poverty: 'on ecological security, by incorporating the parameters of SD in the management and utilization of natural resources'. Also in 1999 the POPCOM reformulated their Population-Environment (PRE) Framework to the Population and SD (PSD) Framework considering the impact of population growth on the ability of the government to provide services, on productivity, and on environmental resources (ILO 1995, UNESCAP 2001, UN 2002).

**Box 1: Integrating PA 21 concerns at national level**

- a) The PCSD committee on socio-economic dimensions together with the Department of Budget and Management has developed a general framework for integrating SD principles and parameters into the budgetary process to ensure that public spending takes them more fully into account.
- b) SD goals and the PA 21 Action Agenda have been incorporated into the research and development activities of the Philippine Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resource and Development.
- c) The draft implementing rules and regulations of Republic Act 8435, the Agricultural and Fisheries Modernization Act, states that PA 21 shall be considered in the formulation of the Agricultural Modernization Plan to be implemented by the Department of Agriculture.
- d) The Civil Service Commission and the Career Executive Board have made the Environmental Intelligence Quotient Scheme part of the exams for civil servants. The inclusion of environment and SD test items in these exams aim to motivate prospective examinees to be versed with environmental and SD concepts.

Source: Isberto 1998

### *Integration of Sustainable Development Principles*

The main goal of the Philippine Agenda 21 is to ensure a healthy environment and a prosperous economy for current and future generations. SD in the Philippine context is translated as the ‘harmonious integration of a sound and viable economy, responsible governance, social cohesion/harmony and ecological integrity to ensure that development is a life-enhancing process’.

## **3 Institutional and Procedural Aspects of the National Sustainable Development Strategy**

### **3.1 Development and Institutional Aspects**

The main legal basis is formed by the Revised Environment Code (the original dating from 1977) but main SD activities started at the end of the 1980s. The PSSD was initiated by the *Department of Environment and Natural Resources* (DENR) through a process of multi-sectoral consultation, and with the World Bank’s financial assistance and involvement. The country’s strategy was strongly influenced by the preparatory and post-UNCED process. Since the 1990s one governmental and one semi-governmental body have performed overall co-ordination tasks with regard to policies for SD: The National Economic Development Authority (NEDA) and the Philippine Council for SD (PCSD). The PA 21 process has been entirely coordinated by the PCSD, which has benefited from capacity building activities of the UNDP’s Capacity 21 Programme (UNDP consultants have worked closely with PCSD members). The implementation of the strategies proposed in the PA 21 rely on the sectoral ministries. The main agency responsible for ensuring sustainable management of natural resources is the DENR. Other related agencies/bodies are the *Environmental Management Bureau* (EMB), a staff bureau of the DENR mandated with formulating policies, guidelines, standards and regulations for environmental management and pollution control; the *Department of Agriculture*; *Dpt. Energy*; *Dpt. Health*; the *Board of Investments of the Department of Trade and Industry*; the *Commission on Population* and the *National Water Resources Board* and the *Investment Coordination Committee*, which is an interagency body that plays a key role in reviewing major capital projects, including an environmental evaluation through the *Environmental Impact Assessment* administered by EMB.

#### **Box 2: The National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)**

The National Economic and Development Authority Board is the highest social and economic development planning and policy coordinating body in the Philippines. It is responsible for providing overall direction and final approval of the national development plans. The board comprises the President of the Philippines as chairman, the Director-General of the NEDA Secretariat as vice-chairman, and the following members: the Executive Secretary and the Secretaries of: Finance (DOF), Trade and Industry (DTI), Agrarian Reform (DAR), Agriculture (DA), Environmental and Natural Resources (DENR), Public Works and Highways (DPWH), Budget and Management (DBM), Labour and Employment (DOLE), Interior and Local Government (DILG), Health (DOH), Foreign Affairs (DFA), Science and Technology (DOST), Transportation and Communications (DTC), Education, Culture and Sports (DECS); the Governor of the Central Bank; and the Chairperson of the Philippines Assistance Programme. The NEDA Board is assisted by five Cabinet inter-agency committees and a cabinet cluster system composed by 8 clusters namely: Agro-industrial Development, Macroeconomy and Finance, Human Resources and Development, Physical Infrastructure Support, Security and Political Development, Development Administration, Water Resources Management and International Relations. Source: UNESCAP 2001, Lotilla 2002

The *Legislative-Executive Advisory Council* is an advisory body which was established to ensure consistency in coordinating executive development planning and congressional budgeting. One of its functions is integrate environmental concepts, principles and practices into the national development plans. It is chaired by the President and comprises members of the executive (9), the legislative (8), representative of local government unit (1), private sector (1) and youth (1) (UNESCAP 2001).

In 1992 the President Ramos created the PCSD by Executive Order N° 15 becoming the first country in Asia to organize a Council of its kind to take action on its commitments to the Rio Summit. The Council's mandate is to: 'formally adopt the PA 21 and develop national sustainability plans'. The Council is primarily an advisory and recommendatory body to the President, the Legislature and the Cabinet, and reports on ad-hoc basis to the President (Encabo 2004). The PCSD is the formal channel for integrating environmental considerations into economic/social policy-making and planning, and acts as the main co-ordinating mechanism and discussion forum for all interested parties in environment and SD. Its four Committees (see box 4) have the functions of both: creating a critical mass of advocates for SD within the government and the NGO sector and actively participate in policy research, analysis and advocacy for SD. It also reports to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (NCSD 2001a).

**Box 3: The Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD)**

The PCSD is a multi-stakeholder body that has adopted the principles of counterparting and consensus building in its structure. It is a multi-sectoral body chaired by the Director-General of National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), with the Secretary of Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) as vice-chaired person. The PCSD was structured along the concept of co-equal parts: the government and the civil society counterpart. Practically all sectors of society and stakeholders of SD are represented among the members of PCSD. The environmental dimension of SD and the civil society membership are the values added of the PCSD compared to NEDA which is a governmental social and economic body. However, PCSD has less political standing compared to NEDA as the chairman of PCSD is only the vice-chairman of NEDA (being the President of the Philippines its chairman).

18 of its members come from Cabinet-level government departments, namely: DENR; DAR; DA; DBM; DECS; Energy (DOE); DOF; DFA; DOH; DILG; National Defense (DND); DPWH; DOST; Social Welfare and Development (DSWD); Tourism (DOT); DTI; DTC and NEDA. Secretaries have been designated as members, with an Undersecretary as alternate to the firsts.

Civil society has 5 representatives that include NGOs and POs selected on the basis of 'commitment to environmental causes, gender balance, and sectoral representation'. Labor and Business have 1 representative each in the Council.

The PCSD is being assisted by a composite secretariat, with representatives from NEDA and other agencies. It has been created a Non-Governmental Organization/People's Organizations (NGO/PO) counterpart Secretariat to coordinate activities of the non-government community in the PCSD and to liaise with the composite secretariat. Although the NGOs/POs representatives are out-numbered by government representatives by a ratio of 2:1, a system of decision-making that approximates consensus-building has been designed. The PCSD has not designed a 'protocol of operations' or formalised its networking system. Yet it does have an agreed and functioning *modus operandi*, and an informal networking system.

Each PCSD decision (to be incorporated into national policy) must still go through other policy-making bodies. In most cases, those bodies view environmental concerns not yet as integral components of the decision at hand. An indicator of that is the general low level of membership within PCSD committees which may manifest the low level of priority given by the different sectoral departments to SD. Source: UNESCAP 2001, Executive Order N° 62, 2001

The PCSD is perceived by many as the best global example for national council for SD (Hemmati 2001), the PCSD is the country's focal point in SD efforts, has been instrumental in forging position papers for international gatherings and dialogues. For example it co-hosted with the government of Canada the *International Experts Meeting on Persistent Organic Pollutants* in 1995; hosted a series of *Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (APEC) meetings on SD* in 1996 aimed at forging APEC-wide consensus on economic and technical cooperation for SD. The major outputs included the *Ministerial Declaration and Action Program on SD*, which essentially embodies the need to advance on: a) sustainable cities/urban management; b) clear production/clean technology; c) sustainability of the marine environment (UNDESA 2003).

**Box 4: PCSD Structure**

The PCSD consists of 4 committees corresponding to the four major sections of the PA 21 and the UNCED A21:

Committee on Social and Economic Dimensions; Committee on the Conservation and Management of Resources for Development; Committee on Strengthening the Role of Major groups; and Committee on Means of Implementation.

Two of these committees have subcommittees membership of which comprises both government and non-government representatives. These are: Biodiversity, Atmosphere, Land Resources, Water Resources, Financing Arrangements, Science and Technology, Information and Education and on Legal and Institutional Arrangements. Agencies and groups not represented at the council level may become members of its committees and subcommittees. PCSD has been supporting local initiatives on the creation of local councils for SD through technical assistance and trainings. To date, 16 local units have already been established, 11 of which are at the regional level, 4 at the provincial level and one at the municipal level.

All matters which can not be settled or acted upon at the PCSD committee level are brought to the Council level discussions, such as those needing legislative and executive action.

Source: NCSD 2001a

The Council started out in a general atmosphere of suspicion and even mistrust, fostered by years of authoritarian rule, between the government and the civil society members (Isberto 1998, NCSD 2001a). One manifestation of this mistrust was the initial strong resistance on the civil society counterparts (NGOs and POs) to expanding the membership of the Council to include the business sector, on the reasoning that the government members 'already represented the interests of business'. It took the Council 4 years to build up trust and include additional two members from business, which in turn had to also include two members from labour groups (Isberto 1998, NCSD 2001a). Another early conflict was protagonized by and among NGOs over representation in the PCSD. This posed difficulties for the government secretariat, who had to bear the complaints from NGO groups who felt excluded from the process. Since then, a formal process for selection of PCSD representatives has been developed in the civil society community. Although dissatisfaction with the process continues to be expressed, the process has helped in minimizing conflicts and distraction (NCSD 2001a).

The PCSD has faced the challenge of co-ordinating activities which require both stability and sufficient senior agency representation in Council meetings. The problems encountered can be summarized as inadequate feedback from representatives to respective ministry (or agency) and low political profile of

representatives, leading to uncoordinated action. Later, it has been required to officially designate a principal and an alternate representative to the the Council (see box 3), and also the President occasionally has chaired over Council meetings forcing Cabinet members to attend. This worked quite well in the Ramos administration but this measures seemed to lose some its momentum in Estrada's (next President after Ramos) (Isberto 1998). Also Ramos displayed an enthusiasm for multi-sectoral consultations on many issues. Conversely, Estrada, has made little use of such mechanisms. For this reason, the PCSD is considering to legislate the creation of PCSD by executive fiat to avoid vulnerability to being sidelined or abolished by an unsympathetic President (NCSD 2001b). No evidence has been found of strong conflicts between NEDA and PCSD. It seems that the strong polarization of ideas would exist within the Council itself, when consensus is not reached. It has been recommended to strengthen the capacities of the Council to maintain institutional memory as Philippine bureaucracy suffers from a rapid staff turnover (UNDESA 2002)

In overall, most of the line agencies have still a sectoral orientation. Co-ordination and a more integrated decision-making approach are generally practiced at the highest official level, like demonstrates the implementation of SD initiatives of, for example, DENR and DA or DENR and DTI (see section 3.4). However, most of the technical personnel still operate within the sectoral orientation of their respective departments in their day to day work. As the overall planning body, NEDA has an advantage in that regard as gains exposure to the whole range of development issues. Nevertheless, its formal internal structure remains sectoral despite of some functionally-oriented units (UNESCAP 2001).

### 3.2 *Participation Aspects*

The operating guidelines approved by the PCSD at its inaugural meeting of 28 October 1992 added to its mandate 'the creation of a critical mass of advocates for SD in both government and non-government sectors' becoming the responsible agency for implementing the participatory process of PA 21. This process was long and tedious, very demanding in terms of time and resources (Reyes 2002). The donor community, specially UNDP and its Capacity 21 programme, provided catalytic assistance to further strengthen mechanisms for broad-based consultations in the formulation of PA 21, which led to the official 'Principles of Unity' and parameters of SD eventually embodied in PA 21.

The PA 21 process was at the beginning somewhat limited by the lack of participation of the business sector and, to certain extent, by inadequate involvement of local governments. Local governments through the PA 21 localization initiative and the business sector with the creation of the Business Agenda 21 (see box 5) have acquired a more active role.

#### **Box 5: The Philippine Business Agenda 21 initiative**

Despite the early exclusion of the business sector in the PCSD, a small segment of the business community, led by the non-profit association *Philippine Business for Environment* (PBE) tried to develop a Business Agenda 21 (BA 21) in 1992. Unfortunately, the results of these efforts were not fully incorporated in PA 21. As independent and parallel initiative, however, the BA 21 effort was revived in 1998, several years after the adoption of PA 21. Source: Reyes 2002, UNDESA 2003

NGOs play a major role in PCSD, e.g. Civil Society Counterpart Council for SD (CSCCSD), the Management Association of the Philippines (MAP) from the business sector and the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP) from the labor sector are active members at the council, committee and sub-committee levels (Encabo 2004). An important achievement of the PCSD with regard NGOs and POs participation is the adoption of a resolution recognising local NGOs/POs as lead entities in the implementation of foreign assisted programmes on SD and defining mechanisms for their participation. The consultation process between NGOs/POs and government has produced interesting parallel effects, such as the creation of local councils for SD or the dissemination of information on SD by NGOs (ILO 1995).

### 3.3 *Monitoring Aspects*

The call for monitoring and assessing PA 21 has been done in the last chapter of the same document in very general terms (no concrete monitoring mechanisms are provided). Additionally the targets of PA 21 are generally not quantified therefore they can not be used as indicators for monitoring the strategy's implementation. However, in view of the Johannesburg Summit the review of the PA 21's implementation formally started in 2000 through presidential order and pointing the PCSD as the responsible institution.

The review had two major phases (assisted actively by the UNDP's Capacity Programme and Fifth Programme). The first phase was an external and independent evaluation: a core group workshop; separate sectoral reviews by government, civil society and business sector; island consultations on *PA 21 localization*; and an expert's workshop to draft the *Enhanced PA 21*. The second phase was conducted by the PCSD committees and the secretariat. The first results are presented in the report *From Rio to Manila: Ten years after An Assessment of Agenda 21 Implementation in the Philippines* issued by members of the Technical Secretariat of the PCSD, which was the Philippine contribution for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). The report indicates that on the one hand, 'the extent and quality of implementation of the PA 21 commitments appear to be generally high, while on the other, the impact of implementation has, so far, been low' (Virtucio 2002:26). The report highlights some major accomplishments such as integration of SD in governance; localization of PA 21; multi-stakeholder participation; the Information Education and Communication Plan and advocacy; and disaster management. In brief, the implementation of PA 21 was marked by uneven progress at several fronts. This report also stresses that further clarification and operationalization of the SD framework is needed. The broad scope of concern under SD may have spread resources and efforts too thinly to be immediately effective (Virtucio 2002).

#### **Box 6: Revised SD priorities included in the Enhanced PA 21**

Currently a reform process with regard to SD has two main objectives, namely, the broadening the localization and strengthening the mainstreaming of SD (Eberhardt 2004).

For the update of SD priorities, this document stresses the need to draw more attention to the following topics (but there are few specific measures proposed and none is time-bound): a) environmental dimension: forestry, mining and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) b) social dimension: population issues, globalization and peace, and good governance; c) economic dimension: trade, finance and economy and globalization.

The updated PA 21 calls for clearer sets of goals: poverty reduction which will include a section on trade/ globalization (i.e., improve access to land and shelter for the urban poor), social equity (i.e., speed up the implementation of a genuine Comprehensive Land Reform Program), empowerment and good governance (i.e., strengthen government decentralization), peace and solidarity (i.e., support and provide high level political mandate to government and non-government peace negotiation panels) and ecological integrity (i.e., declare more watersheds for commercial logging ban, promote 'judicial activism' in the enforcement fo environmental laws). Source: PCSD 2003

Since the middle of the 1990s, a core set of indicators was developed in a comprehensive process, which was supported by the UNESCAP.

**Table 3: Core set of indicators for monitoring PA 21**

<p><i>Economic</i></p> <p>1. Per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</p> <p>2. Employment rate</p> <p>3. Per capita Gross Value Added (GVA) of agriculture, forestry and fisheries</p>	<p><i>Air quality</i></p> <p>14. Number of Land Transportation Office (LTO)-registered vehicles</p>
<p><i>Harvesting Water Resources</i></p> <p>4. Quantity of fish catch</p> <p>5. Quantity of catch in commercial fisheries</p> <p>6. Quantity of catch in municipal fisheries</p>	<p><i>Gender sensibility</i></p> <p>15. Percentage of females employed</p>
<p><i>Harvesting Land Resources</i></p> <p>7. Area irrigated</p> <p>8. Total fertilizer consumption</p> <p>9. Yield of corn per hectare</p> <p>10. Yield of palay per hectare</p> <p>11. Total area of reforestation</p> <p>12. Area of reforestation among timber licenses</p> <p>13. Area of forest land for reservation</p> <p>Source: PCSD 2001</p>	<p><i>Health and Education</i></p> <p>16. Government spending on education</p> <p>17. Government spending on health</p> <p>18. Incidence of diarrhea</p>

During this process, the need for institutional support to build capabilities of agencies in: data collection, compilation and analysis along with training for the development of skills in the use of indicators, has been pointed out. Towards this purpose, the PCSD Coordinating Secretariat has been in charge of the process of developing and establishing a database system for the core set of indicators. The next step identified is the testing of the indicators at the regional/provincial and local levels. No recent information on the latest state of the development of indicators has been made available.

### **3.4 Implementation Aspects and Specific Initiatives**

The PA 21 is currently undergoing a quite intensive reform process based on an evaluation process frameworked within the PCSD and supported by UNDP (project *Mainstreaming Sustainable Development*) which identifies, among others, implemenation deficits of the Action Plan (Eberhardt 2004). This section presents an overview of the most important activities towards implementation of the PA 21, but in any case tries neither to assess their impacts nor explain the causes of deficit implementation of the Action Agenda.

Since the beginning, the PCSD has been hampered by the lack of dedicated budgetary resources for its operation. It operated through resources contributed by the member agencies, especially NEDA and relied also heavily on adhoc external assistance. Lack

of public resources and other national problems such as official corruption have not help to concentrate activities on SD. However, a major achievement of PCSD is the passing of a resolution requesting the Department of Budget Management and congress to allocate funds in support of Council's activities, as a result Php3.5 bio. were allocated in 1994 for SD activities and distributed among various national agencies (Reyes 2002, ILO 1995). From Executive Order No 62 by the President of the Philippines (2001) '[t]here shall be provided in the General Appropriations Act (GAA) a regular line item budget under the NEDA budget to cover the operational requirements of the council [PCSD] subject to prescribed budgetary guidelines [...]'.

In the Philippines external financial sources such as official development assistance (ODA), concessional loans and grants are utilized to finance SD programs and projects inter alia: a) UNDP's Capacity 21 Facility supporting capacity building for the PCSD; b) UNDP Fifth Country Program for the Integrated Environmental Management for SD (IEMSD) (see table 4) and c) Global Environment Fund (GEF) for projects in the areas of biodiversity and climate change. As it currently stands, financial assistance to operationalize SD, in the form of ODA, may not be forthcoming. Given this, the PCSD continually explores and remains open to a host of SD financing mechanisms. Specifically, cooperation with bilateral or multilateral organizations, private sector, or the introduction of economic instruments/market-based instruments (MBIs) are being promoted. The PCSD has supported a study on the *Implementation of Selected Market-based Instruments for Air and Water Pollution Control*. Later, a number of legislative measures promoting the adoption of innovative financial instruments were deliberated in Congress. These measures included on the one hand, the Revised Environmental Code which seeks to espouse the less use of command-and-control and more of market-based mechanisms to encourage greater self-regulation and more efficient participation and compliance from the industries in the protection of the environment. On the other hand, the *Pollution Charge Program* through which industries emitting and discharging effluents exceeding the prescribed environmental levels are charged with annual effluent and emission fees to abate or minimize pollution. Additionally, there are government policies to encourage an increase in efficiency of resource use, reduction of waste per unit of economic output, and recycling.

**Box 7: Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

Improving the *Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) System* aims to integrate EIS system early into the project development cycle. It also encourages the establishment of environmental units (EUs) in all implementing agencies of government, including government owned-and-controlled corporations and government financial institutions, particularly those whose mandates include the introduction of physical plants and infrastructure. However, some critical views (NGOs/POs) claim that EIS need to be revised otherwise they are easily abused by private corporations and TNCs (PHILNET-WSSD, 2001).

Source: Lotilla 2002, UNDP 1998

The *Integrated Environmental Management for SD (IEMSD)*, supported by the PCSD, is implemented to support efforts in the integration of the environment in decision-making, proper pricing of natural resources, and strengthening of people's participation and constituency-building for environmental policy advocacy. The IEMSD has six sub-programmes as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: Integrated Environmental Management for SD (IEMSD)**

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Outline</b>
<i>Integrated Philippine Economic, Environment and Natural Resources Accounting (PEENRA)</i>	The PEENRA is both a tool and a framework in resource management which recognizes the productive role of environment and natural resources in economic systems. It is aimed at incorporating the depletion of natural resources and the deterioration of the general environment in the national income accounting process through adjustments and corrections made on measures like the gross national product (GNP) to reflect the real levels of economic welfare (Environmentally-adjusted Net Domestic Product). This has been successfully piloted as a satellite of the system of national accounts and finally it has been institutionalized through approval of an executive order which mandates DENR, NEDA and National Statistical Co-ordination Board (NCSB) creating their respective PEENRA units and providing staff and budget for operations. For example, the National Water Resources Board is member of the PEENRA which aims to prioritize water resources based on their economic importance and to ensure availability of data needed in the compilation of the accounts.
<i>Integration of Environmental and Socio-Economic Development Policies (SEI)</i>	An action impact matrix which identifies priority areas of study on environment–economy integration has been developed. In this context a Monitoring, and Evaluation (MRE) System was prepared in collaboration with the PCSD.
<i>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</i> <i>(includes EIS, see box 7)</i>	Incorporation of environmental concerns in the project evaluation process; preparation of an EIA Procedural Handbook; strengthening of the EIA system; development of environmental risk assessment software; and creation of a risk-liability system through the Environmental Guarantee Fund (EGF), fund deposited by proponents of projects that pose significant risk for life, health, property and environment (required to submit an EIS).
<i>Sustainable Development Models (SDM)</i>	Formulation of SD indicators (see section 3.3). Documentation of SD projects.
<i>Environment and Natural Resource (ENR) Database (DBAS)</i>	Develop and operationalize an Environment and Natural Resources Database.
<i>Programme Management Support System (PMSS).</i>	Documentation and co-ordination of different SD projects.  Source: Compiled by the author (UN 2002, UNDESA 2003) Lotilla 2002, UNDP 1998

**Table 5: Selected Sustainable Development Initiatives**

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Outline</b>
<i>Information Center for Clean Technology and Environmental Management (CTEM)</i>	Managed by the NGO <i>Philippine Business for the Environment</i> (PBE) with funding support from the United States-Asia Environmental Partnership. Other initiatives of the business sector are the launching of the bi-monthly news magazine 'Business and Environment' and the active role in the development of ISO 14000.
<i>Adopting Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) as the National Strategy to Ensure the SD</i>	This strategy includes two national programs: the <i>Integrated Social Forestry Program</i> and the <i>Industrial Forest Management Program</i> . The first aims to promote a strong

<i>of the Country's Forestland Resources and Providing Mechanisms for its Implementation</i>	partnership between the forest occupants and the government in food production and forest rehabilitation. The latter has the objective of establishing industrial forest plantations as an alternative resource base for forest-based export industries.
<i>Clean Air 2000</i>	This is an action plan to improve the level of air quality by the year 2000. In 1994, related to this plan, the PCSD Subcommittee on Atmosphere started multi-stakeholder consultations with the oil industry, car manufacturing association, government planning and policy bodies and NGOs to push for the phase-out of leaded gasoline. After nearly three years President Ramos issued an executive order phasing out leaded gasoline in Metro Manila by the year 2000 and nationwide by 2001.
<i>Key Production Area (KPA) Development</i>	This is premised on the need to optimize the use of limited land and water to provide for the food requirements of the growing population and foster 'export winners' within the context of equitable and SD. Other initiatives within sustainable agriculture are the <i>Integrated Pest Management (IPM)</i> program, and projects dealing with soil conservation and water resource management.
<i>National Integrated Coastal and Marine Management Strategy (NICMMS)</i>	In 1998, the <i>Philippine Fisheries Code</i> was enacted, which establishes coastal resource management as a national strategy. In 2000 the DA and DENR signed a joint memorandum order defining areas of cooperation for the implementation of the Code resulting in this strategy whose primary responsibility is in DENR's hands through an interagency committee. Source: (Reyes 2002, UNDESA 2003).

Some other key areas in the Philippines have been: a) biodiversity: developed the *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)* approved in 1997 with UNEP assistance; b) freshwater resources: an authority has been created for the planning and regulation of water resources with respect to quality, quantity and tariff; c) ecological waste management: an inter-agency body headed by the DENR, the *National Solid Waste Management Commission*, was created in 2000; and d) the developed *National Master Plan on Land Resources Management* which aims at the integrated approach to the planning and management of land resources (Earth Council 1998, Isberto 1998, UN 2002, UNDESA 2003).

The Philippine archipelago has reacted very actively to the global issue of Climate Change. Before the Third Conference of Parties (COP-3) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), where the Kyoto protocol was adopted, an international *Conference on National Communications under the FCCC* was held in Manila, facilitated by the Earth Council and hosted by the PCSD, which called for legally binding protocols with specific targets and timetables (UNDESA 2003).

**Table 6: Selected Initiatives on Climate Change**

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Outline</b>
<i>National Action Plan on Climate Change</i>	In view of addressing Climate Change and the Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM), this plan aims at integrating climate change concerns into the government's development plans, funded by the USAID.

<i>Philippine Climate Change Mitigation Program (1998-2001)</i>	The DOE in coordination with the the <i>Inter-agency Committee on Climate Change</i> (IACC, established to coordinate the government and non-government sectors and formulate positions to the Climate Change Convention negotiations) have implemented this programme which basic strategy is to slow down the growth of GHG emissions through the expanded use of clean fuels in power generation.
<i>Eco-efficiency MBIs</i>	To promote eco-efficiency, tax exemptions are provided by the Board of Investments (BOI) of the DTI to firms that import brand new equipment. And for the installation of pollution control equipment. The BOI in cooperation with the <i>Green Aide Plan</i> of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry of Japan, transfers technology on pollution control and energy.
<i>Affiliated Non-Conventional Energy Center (ANEC) Program</i>	Consisting of new and renewable energy systems, a total of 298 demonstration projects have been implemented.  (UNDESA 2003, Merilo 2003).

Nine pilot projects co-ordinated by the Philippine Council for SD Coordinating Secretariat (PCSDCS) with support of the Philippines-Canada Development Fund (PCDF) has aimed at strengthening capacities of stakeholders at the LGU level in collectively addressing the creation or strengthening formulation of local agenda 21 (LA 21). Though it has jumpstarted the process of SD localization in the selected LGUs, it has barely scratched the surface of SD mainstreaming in the selected pilot sites. Stakeholders have yet to implement programs and projects identified in their respective LA 21 (PCSD 2003).

An initiative at the local level worth a mention is the gender-conscious budgeting in the City of Bacolod which dedicates 5% of their financial budgets to gender and development activities, leading to gender education throughout the municipal system, as well as increased funding for reproductive health education, community welfare and environmental protection (ICLEI 2002).

## 3.5

*Summary of National SD Strategy***Table 7: Summary of The Philippines' National Sustainable Development Strategy Processes**

Criteria/Aspects	Outline
<i>Content of SDS</i>	
-Typology	-National Sustainable Development Strategy, multi-dimensional in its guiding principles and more environmental oriented for action agenda, cross-sectoral
-Content	-Contains principles, action areas (ecosystem-based), process related objectives (some quantified) with time frame and implementation framework (no monitoring provision, no indicators provided)
-Linkages with other strategies and planning processes	-High integration regarding the overall national development planning framework and with some sectoral environmental plans
<i>Development Aspects</i>	
-Legal basis, state of process	-Memorandum Order (approved by President of Republic), no law, active, under intensive reform process, including: broadening localization and strengthening mainstreaming of SD
-Institutions, responsible agencies	-Responsibilities divided among Ministries (e.g. DENR), governmental committees (NEDA), also multistakeholder bodies (e.g. Philippine Council for Sustainable Development [PCSD])
-Decisions and negotiation	-Very broad consultation process for strategy development. Philippine Council for SD coordinates negotiations on sustainability issues (advisory body). Decisions not taken at committee level are discussed at the Council level until consensus is reached. Final decisions are taken by line departments
-External Support	-ODA, concessional loans and grants (e.g. UNDP, GEF, GTZ)
<i>Participation</i>	
-Coordination	-Co-ordinated by the Philippine Council for SD through both the composite secretariat and the NGO secretariat
-Inter-governmental actors	-Philippine Council for SD, National Economic and Development Authority, Interagency Committee for Climate Change (IACC), Cabinet Committee on Marine and Ocean affairs, National Anti-poverty Commission (NAPC), Social Development Committee (SDC) of the NEDA Board and the Commission on Population (POPCOM), National Solid Waste Management Commission
-Civil society, NGOs actors	-Broad-based consultations for development of PA 21 (exception: business and local governments). Since 1996 Business accepted in the PCSD. Low consultation of local governments. Strong popular movements
<i>Monitoring, Reporting and Adaptation Aspects</i>	
-Responsibilities & Mechanisms	-Responsibility lies on PCSD. No formal provision, monitoring on ad hoc basis. President of Philippines issuing a memorandum order. Core set of indicators developed
-Compliance mechanisms	-No compliance mechanisms identified or implications for failure to comply
-Learning and Adaptation	-PCSD office based in NEDA favoured interchange experiences between the two agencies staff members
-Application of Strategic Environmental Assessment	-No regulation so far on SEA. SEI fulfil some of the requirements of SEA
<i>Implementation of SDS</i>	
-Responsibility and Coordination	-All ministerial departments, co-ordination and supervision by the PCSD under the auspices of the President

---

-Financing and capacity	-Insufficient to cover all tasks of mandate, no official budget allocated to PCSD until 1995. Identified implementation deficits to be dealt with the current reform process.
-Communication	-General information strategy contained in PA 21: Information, Education and Communication plan, Local Agenda 21 and Philippine Business Agenda 21
<i>Specific SD Initiatives</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Strong focus on cleaner industries through market-based instruments, strong focus on renewables, provision of freshwaters resources and climate change-related programs and laws.</li> <li>-Attempts to introduce environmental management tools (including Green Budgeting)</li> <li>-Ambitious measures for improving air quality in the Capital Region</li> <li>-Integrative measures regarding cross-sectoral environmental impact statement</li> </ul>

---

#### 4 Supporting information

Department of Agrarian Reform: <http://www.dar.gov.ph/about/default.asp>

Department of Agriculture: <http://www.da.gov.ph/welcome.html>

Department of Energy:  
[http://www.doe.gov.ph/servlet/page?\\_pageid=2508&\\_dad=portal30&\\_schema=PORTAL30](http://www.doe.gov.ph/servlet/page?_pageid=2508&_dad=portal30&_schema=PORTAL30)

Department of Environment and Natural Resources: <http://www.denr.gov.ph/gov>

Department of Trade and Industry: <http://www.dti.gov.ph/contentment/37/index.jsp>

Philippine Agenda 21: <http://pcsd.neda.gov.ph/pa21.htm>

Philippine Council for Sustainable Development:  
<http://www.neda.gov.ph/pcsd/html/profile.htm>

Philippine Strategy for Sustainable Development: [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDS\\_IBank\\_Servlet?pcont=details&eid=000009265\\_3970702135204](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDS_IBank_Servlet?pcont=details&eid=000009265_3970702135204)

Report to the WSSD: [www.un.org/esa/sustdev/natlinfo/cp2002.htm](http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/natlinfo/cp2002.htm)

#### 5 List of references

Earth Council (August 2001-latest update), National Experiences of Integrative, Multistakeholder Processes for SD. NCSN Report 1999-2000, available at: <http://www.ncsdnetwork.org/knowledge/ncsdreport2000.pdf> (Accessed 5 February 2004)

Earth Council (June 1998- latest update): Rio in Retrospect: The Philippines and Global Agenda 21 1992-1996, Philippine Council for Sustainable Development, April 1997, available at:

- <http://www.ecouncil.ac.cr/rio/national/reports/asia/philippi.htm> (Accessed 2 February 2004)
- Hemmati, M (2001), Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability-Beyond Deadlock and Conflict, London, Earthscan, available at: <http://www.earthsummit2002.org/msp/book.htm> (Accessed 21 February 2004)
- International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) (2002), Local Strategies for Accelerating Sustainability. Case studies of Local Government Success.
- International Labour Organization (ILO), Baybay Villacorta, L. and van Meirhaeghe, L. (1995), Towards Sustainable Development in the Philippines, International Labour Office Geneva, Publications of the International Labour Office.
- Isberto, E. (1998), The Philippine Council for Sustainable Development: Like Cooking Rice Cakes, World Resources Institute, Global Topics, Governance and Institutions, available at: <http://www.wri.org/wri/governance/pdf/ncsds-gfed/philippines.pdf>
- Lotilla M., R. P. (2002). Strategies and Processes Towards Integrating Sustainable Development into National Planning: The Philippines Case, National Economic and Development Authority, Philippines, available at: [http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/calendar/meeting\\_docs/phillippinescontribution1120.doc](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/calendar/meeting_docs/phillippinescontribution1120.doc) (Accessed 5 February 2004)
- Merilo D., G.A., (2003), Addressing Climate Change and the CMD: The Philippine Initiatives, Inter-Agency Committee on Climate Change Environmental Management Bureau, Philippines. Presentation for the 13<sup>th</sup> Asia-Pacific Seminar on Climate Change, Miyazaki, Japan, available at: <http://www.ap-net.org/apseminar/docs/miyazaki/21%20Philippines-rev.pdf> (Accessed 17 February 2004)
- National Councils for Sustainable Development (NCSD) (August 2001a- latest update): The NCSD Sustainable Development Report Republic of the Philippines, available at: <http://www.ncsdnetwork.org/global/reports/ncsd1999/phi.htm> (Accessed 16 February 2004)
- National Councils for Sustainable Development (NCSD) (August 2001b - latest update): NCSD Report 1999-2000 National Experiences of Integrative, Multistakeholder Processes for Sustainable Development Philippines pp. 80-83, available at: <http://www.ncsd.org/knowledge/ncsdreport2000.pdf> (Accessed 20 February 2004)
- Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) (August 2001- latest update): PCSD Tests National SD Indicators, available at: [http://www.neda.gov.ph/pcsd/New\\_Folder/sdis.htm](http://www.neda.gov.ph/pcsd/New_Folder/sdis.htm) (Accessed 3 February 2004)

- Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) (August 2003- latest update): From Rio to Manila: Ten Years After. An Assessment of Agenda 21 Implementation in the Philippines PCSD, available at: <http://pcsd.neda.gov.ph/rio+10.htm> (Accessed 15 February 2004)
- Philippine Network of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (PHILNET-WSSD) (2001): Sustainable Development and Globalization in the Philippines: An Alternative View, available at: <http://www.bulatlat.com/archive2/042wssd3.html> ((Accessed 18 February 2004)
- Reyes L., J. (2002), Planning together in the Philippines, in: Capacity 21 Building Capacity for a Sustainable Future Approaches to Sustainability Civil Society and Sustainable Development Perspectives on Participation in the Asia & Pacific Region, UN Development Programme (UNDP), available at: <http://www.undp.org/capacity21/docs/ats/ats-asia-en.pdf> (Accessed 12 February 2004)
- The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) (2002), London, United Kingdom: Country Profile 2002, Philippines.
- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) (August 2002- latest update): Country Experiences with National Reporting to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development available at: [http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natlinfo/wssd/nfp\\_final.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natlinfo/wssd/nfp_final.pdf) (Accessed 20 February 2004)
- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) (July 2003- latest update): Sustainable Development Information on The Republic of the Philippines, available at: <http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natlinfo/countr/philipi/index.htm> (Accessed 16 February 2004)
- UN Development Programme (UNDP) (1998): Better Environment and Natural Resource Management Discussion. UNDP/Manila Experience in reference to comments from UNDP/Hanoi, available at: [http://rrmeet.undp.org.in/\\_disc2/0000000d.htm](http://rrmeet.undp.org.in/_disc2/0000000d.htm) (Accessed 5 February 2004)
- UN Development Programme (UNDP) (1996), Capacity Building in Support of the Philippines Council for Sustainable Development. Capacity 21 Monitoring Report, March 1996, available at: <http://stone.undp.org/maindiv/bdp/dl/results.cfm?Country=38&Clear=TRUE> (Accessed 5 February 2004)
- UN Economic and Social Affairs for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) (August 2001- latest update) : Institutional Arrangements and Mechanisms for integrating environmental considerations into economic decision making process at the national level in the Philippines, available at:

<http://www.unescap.org/drrpad/publication/integra/volume1/philippines/1p1000.ct.htm> (Accessed 2 February 2004)

United Nations (UN) (2002) : Philippines. Country Profile, Johannesburg Summit 2002. Available at:

<http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natlinfo/wssd/philippines.pdf>

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (June 2003- latest update): Human Development Report, Monitoring Human Development: Enlarging People's Choices, available at: [http://www.undp.org/hdr2003/pdf/hdr03\\_HDI.pdf](http://www.undp.org/hdr2003/pdf/hdr03_HDI.pdf) (Accessed 16 February 2004)

Virtucio, Felizardo K. et al. (2002), From Rio to Manila: Ten Years After. An Assessment of Agenda 21 Implementation in the Philippines, Technical Secretariat of the PCSD, available at:

[http://www.ncsdnetwork.org/mgf/files/Philippines-FROM\\_RIO\\_TO\\_MANILA.pdf](http://www.ncsdnetwork.org/mgf/files/Philippines-FROM_RIO_TO_MANILA.pdf)

World Bank (WB) (August 2003- latest update): World Development Indicators database, available at:

<http://www.worldbank.org/data/countrydata/countrydata.html> (Accessed 16 February 2004)

## **6 Acknowledgements**

I acknowledge the assistance and information provided by Sheila Marie M. Encabo and Fay F. Mancebo from the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) in the Philippines, Jan Peter Schemmel from the GTZ and Alfred Eberhardt.

This report has also benefited from the comments made by the following researchers: Axel Volkery and Dr Klaus Jacob from the Environmental Research Centre at the Freie Universität Berlin, Germany and Darren Swanson from the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Canada.