

Scaling Up Integrated Population, Health and Environment Approaches in the Philippines

Roger-Mark De Souza



Scaling Up Integrated Population, Health and Environment Approaches in the Philippines:

A Review of Early Experiences

By Roger-Mark De Souza¹

¹ Roger-Mark De Souza is currently the Director of Foundation and Corporate Relations at the Sierra Club, the largest grassroots environmental organization in the United States. For 15 years, De Souza researched, designed and provided technical assistance to PHE programs in developing countries. From 1997-2007, he directed the PHE program of the Population Reference Bureau, leading PRB's work in the Philippines.



PUBLICATION CREDITS

FUNDING

This publication is made possible by the generous support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

PHOTO CREDITS

Permission to use the photographs in this publication is gratefully acknowledged. Cover photos from top to bottom, left to right: village producing seaweed © WWF / Judy Oglethorpe; community based distributor and field-trip visitors © Philippine Legislators' Committee on Population and Development (PLCPD); Third National PHE Conference © PLCPD; woman and child with fish © WWF / Judy Oglethorpe. CD cover: Third National PHE Conference © PLCPD.

PROJECT MANAGER

Judy Oglethorpe, manager of WWF-US Population, Health, Gender and Environment Program

CITATION

Please cite this publication as De Souza, R-M. 2008. *Scaling up Integrated Population, Health and Environment Approaches in the Philippines: A review of early experiences*. Washington, DC: World Wildlife Fund and the Population Reference Bureau.

WWF-US

1250 24th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
USA

www.worldwildlife.org

email: ecoregionsupportinfo@wwfus.org

Population Reference Bureau

1875 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 520
Washington, DC 20009
USA

www.prb.org

© 2008 World Wildlife Fund Inc. and Population Reference Bureau. All rights reserved. Reproduction of this publication for educational and other noncommercial purposes is authorized without prior permission of the copyright holder. However, WWF and PRB do request advance written notification and appropriate acknowledgement. WWF and PRB do not require payment for the noncommercial use of this published work. Reproduction or other use of photographs and maps that appear in this publication is prohibited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	4
Acronyms	5
Executive Summary	6
Introduction	9
1. Integrated population, health and environment approaches in the Philippines	11
1.1 Overview of PHE Relationships in the Philippines	11
1.2 Precursors to Population, Health and Environment Projects	12
1.3 Moving from Government Initiatives to Community-based Projects	14
1.4 The PHE Advocacy Movement	17
1.5 Characteristics of PHE Scaling Up in the Philippines	19
2. Enabling Conditions for Scaling Up in the Philippines	27
2.1 Decentralization	27
2.2 Momentum of People Power	28
2.3 Strong NGO Capacity	28
2.4 Visibility of PHE Connections	28
3. Drivers of PHE Scaling Up	29
3.1 Documentation of PHE Approaches	29
3.2 Strong Intermediary Actors	31
3.3 Diffusion of PHE as an Innovation	31
3.4 The Work of PHE Champions	32
3.5 Using PHE as a Multifaceted Advocacy Tool	33
3.6 Donor Interest in PHE in the Philippines	35
3.7 Creating a Buzz Around PHE Connections	37
3.8 International Recognition of the Philippines as a Center of Excellence for PHE Integration	38
4. Constraints to Scaling up and Development of PHE programming	40
4.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Challenges	40
4.2 Gaps in Technical Knowledge	41
4.3 Absence of User-friendly Tools	41
4.4 Difficulties in Sustaining Momentum	41
4.5 Challenges of Impact Scales	42
5. Future Directions	44
5.1 Involve a Variety of Stakeholders	44
5.2 Build Technical Capacity	44
5.3 Work with Third-party Intermediaries	44
5.4 Develop Knowledge Managers	45
Conclusion	45
Annex: The Antipolo Declaration	47
Bibliography	50

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In addition to reviewing the scaling up literature and PHE project documents, 20 on-line and in-person interviews were conducted with project managers and partners in the Philippines and in Washington, D.C. Stakeholders interviewed in Washington D.C. included representatives from the Sierra Club, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International, U.S. Agency for International Development, the Population Reference Bureau and an independent consultant who evaluated PHE projects in the Philippines for the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Sacnite Ramos, a University of Michigan Minority-Serving Institutions Summer Intern, assisted with background research and interviews for this paper.² These interviews probed three issues: (i) whether these stakeholders found PHE interventions innovative and useful; (ii) the role that PRB and others played in PHE programs and their scaling up; and (iii) perspectives on initial experiences with scaling up of the PHE approach.

Several colleagues reviewed this report, they include: Bill Fischelis (Conservation International-Philippines); Janet Edmond (Conservation International-Washington D.C.); Joan Castro and Leona D'Agnes (Path Foundation Inc-Philippines); Ramon San Pascual (Philippines Legislators' Committee on Population and Development); Melissa Thaxton and Lisa Colson (Population Reference Bureau); Norma Pongan-Chan (Save the Children/US-Philippines); Judy Oglethorpe (World Wildlife Fund); Geoff Dabelko (Woodrow Wilson Center's Environmental Change and Security Program); and Heather D'Agnes (US Agency for International Development/Washington). Any shortcomings or omissions from this paper are entirely my own.

Assistance with production of the report was provided by Tessa Pechenik, March Wood, Stacey Simmonds and Judy Oglethorpe in WWF, and Lisa Colson in PRB.

² The internship program no longer exists, but historical information about the program may be found at <http://www.sph.umich.edu/pfps/msi/overview-msi.htm>

ACRONYMS

BASIC	Building Action for Stability in Communities
CI	Conservation International
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
ECSP	Environmental Change and Security Program
FP/RH	Family Planning/Reproductive Health
FISH	Fisheries Improved for Sustainable Harvest (USAID project)
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
LGU	Local Government Unit
ICM	Integrated Coastal Management
ICDP	Integrated Conservation and Development Project
IDRC	International Development Research Center
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IIASA	International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis
IPOPCORM	Integrated Population and Coastal Resource Management
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
NGO	Non Government Organization
NSO	National Statistical Office
MEASURE	Monitoring and Evaluation to ASsess and Use Results (USAID project)
Packard	David and Lucile Packard Foundation
PESCODEV	People and Environment Coexistence Development
PFPI	PATH Foundation Philippines Inc.
PDE	Population, Development, Environment
PDPR	Population and Development Planning and Research Project (A project of the Commission on Population)
PHE	Population, health and environment
PLAN	People's Legislative Advocacy Network
PLCPD	Philippines Legislators' Committee on Population and Development
PNGOC	Philippine NGO Council for Health, Population, and Welfare
POPCOM	Commission on Population
POPDEV	Population Development Program (Commission on Population)
PPLL	Planning at the Local Level (A project of the Commission on Population)
PRB	Population Reference Bureau
RH	Reproductive Health
SIGUE	The acronym adopted by the initial PHE coalition – it comes from the initial ground rules adopted by the group - <i>Study, Internalize and apply, Go the extra distance; Understand; and Enjoy</i> . “Sigue” is also a popular Tagalog expression that means “okay” “forge ahead” “I agree.”
SC	Save the Children/United States-Philippines Field Office
SUM	Scaling Up Management Framework (proposed by Cooley and Kohl, 2006)
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
WWF	World Wildlife Fund/World Wild Fund for Nature

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From the early 1980s through the 1990s, the Philippine Government, with support from the United Nations and the academic community, initiated a number of national poverty alleviation projects that specifically linked population, health and environment (PHE) issues such as urbanization, migration and land use. In the late 1990s, non-government organizations and international partners in the Philippines started a number of pilot community-based PHE projects, working in varied villages and regions. These community projects benefited from the momentum of the national projects and focused more specifically on smaller scale integrated efforts to improve natural resource management, deliver greater reproductive health services, and enhance food security and livelihood options for poor Filipinos.

With the success of these community projects, the implementing organizations sought to expand them from the initial pilot sites to adjacent or more distant sites. At the same time, local and international NGOs, policymakers and journalists worked together to systematically disseminate the lessons learned from these community projects and to explore avenues for larger and deeper application of the PHE approach.

Today, integrated PHE programming is gaining momentum in new geographic areas of the country and is being applied to other domains outside the traditional population, health and environment fields such as disaster mitigation and food security. This paper reviews this early experience of PHE scaling up in the Philippines and looks at constraints and opportunities to further scaling up.

The Context of PHE Scaling Up in the Philippines

For this review, the processes of scaling up are viewed through Cooley and Kohl's (2006) scaling up framework which defines scaling up in terms of *expansion*, *replication* and *collaboration*. Through *expansion* the PHE approach is scaled up by increasing the scope of operations of the organization that originally developed and piloted it. *Replication* involves increasing the use of the PHE model of service delivery by getting others, including the public sector, to take up and implement the model. *Collaboration* includes establishing formal partnerships and strategic alliances such as the national PHE network.

These scaling up processes are examined according to policy communication techniques, particularly those used by the US-based Population Reference Bureau (PRB) working with local partners. Such communication techniques recognize that partnering institutions that adopt PHE – particularly NGOs and government agencies – encourage institutionalization of PHE within their respective organizations and help expand PHE approaches from the ground up, from community projects to local and national policies.

In addition to reviewing the scaling up literature and PHE project documents, 20 on-line and in-person interviews were conducted with project managers and partners in the Philippines and in Washington, D.C. Interviews probed three issues: (i) whether these stakeholders found PHE interventions innovative and useful; (ii) the role that PRB and other partners played in PHE programs and their scaling up; and (iii) perspectives on initial experiences with scaling up of the PHE approach.

Opportunities for PHE scaling up

The main characteristics of PHE scaling up in the Philippines were: a broad understanding of scaling up (including reaching out to new locations and people in currently served locations); a deep and wide programmatic implementation of PHE scaling up (expanding services to current clients); and finally, a desire to move from program implementation to policy application (extending pilot or demonstration projects to policies at the local and national levels).

These early scale up attempts were facilitated by enabling factors such as visible impacts of human-environment interactions on people's lives (the loss of life from disasters, for example); by the possibilities of linking reproductive health with environmental and livelihood issues for advocacy purposes; and by donor support in the Philippines to provide critical reproductive health services for Filipinos and to protect unique biodiversity. Simultaneously, a number of conditions specific to the Philippines also facilitated PHE scale up. These include initial government efforts in the 1980s and 1990s at PHE integration which provided some initial context for some practitioners to apply the model; decentralization of power to local decisionmaking entities such as local government units which provided budgetary and programmatic impetus for action at the community level; the modus operandi of people power movements which generated momentum for action through networking and community organizing; and strong NGO capacity which provided effective program implementers.

Drivers and Constraints to PHE Scaling Up

A number of forces boosted scaling up efforts: diffusing PHE as an innovation; using PHE as a multifaceted advocacy tool; donors' investing in PHE/Philippines; and working with intermediary actors who, collectively, documented PHE approaches, sparked interest around PHE issues, and ultimately helped garner international recognition of the Philippines as a center of excellence for PHE integration.

Attaining measurable and sustained outcomes in behavioral, environmental and policy change such as those sought by PHE projects, however, are large-scale commitments which present obstacles for further scaling up. Some constraints to additional scaling-up include insufficient funding due to the lack of effective and proven models that can be replicated easily; need for clarity on the definition of scaling-up among implementing organizations; and a lack of solid scientifically-based evidence to prove to government and other organizations that the PHE approach is a viable method of achieving development goals.

Lessons Learned and Future Directions

Even though the Philippines provides a good opportunity to scale-up PHE projects, there is a long path ahead. Overall, what is needed are model-driven, programmatic and policy activities that include a detailed, prospective evaluation to support the development of program and policy change benchmarks. Future evaluation efforts would ideally start with a detailed assessment of the program and policy environment and data available to illuminate problems and solutions, then move into the design and implementation of activities based on the PHE approach. The strengthening of the current national PHE network, in particular, would provide a strong clearing house of best practices and a scaling up mechanism for PHE integration. As the largest generation of Filipinos in

history comes of age in the next several years, renewed efforts at integration will be help meet citizens' needs and achieve key development goals.

INTRODUCTION

Projects that integrate population, health and environment (PHE) issues have generated significant interest at the local, regional and national levels in the Philippines. In a number of villages and regions, these projects have maximized efforts to improve natural resource management, deliver greater reproductive health services, and enhance food security and livelihood options for poor Filipinos by integrating these various components under one set of project delivery mechanisms.

During 2001-2006, for example, the Integrated Population and Coastal Resource Management (IPOPCORM) project served an estimated 400,000 people living in 1,288 coastal sitios (hamlets) of 216 barangays (villages) spanning 33 municipalities located in five administrative regions and 11 biogeographic regions of the country.³ Similarly, during 2000-2004, Save the Children's People and Environment Coexistence Development (PESCODEV) project benefited 375,203 people living in 95 coastal barangays of 11 municipalities in one administrative region - Western Visayas.⁴

Together, these two PHE projects reached about 775,203 coastal residents living in 44 municipalities of six administrative regions. Although the cumulative level of population coverage (775,203) is modest in comparison to the total number of people living in coastal Philippines (51,577,096) the level of hotspot coverage of these two projects is unprecedented. Together these projects introduced the integrated approach to nine of the country's 14 areas ranked as "extremely high" priority for conservation of marine biodiversity. There is no other country in the world where PHE approaches have reached a scale of such ecological-significance.

Given such success stories, a number of local and international NGOs, policymakers and journalists have started working together to systematically disseminate the lessons learned from these initiatives and to explore avenues for larger and deeper application of the PHE approach. As a result, integrated PHE programming is gaining momentum in new geographic areas of the country and is being applied to other domains outside the traditional population, health and environment fields such as disaster mitigation and food security.

The accomplishments of these early PHE implementers have been facilitated by opportunities and driving factors such as visible impacts of human-environment interactions on people's lives (the loss of life from disasters, for example); by the possibilities of linking reproductive health with environmental and livelihood issues for advocacy purposes; and by donor investments in the Philippines given critical reproductive health and environmental needs for local Filipinos and the need to protect unique biodiversity.

The paper is organized in five sections. Section one explores how the concept of integrated population, health and environment has been applied recently in the Philippines and explores the ways in which scaling up might be relevant for PHE programming in the country. Section two looks at opportunities and enabling conditions that have facilitated PHE replication, broadening and deepening. Section three discusses the factors that have driven scaling up of PHE programs in the Philippines, while section

³ PFPI November 2006 IPOPCORM Interim Report to the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

⁴ Pielemeier, J. Aug 2005 Review of PHE Programs supported by Packard and USAID

four examines constraints to further scaling up and development of PHE programming. A final section looks at lessons learned and future directions.

It is hoped that this paper will be useful to project staff working in the Philippines who may not be aware of the history of PHE projects, the range of scaling up activities in the country, or the ideas expressed in the scaling up literature. New stakeholders who learn of the PHE approach are enthusiastic about the possibilities of further scaling-up initial PHE successes. These new stakeholders are looking to partner with those groups that have tried these approaches and want to replicate and broaden winning strategies for integrated programming. This paper will also be useful to these new stakeholders because it provides an overview of the scope of PHE movement in the Philippines in the context of holistic development approaches and social movements.

What is Scaling up?

For the purposes of this paper, scaling up is defined in terms of Rogers' (2003) diffusion of innovation theory, recognizing the importance of sharing the successes of early adopters and getting others to adapt the PHE approach as an innovative solution to pressing problems.

The processes of scaling up are examined through Cooley and Kohl's (2006) scaling up framework which defines scaling up in terms of *expansion*, *replication* and *collaboration*.⁵ Through *expansion* an approach is scaled up by increasing the scope of operations of the organization that originally developed and piloted it. *Replication* involves increasing the use of a particular process, technology or model of service delivery by getting others, including the public sector, to take up and implement the model. *Collaboration* includes formal partnerships and strategic alliances.

The scaling up framework also notes that extension of a pilot project's services or benefits can be along any of the following five dimensions:⁶

1. Geographic coverage (extending to new locations);
2. Breadth of coverage (extending to more people in the currently served categories and localities);
3. Depth of services (extending additional services to current clients);
4. Client type (extending to new categories of clients); and
5. Problem definition (extending current methods to new problems).

These processes are examined according to policy communication techniques (Ashford et al, 2006) which recognize that partnering institutions that adopt PHE – NGOs and government agencies – encourage institutionalization of PHE within their respective organizations and also work to expand PHE approaches from the ground up, from local community projects to local and national policies.

⁵ Cooley, Larry and Richard Kohl. "Scaling up – from vision to large scale change: A management framework for Practitioners," Management Systems International, March 2006. p11

⁶ Ibid. p17

SECTION 1

Integrated population, health and environment approaches in the Philippines

1.1 Overview of PHE Relationships in the Philippines

In the Philippines the connections among population, health and environmental issues are particularly salient. The health and well-being of Filipinos are being progressively more compromised as the country's cities become more crowded and polluted and as the reliability of food and water supplies in rural areas of the country becomes more uncertain. The productivity of agricultural lands and fisheries is declining as they become increasingly degraded and pushed beyond their capacity to produce. Plant and animal species are also disappearing due to forest loss and coral reef destruction.⁷

The impacts of these PHE linkages are not limited to one ecosystem or island in the Philippine archipelago. Rapid forest loss has eliminated habitat for unique and threatened plant and animal species; it has also left large tracts of land vulnerable to soil erosion and mudslides. Natural population growth and migration to coastal areas have contributed to increased fishing as new coastal residents seek to support themselves and their families. More fishing has also contributed to the depletion of fish stocks, accelerating the decline in fisheries-based food availability.⁸ The total fish available per person per year declined 19 percent between 1990 and 1996.⁹ Clearing mangroves for fuelwood, charcoal production, and coastline development has further degraded areas important to the fishing industry and left the coastline more vulnerable to storm surges, tidal currents, and typhoons. It is estimated that approximately two-thirds of the country's original mangroves have been lost.¹⁰

With 9.7 million Filipinos employed in agriculture, hunting, and forestry activities and another 1.3 million employed in fishing,¹¹ the loss of productivity of agricultural lands and fisheries has negatively affected the livelihoods and well-being of the country's residents. Changing landscapes—such as the clearing of forests for human settlement, agriculture, and timber—have also contributed to the severity of flash floods and landslides in the Philippines. Such natural disasters have claimed the lives of thousands of Filipinos and are particularly problematic in areas of high population density. A case in point is the well-known 1991 flash flood in Ormoc City in Leyte Province, in which at least 3,000 people died.

The potential effects of these environmental trends are exacerbated by growing population pressures. The Philippines' total fertility rate (lifetime births per woman) is currently 3.5, higher than most of the country's Southeast Asian neighbors. This high rate

⁷ Kathleen Mogelgaard. *Breaking New Ground in the Philippines: Opportunities to Improve Human and Environmental Well-being*. Population Reference Bureau. Policy brief. 2004

⁸ Catherine A. Courtney et al., *Coastal Resource Management for Food Security* (Cebu City: Coastal Resource Management Project Philippines, 1998): 4.

⁹ World Bank, *Philippines Environment Monitor 2000* (Manila: World Bank Group, 2000): 30.

¹⁰ Kathleen Mogelgaard (2004).

¹¹ National Statistical Coordination Board, preliminary labor and employment statistics for April 2004, accessed online at http://www.nscb.gov.ph/secstat/d_labor.asp, on July 28, 2004.

is due in part to an unmet need for family planning: Approximately 17 percent of the country's married women either would like to wait before having more children or would prefer to have no more children, but aren't using traditional or modern methods of family planning.¹² The youth bulge in the Philippines population poses additional threats to national and environmental security as more young people enter the reproductive age group and vie for limited educations and employment opportunities in the coastal zone.

1.2 Precursors to Population, Health and Environment Projects

The negative impacts of these population and environment trends are all the more acute in the context of increasing per capita poverty levels. In 2000, 4.3 million households—more than one-third of the population—lived below the national poverty threshold (4,835 pesos per month for a family of five).¹³ The Philippine Government, with support from the United Nations and the academic community, worked to link these population, health and environment trends in recognition of the need for poverty alleviation and income generation.

The Government's Commission on Population

When the Government's Commission on Population (POPCOM) was first established in 1970 it focused almost exclusively on family planning in the hopes of reducing population growth. In the following decade, it shifted this policy to include strategies to address the ways in which population and family planning linked to larger development questions such as natural resource planning. This policy shift paved the way for greater appreciation of population and environment linkages in the country. This new approach to integrated population and development planning was called "POPDEV."¹⁴

Using this POPDEV framework, POPCOM initiated a Population and Development Planning and Research (PDPR) Project in 1981. Under PDPR, POPCOM built the institutional capacity of local government institutions, promoted research/research utilization and conducted training on POPDEV. These efforts were focused in three pilot regions: Western Visayas – region 6, Eastern Visayas – region 7 and Northern Mindanao – region 10. Through PDPR, POPDEV helped integrate population into development planning at the national level and in these three pilot regions.

PDPR results included greater collaboration between researchers and development planners and the development of a core group of trainers and training modules. POPCOM soon realized, however, it needed to reach regions not covered by the project, and to find ways to make POPDEV more real and applicable to planners by designing user friendly methodologies and by linking POPDEV to livelihood issues. As such, it developed a new project in 1990 which it called its "Integrated Population and Development" project.

¹² Kathleen Mogelgaard and Roger-Mark De Souza, Population Reference Bureau, *Making the Link in the Philippines: Population, Health and the Environment*. Washington D.C.: 2006

¹³ National Statistical Coordination Board, "Fact Sheet: 4.3 Million Filipino Families are Living Below the Poverty Line" (FS-200310-SS1-01, posted October 2, 2003), accessed online at http://www.nscb.gov.ph/factsheet/pdf03/fs3_07.asp, on July 28, 2004.

¹⁴ Population Commission. "PPMP Directional Plan 2001-2004," pp 65-75 accessed on line at <http://www.popcom.gov.ph/pdf/PPMPDirectionalPlan.pdf>

The new POPDEV project came at a time when a new decentralization law called for a general rethinking of development planning. In 1991, a Local Government Code shifted the locus of power from the central to local government. This development put the onus on local governments at the provincial, municipal and barangay (village) levels.

Assistance from the United Nations Population Fund

In 1993, to build on the initial success of the PDPR project and to accommodate decentralization efforts, a United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) strategic review team made four recommendations. These recommendations included 1) strengthen efforts to integrate population in development planning at the LGU level; 2) foster scientific and data-based planning with LGUs; 3) help POPCOM train others in POPDEV planning and 4) address the lack of methodologies and baseline information that link population data to socio-economic processes.

Around this time, POPCOM began exploring how it might develop a policy planning tool to integrate population, development and environment. It sought to apply a model developed for Mauritius by the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA).¹⁵ The PDE model projected various scenarios using standard demographic forecasting techniques and an economic input-output model, together with models for land use and fresh water systems.

In 1994, a group of demographic, economic and environmental experts from IIASA, the East-West Center, POPCOM, and USAID discussed how they might implement a PDE model in the Philippines. Participants examined whether such a model - developed for Mauritius, a single island with a population of roughly one million - was feasible in a country like the Philippines - an extensive archipelago with a population of over 60 million. They expressed doubts about the model's ability to timely forecast variations for the Philippines, particularly given such varied physical environmental, economic infrastructure, and population characteristics.

Given the difficulties of implementing a large scale policy planning model, from 1996 to 1999 POPCOM initiated locally-based plans called the "POPDEV Planning at the Local Level" (PPLL). PPLL helped LGUs prepare socio-economic profiles, situational analyses, local development plans and local investment programs, as well as POPDEV indicators for LGUs to plan and monitor activities.

UNFPA also supported a project to help national government agencies consider population and development impacts. The project, "Population Policy Operations," was implemented through POPCOM. One of the areas for policy coordination was migration, urbanization and land use. The Population Policy Operations project contributed to a set of workable implementing rules and regulations known as the Urban Development and Housing Act of 1992. This act called for collaboration among LGUs, POPCOM, the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), and the National Statistical Office (NSO) to monitor population movements and their impact on development.

The Population Policy Operations Project worked through a number of sectoral task forces. These task forces, staffed by policy and program technical personnel from various national agencies and NGOs, formulated ways to analyze population

¹⁵ Cecile Joaquin-Yasay and Eric R. Jensen "Population, Development and Environment in the Philippines: An Introduction to this Issue." *Journal of Philippine Development*. Number 42, Volume XXIII, No. 2, Second Semester 1996 accessed on line at <http://dirp3.pids.gov.ph/ris/pjd/pidsjpd96-2population.pdf>

interrelationships and determined areas of intervention. Some outputs included the development of indicators for monitoring food security, a user's guide to analyze the implications of agricultural development policies on population and food security; and research on basic household water requirements and gender sensitive reproductive health programming.

Contributions from Academia

The POPDEV approach also gained currency in Philippine academic circles. The University of the Philippines implemented a comprehensive research program on POPDEV which proposed the systematic use of population variables in development policy formulation and planning. POPCOM, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and the School of Environmental Science and Management at the University of the Philippines-Los Baños jointly developed an approach to integrate population variables into Environmental Impact Assessments. Today, the approach is still integrated into the country's Environmental Impact System.

1.3 Moving from Government Initiatives to Community-Based Projects

Internationally, early attempts to integrate population and environment issues on a large scale were tried through rural development programs in the 1970s and integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs) in the 1980s. These ICDPs paved the way for smaller, community-based PHE projects.

The Emergence of Integrated Conservation and Development Projects

ICDPs aimed to jointly meet social development priorities and conservation goals by building social factors into natural environmental management programs and policies. ICDPs became popular in the conservation community, following the creation of a large number of parks and protected areas. Initially, they were well-supported by conservation organizations and development agencies. But highly publicized evaluations and critiques of ICDPs and their outcomes surfaced in the 1990s, calling into question the effectiveness of such comprehensive approaches in meeting conservation goals. Some groups have been concerned that integration of population and conservation activities led to "mission drift"—that the groups were straying too far from their conservation objectives and capabilities.

However, a further development in the conservation sector in the 1990s was the realization that protected areas were not sufficient to conserve many elements of biodiversity, and a broader landscape scale approach was needed to conserve biodiversity that occurred outside them. This involved working in areas with many different land uses, and with local communities living there. Hence the conservation sector moved towards multi-sector programs that could address communities' interests and needs at a local level in order to promote improved environmental management as part of broad landscape programs.

An advantage of this approach was the opportunity to operate at multiple levels – including, for example, at national policy level and at regional level as well as local level. At local level the new community programs were smaller than ICDPs and encompassed a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between communities and the environment; some incorporated population elements. Proponents of PHE integration into

this approach suggested that linked PHE interventions could allow communities to benefit from economies of scale and cross-sectoral collaboration by pooling information, funds, and strategies.

The community-based strategies that emerged in the Philippines in the late 1990s/early 2000s were based on the premise that the synergy produced by integrating family planning and conservation activities into community-based projects could create more effective and sustainable programs. In these initiatives, ecologists, health specialists, and community development experts connected a number of factors, including environmental stress, fertility, migration, women's health, women's educational status, economic decisions and community governance of land, inshore waters and natural resources.

Population, Health and Environment Projects

A number of these proposals pilot tested and applied the PHE approach in specific barangays or landscape sites such as watersheds. As these efforts were successful, project managers sought to expand them into demonstration projects, expanding from their initial pilot site and testing the model in adjacent or in more distant sites.

In this demonstration phase, these projects often broadened their outreach to make the PHE approach better known and more widely accepted by local decisionmakers and potential users, particularly at the barangay and municipal levels. Many of these projects also included reproductive health service delivery components. By the late-1990s, NGOs such as Save the Children, Conservation International, World Neighbors and PATH Foundation Philippines Inc. had already made important strides on the ground. Together, the projects covered five regions of the country -- Northern Luzon, Southern Luzon, Central Visayas, Western Visayas and Northern Mindanao. These early PHE projects are briefly described below:

The People and Environment Coexistence Development (PESCODEV) Project
Recognizing the links between growing populations and declining fish stocks in coastal communities, Save the Children (SC), a humanitarian relief and development organization, launched the PESCODEV Project. Nestled between two of the most productive fishing grounds in Central Philippines, and gateway to the flourishing the Western Visayas region, Guimaras and Iloilo certainly could have a lot of potential. Instead, they were among the top twenty poorest provinces of the country. Both provinces housed important marine resources, a growing population, and increasing poverty. Combining reproductive health service delivery and environmental management, Save the Children worked with local government officials and fishing families in the provinces of Iloilo and Guimaras to provide assistance and training in coastal resource management and fish catch monitoring. Activities included designating and monitoring marine protected areas, initiating mangrove reforestation efforts, and delivering improved reproductive health services—efforts that helped communities achieve their long-term goals of poverty reduction and economic well-being.

World Neighbors Protecting the Environment

World Neighbors, a grassroots development organization, worked with the Bohol Alliance of NGOs in the Visayas region to ensure community well-being, family health, and watershed protection. This program combined its research and activities in various locations with broader watershed protection efforts. The program promoted the use of farming technologies to increase water supply and quality, protect biodiversity, and provide environmentally sound livelihood opportunities. As part of the program, communities provided health services together with natural resource management efforts.

The Integrated Population and Coastal Resource Management (IPOPCORM) Initiative

In 2001, the IPOPCORM initiative was managed by a local, private NGO, PATH Foundation Philippines, Inc. The program encompassed 216 of the country's coastal barangays in 33 municipalities, spanning nine priority marine conservation areas. IPOPCORM's program worked to simultaneously build local capacity for coastal resource management and improve reproductive health outcomes in these areas through expanding family planning services, including the prevention of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. The program incorporated efforts to ensure the sustainability of activities through the engagement of local counterparts and strengthening of the PHE planning capacity of municipal and barangay development councils. Working with the private sector, the IPOPCORM program achieved a ten-fold increase in access to family planning services in the area in which it worked, establishing over 2,061 service points in the program's coastal communities by 2006.¹⁶

Mapping Population-Biodiversity Connections

Through its Mapping Population-Biodiversity Connections in the Philippines project, the international NGO, Conservation International, worked with the Philippines' Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau-Department of Environment and Natural Resources as well as with the National Economic and Development Authority on a comprehensive population-environment mapping project. The project created digitized maps using geographic information systems technology and statistical analysis to identify key demographic and socioeconomic variables. These maps covered 79 provinces and 137 priority conservation areas identified by a government-NGO collaborative effort called the Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Priorities Program. These maps provide enriched information for policymakers that can be used to design more effective strategies to address the interconnected issues facing people and the environment in these high-priority conservation areas.

Philippine NGO Council for Health, Population, and Welfare (PNGOC)

¹⁶ Joan R. Castro, Leona A. D'Agnes, and Carmina A. Aquino, *Mainstreaming Reproductive Health and Integrated Coastal Management in Local Governance: The Philippines Experience* (Manila: PATH Foundation Philippines Inc., 2004): 10 and PFPI November 2006 Interim report to the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

In 2000 PNGOC began a media advocacy campaign with funding from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. The goal of the campaign was to train media practitioners from five regions on reproductive health, gender and development/environmental reporting. PNGOC also worked with media personalities to popularize population and reproductive health concerns and to reach target audiences across different social sectors.

Documentation of Key PHE Approaches

In an effort to start to understand the approaches to PHE integration that these projects were using, World Neighbors convened a workshop in 2001.¹⁷ The workshop noted four key approaches. These were:

- (i) The "simultaneous introduction" approach wherein a project introduces a number of programs dealing with various issues at the same time;
- (ii) The "bridge" approach, in which activities in one sector, for example, health or conservation, support activities in another;
- (iii) The "symbiotic approach" where activities depend on one another and are conducted by the same staff; and
- (iv) The "staggered approach" involves establishing a single-sector program and later incorporating activities from a second sector.

This documentation of PHE approaches was an early attempt by PHE practitioners to systematize and share the results of their work among various NGOs and interested parties. Years later, some project staff would report that the PHE organizational model—e.g., the staggered or bridge approach—is less important than other factors such as local leadership and community acceptance of the PHE concept.¹⁸ Others disagree, indicating that more integrated models lead to greater buy-in from program staff, which leads to greater sustainability and the development of additional projects.¹⁹

1.4 The PHE Advocacy Movement

In 2002, to build on these efforts to define PHE approaches, the Washington-based population NGO, the PRB, collaborated with Save the Children to conduct an intensive training program for 18 PHE specialists and program managers. This was the first concerted attempt to build a PHE community by reaching out to three key constituents: existing PHE practitioners; those who were doing work in separate population, health and environmental sectors and who could better integrate their work using a PHE model; and finally, those working on the policy application, either through direct advocacy (such as the Philippines Legislators' Committee on Population and Development – PLCPD) or through policymaking or allocating resources for policies, such as municipal mayors.

¹⁷ Rainera L. Lucero and Robert Layng, "Understanding Reproductive Health/Natural Resource Management Integration in the Philippines," *World Neighbors* 28, no. 2 (2002)

¹⁸ Pielemeier, John. August 2005. "Review of Population-Health-Environment programs supported by the Packard foundation and USAID" available at <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/events/docs/Pielemeier%20USAID%20Report1.doc>

¹⁹ Personal communication

Initial PHE Training

Overall, the workshop was the seed that gave rise to the community-based PHE network in the Philippines. Participants ended the intensive two-week session convinced of the need to act together to address the following issues: a lack of an operational PHE framework and measurement tools for PHE programming and policymaking; socio-cultural barriers with regard to population/reproductive health issues; a tendency to work only in their areas of technical expertise thereby creating structural barriers, and a shortage of technical knowledge (in P-H-and E issues separately and in how they interact) and in policy communication/advocacy skills.

The workshop thus provided a major impetus to thinking about systematizing PHE programs across the country, and about scaling up PHE activities. Participants developed a plan of action in five general areas: (i) replicate the training received; (ii) incorporate the PHE agenda into existing coalitions; (iii) expand their respective organization's interest and capacity in PHE integration; (iv) include PHE themes in their outreach activities, and (v) work with PRB to document their PHE approaches.

Bringing PHE Advocacy to Program Partners

One key partner from the PRB-SC workshop that helped drive the movement of bringing the results of the community programs to the central government was the Philippines Legislators' Committee on Population and Development (PLCPD). PLCPD is an advocacy NGO whose members are legislators working to improve the quality of life for Filipinos through population and human development legislation.²⁰ After the workshop, PLCPD developed a new five-year plan to advance population advocacy, incorporating PHE messages. The plan included three key components: generate full support of PLCPD members on its legislative agenda, strengthen the policy analysis and research capabilities of PLCPD and its partners, and broaden advocacy efforts at the local level working with community-based projects.

In the initial months following the workshop, participants collaborated on a number of trainings on PHE programming, political mapping, strategic communications, media outreach, and coalition building. Examples include a PHE workshop for key advocates of the People's Legislative Advocacy Network (PLAN). PLAN is the umbrella network of NGOs engaged in policy advocacy in Congress. Similarly, participants conducted a seminar on PHE advocacy and strategic communications for 25 community leaders and staff of the Save the Pasig (Sagip Pasig) Movement working to rehabilitate the Pasig River.²¹

In 2003, just one year after the initial workshop, participants had replicated the training with 150 additional influentials, including journalists, community leaders and vice mayors. Since then various efforts have continued to build the momentum for further information sharing and scaling up. These efforts include a 2004 conference, "Reproductive Health-Natural Resource Management Integration: Communicating Project Results to Policy Makers," which was organized and conducted by World Neighbors and the Bohol Alliance of Non Government Organizations Network. Similarly, in 2005 workshop participants engaged in a number of visioning exercises including a "Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats" (SWOT) study.

²⁰ See <http://www.nonprofitpages.com/plcpd/>

²¹ See <http://www.philsol.nl/org/sagip/brief-99.htm>

Building a National PHE Network

To increase the collective knowledge among project managers working in various sectors in the country, PRB helped form a national PHE coalition. At its inception the coalition was named SIGUE, which in Tagalog means agreement and desire to move forward. Coalition members refine best practices, provide training, and make recommendations to increase integrated population, health, and environment benefits for Filipinos.

In order to advance PHE integration, SIGUE worked to position itself as the formal national advocacy network for PHE issues; to mobilize resources in support of PHE projects/programs at the local and national level; to identify common PHE indicators, to develop systems for monitoring and evaluating PHE initiatives; and to conduct capacity building activities for the PHE community.

In 2005, SIGUE members realized the need to scale up/expand the creation and dissemination of PHE related knowledge. As a result, SIGUE expanded and open up membership and renamed itself as the PHE Network. In 2007, network members adopted a formal organizational structure and operating manual. This structure will better guide the Network's growth and continued efforts to advance the integration of PHE as an innovative approach to promote equity, health and environmental stewardship. Today, the PHE network is composed of an executive committee, a secretariat that carries out the day-to-day functioning of the network, and three standing committees on policy advocacy, information, education and communications (IEC) and research, monitoring and evaluation.²²

1.5 Characteristics of PHE scaling up in the Philippines

The training, strategic thinking and visioning activities collectively carried out and coordinated across the portfolio of PHE projects in the country formed the basis of a scaling up plan, though they were never explicitly stated as such. As a whole, these activities correspond roughly to what Cooley and Kohl (2006) refer to in their "Scaling Up Management" (SUM) framework as the three stages of scaling up: (i) developing a scaling up plan; (ii) establishing the pre-conditions for scaling up; and (iii) implementing the scaling up process. Groups working on PHE integration in the Philippines have done a relatively good job of steps one and two in this schema and are currently embarking on the latter stages of step two, and projecting to move into step three in the future.

Local projects were interested in scaling up PHE operational models, stressing, in particular, the ways in which the PHE approach and technique provided an innovative response to pressing development, reproductive health and environmental issues. Given that these initial pilot projects wished to expand their operations and deliver services on a larger scale, from their inception, they were planning to engage in scaling up activities.

Three main characteristics of this scaling up process were: broad understanding of scaling up (including reaching out to new locations and people in currently served locations), deep and wide programmatic implementation of PHE scaling up (expanding services to currently clients), and finally, moving from program implementation to policy application (extending pilot or demonstration projects to implications for policies).

²² "Draft Operations Manual For The PHE Network 3.6.07"

Broad Understanding of Scaling Up

When the question of scaling up was raised in interviews with Filipino project managers, they expressed an underlying, inherent support and expectation of scaling up – indicating that they believed PHE should inevitably scale up in a broader sense. At the same time they displayed an interesting mix of perceptions and expectations about what scaling up actually meant.

When asked, “How would your organization best define scaling-up?” respondents gave the following answers: “covering a new location,” “covering a new area with high biological significance,” “reaching more people,” “increasing services in current locations, and reaching new categories of clients.” While all of these responses indicate methods of scaling up, it is clear that there was no common working definition of scaling up across the programs. None of the respondents, however, believed that lack of a common definition of scaling up was a constraint to their efforts.

It should be noted that Washington D.C. respondents gave similarly different definitions of scaling up. One respondent noted that in the health sector scaling-up is only an option if the existing programs are successful and when a program is moving from a community-based approach to a larger scale, affecting more people in different regions and countries. Another respondent mentioned that scaling-up involves replicating community-based programs in order to reach more communities, areas, provinces, and regions.

A third definition of scaling up entailed working to expand PHE efforts to reach a “critical mass”- a body of people capable of adopting and sustaining the program on their own. By using this approach, partners like PRB hoped to reach enough key people at the community and national level so that the PHE approach was adopted in the target regions.

Overall, all respondents saw “scaling-up” as having the objective of benefiting more people, but individual responses differ on ways of achieving scaling up. Those in the field tended to respond from the perspective of their specific program, based on the outcomes of each project implemented. Those in Washington D.C. saw scaling up in terms of expansion of services across operational locales, such as across similar ecosystems in various countries, perhaps a reflection of their management role across different regions and countries. Finally, intermediary actors, such as PRB, define scaling up in terms of Rogers’ (2003) diffusion of innovation theory, sharing the successes of early adopters, and getting others to adapt the PHE approach so that the process of adoption develops an internal momentum that is harnessed and sustained by local partners.

Deep and Wide Programmatic Implementation of Scaling Up:

A second characteristic was the deep and wide programmatic implementation of scaling up. In fact, Cooley and Kohl’s (2006) SUM framework recognizes a wide range of types of scaling up activities, defined as *expansion*, *replication* and *collaboration*. They also outline five dimensions of scaling up as explained below, namely geographic, breadth, depth, client type and problem definition.²³

²³ Cooley, Larry and Richard Kohl. “Scaling up – from vision to large scale change: A management framework for Practitioners,” Management Systems International, March 2006. p11

Through *expansion* a model is scaled up by increasing the scope of operations of the organization that originally developed and piloted it. *Replication* involves increasing the use of a particular process, technology or model of service delivery by getting others, including the public sector, to take up and implement the model. *Collaboration* includes formal partnerships and strategic alliances. In the Philippines these three types of scaling up were fairly evident.

The SUM framework also notes that extension of a pilot project's services or benefits can be along any of the following five dimensions:²⁴

1. Geographic coverage (extending to new locations);
2. Breadth of coverage (extending to more people in the currently served categories and localities);
3. Depth of services (extending additional services to current clients);
4. Client type (extending to new categories of clients); and
5. Problem definition (extending current methods to new problems).

While many of those surveyed for this paper primarily recognized scaling up in terms of geographic coverage, it was clear that many of the projects and coalition efforts aspired to the other four dimensions of scaling up. Overall, the projects approached these different dimensions of scaling up through the three categories of *expansion*, *replication* and *collaboration*. The programmatic landscape for scaling up of PHE approaches in the Philippines was, therefore, quite wide and deep across various sectors and scales. Table 1 highlights the approaches and dimensions of scaling up that are being explored among these projects.

Expansion:

In its first four years, from 1999 to 2004, Save the Children's PESCO-Dev project expanded its efforts in family planning and mangrove reforestation. The project worked in its 12 pilot coastal communities to reach new clients. All the health centers in the project sites were initially reluctant to provide information and services to non-traditional clients, such as commercial sex workers and unmarried women/adolescents. After learning of PESCO Dev's work, the health centers decided to provide services to these non-traditional clients. In addition, 66 adolescent peer facilitators were trained to provide counseling, in and out of the health centers. And a pilot theater group was formed, with adolescents who translated key behavioral messages for the project into 10- minute street performances for youth audiences.

PATH Foundation Philippines Inc (PFPI) had similar expansion results with its IPOPCORM project. As the implementing agency, PFPI trained 14 NGO intermediary partners to provide technical, financial and commodities assistance to the project's adopting partners in 33 municipalities. The majority of the NGO partners specialized in community development and/or conservation work and only two had previous family planning experience. All the partners implemented cross-sectoral activities, except in sites where single sector approaches were being applied for comparative purposes. After approximately 12 months of sequential training to build local NGOs' capacity to develop and deliver IPOPCORM's outreach delivery systems and services, PFPI scaled up its PHE approach by transferring know-how to NGO partners who, in turn, enabled 95 Peoples Organizations to implement linked RH and CRM activities.

²⁴ Ibid. p17

Table 1: Emerging PHE Scale up Approaches Being Used in the Philippines

Scale up Model	Projects/Activities	Components to be scaled up	Primary Dimensions
Pilot project – testing solution to a problem	IPOPCORM; PESCODEV	Reproductive health (RH) service delivery; mangrove reforestation; coastal rehabilitation; food security planning; gender mainstreaming	Breadth of coverage; client type
Demonstration project – raising awareness about usefulness of model	IPOPCORM; PESCODEV, CI Mapping project; World Neighbors project; WWF	Mangrove reforestation, RH service delivery; PHE analytical tools; community mobilization techniques for PHE; gender mainstreaming; food security planning; disaster mitigation; poverty alleviation; alternative livelihood strategies	Geographic coverage; breadth of coverage, depth of services
Capacity Building project – creating institutions, skills, physical infrastructure or systems	Trainings and workshops on: working with the media; policy advocacy; political mapping; strategic communications; PHE programming; training of trainers; and participatory processes for demographic analysis.	Operational models, communication skills building, policy advocacy, how to conduct a training	Client type, depth of services (national and local policymakers); expanding adopting organizations
Policy projects – advocacy, research, producing policy change	Study tours; policy roundtables; PLCPD advocacy briefings; advocacy training; policy research projects	Policy engagement at LGU and national levels; collaboration with policy partners outside the Philippines	Client type, problem definition
Service-delivery projects – filling gaps for needed services not being provided by government	IPOPCORM; PESCODEV; World Neighbors; WWF	RH health service delivery; mangrove reforestation; food security planning; alternative economic opportunities	Geographic coverage, breadth of coverage

Replication:

In some instances PHE approaches were replicated by other NGOs. WWF-Philippines, for example, harnessed the technical expertise of SC’s PESCO-Dev project to implement new PHE projects in Roxas, Palawan, in priority areas of the Coral Triangle Ecoregion. WWF contracted SC to provide technical assistance including conducting 15 training sessions on its *family planning in action* model to improve the knowledge, attitude and skills of health service providers on family planning /reproductive health and to promote quality reproductive health care and services in these new WWF project sites, and building WWF capacity for PHE.

Collaboration:

Collaboration via formal partnerships and strategic alliances was considered another effective approach to scaling up. A number of peer partnerships were formed among journalists, project managers and policymakers. In 2005, PRB provided training for mid-career journalists to explore PHE issues. The journalists were trained in the areas of investigative journalism, interpreting and citing PHE data, and overcoming barriers to reporting on PHE issues. As a result of the seminar, participating journalists formed an informal list serv group in which they shared relevant PHE information and stories, helping each other to understand and report on PHE stories.

In 2006, a strategic alliance was formed by stakeholders in Central Visayas to strengthen regional partnership for PHE activities. The network, called the Population, Health, Environment, Education and Livelihood Network, Inc., initiated community PHE activities including a medical and dental mission to promote safe motherhood and child survival. The mission, which aimed to promote population and health issues, helped educate and give free services to the indigent residents of the urban poor community.²⁵

The National PHE Network also sought to expand PHE efforts and apply them to different areas – serving as a mechanism for further scaling up and application of the PHE approach, and extending the current PHE methods to new problems such as disaster mitigation. One such event occurred in August 2006 when a ship sank off Guimaras Island and its cargo of bunker oil contaminated a wide swath, displacing 39,000 residents and damaging 220 kilometers of coastline that included pristine marine reserves.

Coalition members came together to produce a coordinated response to the oil spill. They organized policy and press briefings, provided opportunities for site visits, worked with journalists to produce more than 10 media stories on the social, economic and environmental dimensions of the spill, and provided up-to-date information to policymakers on the situation. This type of outreach to policymakers represents an important characteristic of the scaling up movement in the Philippines.

The Move from Program Implementation to Policy Application of PHE

In addition to a broad understanding of scaling up and a deep programmatic implementation of scaling up, a third characteristic of PHE scaling up in the Philippines is the move from program implementation to policy application.

It is generally recognized that PHE interactions do not operate in a vacuum, and are often influenced by “intervening factors” such as scientific and technological developments, cultural norms and policy decisions that create an enabling environment. Institutional structures, such as local government councils or high-level government committees at the national level that seek to integrate population, health, and environment concerns into development strategies can help further scale up PHE approaches.

- *PESCO-Dev’s Work with LGUs*

For Save the Children, the success of the PESCO-Dev project would be partly determined by the acceptance of the project by the barangay leaders and community residents. In order to secure their commitment, SC conducted workshops with barangay leaders that strengthened their skills in mobilizing community members, development

²⁵ Sunstar Cebu, September 2, 2007. accessed on line at <http://www.sunstar.com.ph/static/ceb/2007/02/09/life/medical.dental.mission.set.for.pasil.indigents.html> on

planning, and project decisionmaking. LGUs deployed their staff to be part of the SC project team that worked closely with the communities. SC also regularly worked directly with municipal leaders so that PHE plans would get budgetary and policy support and would be aligned with the annual municipal development plan.

The result was that the barangay and municipal levels of LGUs held each other accountable, creating mutual and sustained support and commitment. “It was the mayor and key municipal staff and not SC who made sure the barangay local government unit understood the project and supported the partnerships with SC,” said Rene Sobremonte, the municipal planning development coordinator.²⁶

The Philippine-Canadian Development Fund and UNFPA provided support for replicating PHE activities implemented under the SC-LGU partnership. Such initiatives enabled some municipalities to allocate funding to continue operations even as the PESCO-Dev project closed. Two municipalities (Sibunag and Ajuy) decided to adopt SC’s *Couples Family Planning Action* sessions for additional barangays, particularly those not covered by PESCO-Dev.

The IPOPCORM project similarly worked with LGUs. At municipal levels, PFPI worked with its partnering NGOs to link with relevant LGUs for joint implementation of project strategies. The LGU-NGO partners jointly executed Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) that clarified the roles and tasks of each partner—including fiscal responsibility. The LGU-NGO teams advocated for the passage of ordinances to protect critical ecosystems and for the integration of RH and AIDS prevention strategies into integrated coastal management (ICM) agendas at provincial and municipal levels.

At the barangay level, LGU-NGO teams worked with multi-sectoral Barangay Development Councils and local Peoples’ Organizations to facilitate participatory coastal resource assessments and barangay-specific action plans and budgets for ICM and RH activities. The partners also delivered paralegal training, technical assistance for strengthening/establishing marine protected areas, alternative livelihood/enterprise development support (including micro-financing), family planning outreach services, and Information, Education and Communication (IEC) strategies for PHE. The LGU-NGO teams also trained and supervised the work of the social marketing partners that were making non-clinical methods of family planning available to eligible acceptors.

- *IPOPCORM’s Work with LGUs*

From 2001 to 2006, IPOPCORM serviced 216 communities in 33 coastal municipalities spanning eight provinces and 5 regions. LGU-NGO partners facilitated the development and reform of 97 policies and regulations that protected marine ecosystems, regulated fishing in municipal waters and banned the use of compressors in fishing. Eighty-eight new and existing protected areas were using better management systems (compared to 17 in 2001). Six local governments incorporated RH strategies into their municipal environmental/coastal resource management plans.

²⁶ Population Reference Bureau. September 2006 “Building Local Partnerships with Local Government Units: PHE programming in the Municipality of Concepcion” by Norms Chan-Pongan, Save the Children, U.S.-Philippines Country Office. Accessed on line at <http://www.prb.org/pdf06/PHE-BuildingPartnerships.pdf> - a case study in “Strategies for Sustainable Development: Case studies of community-based Population, Health and Environment Projects” p 3

Twenty-seven LGUs executed MOUs with local NGOs supporting community based family planning including community-based distribution. Through the policy reforms, resources valued at US\$882,248 were leveraged from local sources for implementation of IPOPCORM activities. The matching contributions (cash and in-kind) were donated by the communities themselves, Peoples' Organizations, by Provincial, Municipal and barangay Government partners, and by NGO partners and socially responsible corporations.

With technical assistance from PRB, PFPI also supported a PHE symposium for 60 decisionmakers from the province of Siquijor. The objective of the forum was to build consensus for a province-wide scale-up of the IPOPCORM approach. During the symposium, the mayors of Siquijor's six municipalities discussed the findings and results of IPOPCORM surveys and activities in their areas. They also presented the details of MOUs between the municipal governments and their respective partner NGOs for expansion of the approach to other villages within their coastal areas. PFPI presented an estimate of the incremental funds that would be required to finance a province-wide scale-up, which was considered reasonable and doable by most participants. The governor expressed his full support for the proposed scale-up, which paved the way for its eventual incorporation into the Siquijor provincial development plan for the year 2006.

Currently PFPI is working to further scale up this component of its work through an "Alternative Advocacy" approach supported by the Packard Foundation. The objective is to get policymakers at the national level and LGU officials in coastal communities around the Danajon Double Barrier Reef in Bohol to accept PHE approaches to fisheries/coastal management that incorporate population dynamics. If successful, the project will drive the first ecosystem-wide scale up of a PHE approach in the Philippines that could impact the lives of 900,000 people living in the vicinity of the Danajon. Anticipated outcomes include integration of population and reproductive health perspectives into the master plan for improved management of the Danajon's resources, political commitment and action to expand access to family planning information and methods in Danajon communities not yet served by the formal health system, and an informed constituent of decision makers advocating for population and reproductive health perspectives in national plans and agendas for poverty alleviation and fisheries/coastal resource management.

Evidence-based Advocacy

Another strategy for giving policymakers a deeper understanding of PHE interactions is to present the results of scientific research in formats accessible to non-technical audiences. PHE project partners sought to reach out to the central government by working with the Philippines Legislators' Committee on Population and Development (PLCPD). PLCPD has been working with PHE programs to sensitize policymakers and planners on PHE linkages. Together, these groups have been involving new partners, such as municipal governing bodies and community NGOs, to mobilize policymakers' support for policy decisions through regular dialogue at the national and regional levels, research studies on population and sustainable development, and policy papers based on research findings and policy consultations.

These characteristics of scaling up in the Philippines - broad understanding of scaling up, the deep and wide programmatic implementation, and the policy application of PHE approaches - would be supported by a number of pre-existing conditions that made the Philippines favorable to PHE scale up.

SECTION 2

Enabling Conditions for Scaling Up in the Philippines

These actions around scaling up PHE approaches in the Philippines have been supported by four key pre-existing conditions that made the Philippines favorable to PHE scale up. These include decentralization, people power, strong NGO capacity and the visibility of PHE connections.

2.1 Decentralization

The 1991 code that formalized the decentralized system of governance included provisions for popular participation, especially at the LGU level. These provisions call for creating “special bodies” such as a local development council and local health board. The provisions also mandate that at least 25 percent of the members be from NGOs or people’s organizations. The development councils work to identify needs and create a development plan for recommendation to the local executive and Council. As a result, there is a significant opportunity for NGOs to work with communities and LGUs to advocate uses for local development funds.

In this decentralized context of programming and resource allocation, NGOs recognized the importance of working with LGUs, particularly the municipal and barangay councils, in order to sustain reproductive health and family planning interventions. As we have seen with the examples of IPOPCORM and PESCO-Dev, NGOs made a conscious decision to scale up their activities at this level by working to build the institutional capacity of the LGUs to be mainly responsible for continuously improving access and quality of family planning/reproductive health services in the project sites and in several expansion areas designated by the LGUs.

The decentralization code devolved such functions as the delivery of basic services in health care, agriculture, natural resource management, water supply, local infrastructure and social welfare. In order to finance their new functions, the Code also provided a significant resource transfer from the national government to the LGUs. By law the LGUs receive an amount equal to 40 percent of the national tax revenues for the year, 36 months prior to the current year. The far-reaching decentralization Code of 1991, therefore, had two major impacts. First, it greatly increased the scope of authority and responsibility, as well as the available resources, of LGUs. Second, it provided a valid and accessible avenue for managers of community projects to engage local decisionmakers in their programs.

2.2 Momentum of People Power

The NGO and civil society sector is well developed and active in the Philippines and NGOs wield significant influence over the shaping of public opinion and even governmental policy. The Philippines is world renowned for its people power. People power movements have helped overthrow corrupt governments and mobilize Filipinos around social and political issues. As a result, Filipinos demonstrate a high level of connectivity, decentralization, and community organizing. Such communication and networking among Filipinos have facilitated the transmission of ideas around PHE.

Because the PHE approach could be easily tested and experimented on a limited or partial basis, and given a history and social acceptance of community organizing and networking, the PHE approach was introduced on a small scale with limited resources (money, staff), and then scaled up. For instance, a new PHE initiative program called “Project Pampalusog Bata” has been implemented in Manila in order to introduce youth to the concepts on PHE. This program was introduced into the community by 2004 and has been successfully refined as an urban PHE project. Given the deep roots of community organizing, communities were receptive to organizing themselves around PHE issues.

2.3 Strong NGO Capacity

The strong NGO capacity in the Philippines is one of the real reasons why PHE has scaled-up to a large level in the Philippines. Local NGOs in the Philippines have well-established capacity to do advocacy, implement programs, and provide technical assistance to other NGOs. The two NGOs that pioneered PHE – Save the Children and the Path Foundation Philippines Inc. – are both basically local NGOs even though they were the country offices of international NGOs. Their staff is local and was able to see the implementation of PHE through the longer term.

2.4 Visibility of PHE Connections

The PHE linkages on the ground are very clear in the Philippines due to the high population growth rate, unsustainable resource use, and link to poverty and food security. In addition, they get a lot of national attention because of recent natural disasters like the landslides. These linkages will probably only grow in visibility due to increasing environmental vulnerabilities to natural disasters and mounting climate change variabilities.

SECTION 3

Drivers of PHE Scaling Up

These pre-existing conditions provided a context for a number of drivers of PHE scaling up. These included the diffusion of PHE as an innovation, using PHE as a multifaceted advocacy tool, donor interest in PHE/Philippines, the role of intermediary actors, documentation of PHE approaches, creating a buzz around PHE issues, the work of PHE champions; and international recognition of the Philippines as a center of excellence for PHE integration.

3.1 Documentation of PHE Approaches

As Cooley and Kohl (2006) note, any serious effort to scale up a model or pilot project should be preceded by testing, clarifying, refining, and simplifying the model to emphasize those elements essential to success. This is important both for program and policy application. A number of documents and presentations helped to simplify and disseminate the lessons from Philippine PHE programming. These resources provided anecdotal and third-party evaluations of the extent and reasons for the success of the PHE model, including its strengths, weaknesses, and cost effectiveness. At the same time, many of these documents served to extrapolate political and social implications from scientific and technical data and information. As such, they helped to generate a wider understanding of and potential support for policy reforms supportive of PHE linkages. And because individuals move in and out of positions of influence, the project partners ensured a strategic, steady stream of information to ensure that key decision-makers were sufficiently informed of PHE initiatives. Examples of PHE documents and presentations include:

- **PHE policy brief:**

In 2004, a policy brief called *Breaking New Ground in the Philippines: Opportunities to Improve Human and Environmental Well-being*, provided the basis for initial dissemination and documentation of PHE work in the Philippines. The brief was released at the first national PHE conference in November 2004 and was subsequently used for an opening address delivered by the President's Office. Journalists reporting on the conference cited data and information from the brief and PHE advocates used the brief to craft the Antipolo Declaration, a national statement of the importance of PHE for the Philippines' development priorities.

- **PHE datasheet:**

At the second national PHE conference in March 2006, a Philippine PHE datasheet called *Making the Link in the Philippines: Population, Health and Environment*, documented key information about current development issues such as human vulnerability to natural hazards. The datasheet outlined national, regional and provincial trends and data for 15 population, health and environment indicators. The datasheet was released shortly after a devastating landslide killed an estimated 1,800 Filipinos in Guinsaugon on the southern part of Leyte Island in eastern Philippines. In this context, it was widely used by the press for linking data to natural disaster and community planning. Several policymakers from

the National Economic and Development Authority and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources are using the *Breaking New Ground* policy brief and the *Making the Link* datasheet to help create a "PHE cluster" within the president's cabinet. The intent is to form a caucus of decisionmakers who will examine PHE data and links and work toward supporting policies and programs that use a linked approach to address development priorities.

- PHE case studies:

In 2006, a set of five PHE case studies called *Strategies for Sustainable Development: Case Studies of Community-based Population-Health-Environment Projects*, documented how and why PHE programming has been successful in communities across the Philippines and addressed themes such as partnering with local governments, engaging communities in participatory research, and developing advocacy strategies. The case studies were developed as teaching case studies, and are being used to help students and activists learn PHE strategies.

- Presentations and briefings:

A number of presentations and briefings were given by Filipino partners in local, regional and international forums, including the Visayas Fisherfolk Assembly; Philippine Congressional meetings; the Global Health Council annual meetings; the Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development regional meetings; Environmental Change and Security Program (ECSP) symposia at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington D.C.; Women in International Development conferences at the Coastal Resource Center at the University of Rhode Island; and various Coastal Zone Asia Pacific Conferences in Bangkok, the Philippines and Australia.

- Independent assessment:

In 2005, USAID and the Packard Foundation hired an independent team to assess PHE programs in the Philippines and Madagascar.²⁷ The assessment includes descriptions of successful models for action. The assessment found that integrated PHE projects bring several major advantages to family planning and environment/conservation efforts and that PHE projects are typically both cost-efficient and cost-effective. The results were presented in various forums including the Board of Trustees meeting at the Packard Foundation. This assessment helped document credible verification of impact and has been used to publicize and market the PHE model.

- Popular dissemination

Various efforts were made to reach new audiences with information about PHE projects. These included articles in various programs' newsletters such as the University of Michigan's Population and Environment Fellows program, Environmental Change and Security Program, and the University of California at Berkeley's Beahrs Sustainable Environmental Leadership program. The IPOPCORM project also published a number of journal articles highlighting its experience with PHE integration.

²⁷ See Population Reference Bureau – article by John Pielemeier, independent assessment of PHE projects: <http://www.prb.org/Articles/2006/LessonsFromtheFirstGenerationofIntegratedPopulationHealthandEnvironmentProjects.aspx>

A number of efforts were also made to disseminate PHE lessons in the popular press. Articles appeared in *Worldwatch* and the *Sierra Club magazines*. In the mid-2000s, Save the Children published a “coffee table book” called *Walking the Extra Mile* wherein it presented photos and easy-to-read stories about two of its PHE projects. And in 2007, USAID launched an electronic PHE clearing house to highlight PHE initiatives and project partners.²⁸

Community members also shared PHE messages in their own ways. The Barangay Hoskyn Theater Arts Group, in the province of Guimaras, began including messages about relationships between people and their natural resources in their popular plays. Several projects used slogans for T-shirts, health clinics and public celebrations. The PESCO-Dev’s slogan read, “With family planning, your health is ensured, your environment is saved.” Such messages were shared during local celebrations. At a popular annual fluvial parade in 2004, for example, PLCPD and other partners hosted five boats that carried population and environment messages that focused on reproductive health, clean water, clean air, solid waste management, and land use.

- PHE policy manual

Save the Children is currently developing a quick reference handbook to help LGU staff implement and support integrated PHE programs. The handbook covers a wide range of topics including how to generate policy support, estimate resource needs (staff and finances), replicate integrated PHE activities, and build long-term sustainability.

- Operations Research project

Also of note is the fact that the Philippines is the site of an important Operations Research project which will provide rigorous data on the benefits of the PHE approach. This OR project is being undertaken by PFPI.

3.2 Strong Intermediary Actors

Several program staff interviewed for this paper highlighted the importance of third-party intermediary actors, such as PRB, who provided technical expertise, perspectives on PHE programs from different countries, capacity building to people and organizations, and funding. At the same time, others noted that by promoting the PHE approach, intermediary actors helped lay the groundwork and added validation for their work which eased the entry into communities where they have not worked before. Within the National PHE Network a number of organizations fulfill a strong intermediary role. A rotating lead organization of the Network assumes a two-year chairmanship.

3.3 Diffusion of PHE as an Innovation

When surveyed, stakeholders in the Philippines agreed that the PHE approach was highly cost-effective and that it supplied new tools and methods to achieve program goals and objectives. Through their experience these project managers have been convinced of the economic benefits (operating costs) and overall project efficiency (economies of scale in terms of staff time and effort). Efficiency was also measured in terms of pooling

²⁸ See <http://www.ehproject.org/phe/phe.html>

expertise from three different fields, leveraging efforts across programs and merging funds from different funding streams.

Respondents mentioned additional benefits such as finding an innovative way of introducing family planning to communities despite objections from the church; encouraging NGOs and LGUs to address community needs from different viewpoints; working with academia to examine and discuss PHE approaches; and facilitating community involvement in program implementation.

Others who were based in the D.C. headquarters of partner organizations understood these benefits, but were a little skeptical about how innovative the PHE approach was. They accepted that the approach had developed newer aspects that made it more distinctive and valuable than earlier efforts, such as integrated conservation and development programs, but did not perceive PHE to be a programmatic innovation to the degree that local project managers did.

PHE advocates in the Philippines focused on the successes of their pilot programs, emphasized the new elements and benefits of the PHE approach and began to propose the PHE approach to others, seeking to diffuse it as an innovation. Innovative ideas such as these, according to Rogers (2003), can be adopted if the community perceives the innovation as superior to the idea it replaces. Factors that affect the rate of adoption include compatibility with existing religious values and social customs; comprehensive and accessible programming methods; the ability to be easily tested on a small scale; and the possibility of easily observable positive results.²⁹

Overall, the majority of program managers in the Philippines were convinced that the PHE approach was innovative according to such criteria. And the disparity between perceptions from those in the field and those in Washington D.C., didn't necessarily derail adoption or scaling up. It would appear that Rogers statement that "an idea is innovative if it seems new to the target audience whether or not an idea is 'objectively' new as measured by the lapse of time since its first use or discovery" applies in this case.³⁰

Indeed, proposing PHE as an innovative approach was one of the driving factors behind its adoption in communities. Local partners actively worked to encourage the adoption of PHE, adjusting their diffusion strategies to overcome any difficulties in the criteria as outlined by Rogers. In some cases they worked to overcome religious barriers to accepting the PHE approach. In other instances they sought to document the benefits of the approach, and to present the benefits in systematic and simple doable actions. Others worked to convince key actors outside of the Philippines, such as the headquarters of a major NGO, of the benefits of the approach in order to ensure programming and financial support for implementation at the local level.

Some are still working on operations research activities to test hypothesis about cross-sectoral program synergies between reproductive health, natural resource management and food security in coastal areas in order to inform policy development in the Philippines and other archipelago countries.

3.4 The work of PHE Champions

²⁹ Rogers, Everett M. *Diffusion of Innovation* (New York: Free Press, 2003).

³⁰ Ibid

Champions - public figures and newsworthy individuals like Mayor Baniyas who knowledgeably speak about PHE issues – were key to the local and international advocacy. Because they were credible, well-respected, and known for an open-minded, flexible, and innovative approach to problems, audiences listened when they spoke about PHE.

Champions can be categorized in two groups: those who advocate for others in their community and those who support the PHE approach within larger organizations. Several mayors, like Jordan’s Major Nene Nava, helped to spread the benefits of PHE programs throughout their communities.³¹ Similarly, other champions, such as directors of PHE programs at USAID, Conservation International and World Wildlife Fund, promote the PHE approach as a viable method for achieving their organization’s goals.

Champions outside the Philippines were also at times very effective in advancing PHE approaches. Several mayors cited PRB’s PHE work as being important in helping them to understand and accept the PHE approach. In another example, Mayor Camacho in the Philippines committed to incorporating reproductive health interventions into a coastal resource management program once she had participated in a study tour in Thailand and interacted with champions there.

Within the environmental community in the Philippines a number of PHE champions have emerged. These include Dr. Angel Alcala, who is world renowned for his research on MPAs. A number of respected marine biologists affiliated with USAID’s Fisheries Improved for Sustainable Harvest (FISH) project often speak to the importance of addressing population based threats as part of a fisheries management approach in the Philippines.

IPOPCORM’s targeted policy advocacy project over the course of three years also brought important Municipal level champions (mostly Mayors) to Thailand for a PHE training with the Thai Population Development Association. This is a very important component of IPOPCORM’s success at getting municipal level policy change in favor of PHE.

3.5 Using PHE as a Multifaceted Advocacy Tool

Whether in the halls of the Philippine Congress or at the LGU level, within the NGO community or among the public at large, PHE advocacy has taken many forms. In Congress, PLCPD had been in the forefront of PHE advocacy, helping develop legislative proposals on population and human development and tracking progress on Congressional bills. During the 12th Congress (2001-2004), PLCPD disaggregated about 808 population and human development related measures from the 3,814 filled in Congress. PLCPD emphasized 137 of these bills, and linked them to the legislative agenda of the People’s Legislative Advocacy Network (PLAN), one of the key advocacy coalitions in the country.

PHE advocacy is important for reproductive rights activists because the Philippines has no family planning laws, though legislation is pending. The *Responsible Parenting and Population Control Act of 2005* would make it the policy of the State to “guarantee universal access to safe, affordable and quality reproductive health care

³¹ Save the Children, “Waking the Extra Mile”. P54

services,” including family planning. The Act also states that two children will be considered the ideal family size, though it is not compulsory.

Specific provisions of the Act aim to create an environment that supports the use of family planning services. These provisions include: (i) training local health care workers; (ii) providing mandatory sex education in secondary schools; (iii) initiating criminal penalties for health care workers who refuse to provide requested family planning services; (iv) mandating that employers provide free family planning services to employees; and (v) distributing free contraceptives through some government channels. The law is quite controversial and vigorously opposed by the Philippine Catholic Church, and its passage would be ground-breaking in this fervently Catholic country.

In this context, PHE offers a potential for advocacy above any single issue such as reproductive health service delivery. Those advocating solely for reproductive health rights face the wrath and lobbying efforts of the Catholic Church. In aligning reproductive health with PHE, advocates can increase their impact by presenting reproductive health rights among a portfolio of rights issues such as the right to a clean environment and meaningful livelihood opportunities.

For those who seek to advance natural resource management issues, particularly at the community level, the PHE approach offers an entrée into local communities – driven by communities’ requests for reproductive health, public health and livelihood services. The PHE approach is also tied to poverty alleviation, disaster mitigation and food security, allowing activists to develop multipronged approaches and build on grassroots movements, joint advocacy campaigns and relationships of trust.

Given the dynamic nature of the policy process, it was important to work on multiple fronts to have an impact with policymakers. For example, activists would release new information and host events around that release to help generate attention and place PHE issues on the policy agenda. As important as recognizing and understanding the link between population and environment is making this link work from both ends. On the one hand, community initiatives seek to breathe life into the PHE concept. On the other hand, government and NGOs need to be harnessed so that these initiatives can be carried out more efficiently and effectively.

For the local decisionmakers such as LGUs and Barangay Councils, support and advocacy for PHE programming came in several ways. Support was provided through budgetary supplements and manpower complements, especially in implementing area specific projects for health and population (like potable water projects) and legislation through the adoption of ordinances and local environment laws such as those that would define Marine Protected Areas. In some instances, the town governments, through the barangay councils, gave active support to projects – for example, deploying pump boats for use in patrolling the municipal waters and in guarding against illegal fishing activities.

Most recently the IPOPCORM project has been working with Assistant Secretary Dolores Castillo of the National Anti-Poverty Commission (who is one of the "champions" mentored under PATH Foundation Philippines PHE study tour program) and other members of the Commission's technical working group to revise a population-poverty framework to incorporate natural resource perspectives. The new framework is entitled Development of Harmonized Approaches for Population, Poverty Integration and Environment Resources (HAPPI*ER).³²

³² Personal communication

3.6 Donor Interest in PHE in the Philippines

Funding from a variety of philanthropic sources has provided a strong momentum for PHE integration and scaling up in the Philippines – either for the development of new PHE programs or for the introduction of added PHE dimensions to existing programming. The PHE linkage was first supported in the Philippines in the 1980s through funding from UNFPA, particularly to government agencies such as POPCOM.

Since the late 1990s, with funding from the Packard Foundation and USAID, as well as local funders such as the Foundation for the Philippine Environment, projects worked to integrate conservation and family planning in communities within selected areas of high biodiversity. In addition, these funders supported leadership development and increased advocacy for, and awareness of, PHE linkages.

The David and Lucile Packard Foundation

With the stock market crash that started in 2001, the Packard Foundation decided in 2002 to discontinue its PHE Initiative. Despite phasing out, the Foundation recognized the success of its PHE efforts, likening it to “a big splash from a small stone,” noting that “(g)iven that more than 40 percent of Filipinos struggle to simply survive amid extreme poverty, linking population and family planning issues to social and economic development increased the salience and the acceptance of these issues among policy makers.”³³ Recognizing that considerable investments and progress had been made, phase-out grants to some existing projects were made over the next two years, with final grants under the Initiative awarded in 2004, and some extending to 2006.

The U.S. Agency for International Development

Funding also came from the U.S. Government. In 2002, a foreign appropriations allocation from the U.S. Congress directed USAID to include funds for family planning in its foreign assistance to “areas where population growth threatens biodiversity and endangered species.” Despite the generally hostile environment in Washington for almost all things population or environment, this language became law along with the appropriations bill that included it, and it has survived additional funding cycles since.

Overall, the USAID program already has provided an estimated \$9 million to projects linking natural resources management and improved access to reproductive health care in eight biodiversity-rich countries, including the Philippines. The combination of USAID and Packard Foundation funding served as a major drive to PHE programming in the country. In some cases both funders supported the work of some groups such as PFPI and PRB.

USAID also provided support for an early-career population and environment (P-E) fellowship program. From 1993 to 2006, the program was managed by the University of Michigan. P-E fellows worked as technical experts who devoted their efforts to supporting PHE programs. The program would place fellows on two-year

³³ David and Lucile Packard Foundation. Report on its grantmaking in the Philippines 2007 accessed on line at http://www.packard.org/assets/files/population/program%20review/2007%20pop_report_philippines_041707.pdf

assignments with organizations working to link family planning and environmental programming in the developing world. In the mid-1990s to the early 2000s, four PHE fellows worked at Conservation International, Save the Children, and Path Foundation Philippines Inc. In addition, a fellow based at PRB spent approximately half of her two-year fellowship working on PHE integration in the Philippines, and another fellow at WWF-US supported WWF's PHE project in the Philippines. In July 2006, the P-E fellows program was subsumed under USAID's Global Health Fellows Program. Currently, a Global Health fellow who has first-hand knowledge of PHE integration in the Philippines is serving as USAID's technical advisor for PHE.

Moreover, the USAID-Packard Foundation partnership has led to the involvement of the USAID country mission. Since 2005, the Philippine mission has been working to mainstream PHE approaches into its Fisheries Improved for Sustainable Harvest (FISH) project. FISH is working in partnership with the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) and selected LGUs to improve fisheries management and achieve a more sustainable harvest of marine fish stocks in targeted areas. This five-year, \$8.86 million initiative is supporting and developing fisheries management plans that incorporate population and reproductive health perspectives. Through a collaboration between TetraTech EM, PATH Foundation Philippines and other local partners, this integrated fisheries management approach is being applied in selected ecosystems in four target provinces, with the goal of increasing marine fish stocks within five years by at least 10 percent from established baselines in targeted marine ecosystems.

A 2007 mid-term evaluation recognized that the FISH/RH component was innovative and successful in bringing access to family planning/reproductive health to remote, unserved communities and building a local constituency for FISH/CRM interventions. The evaluation team commended the FISH project for working to address long-term factors such as population growth and food security and for building strong support from senior LGU officials.³⁴

Other Donors

In the mid 2000s, other funders, such as the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAid) and the International Development Research Center (IDRC) in Canada, have supported small discrete community-based PHE projects. In 2006 IDRC provided funding for PRB, together with CI-Philippines and other local partners, to conduct a training program for Filipino project managers to develop tools to better understand and manage the effects of a changing human population on the local environment in the areas in which they work. The workshop was held in Tuguegarao City and Baggao, Cagayan. The training program-Building Action for Stability in Communities (BASIC)-combined demographic, health, and environmental management tools to bring added value to planning for increased stability, health, and well-being of communities.

The program focused on a participatory population appraisal process in collecting information about population-environment interactions using a village census, focus group sessions, participatory mapping exercises, and local population projections.

³⁴ USAID Fisheries Improved for Sustainable Harvest (FISH) Final Mid-Term Report, January 2007

Through an intensive workshop and follow-up activities, the program is strengthening the capacity of project managers, government planners, and communities to collect information about demographic and environmental change and use that information to plan sustainable population growth and natural resource management. Through this activity, participants are implementing plans to address some of the root causes of instability including poverty, community health issues, environmental degradation, and population pressure.³⁵

3.7 Creating a Buzz Around PHE Connections

PHE connections are increasingly visible in the Philippines. “Attention-generating” events, such as national symposia, seminars, and press conferences that follow the release of new study findings helped focus public and high-level policy attention on PHE linkages. Other events with PHE dimensions, such as the Guinsaugon landslide or the Guimaras Island oil spill, were covered by the local and international media. Such coverage encouraged the general public and policymakers to think about PHE links. Some examples of this increased PHE visibility include:

- PHE conference in 2004 and a national PHE declaration:

In 2004, PRB and SC worked with local partners to organize and host the first ever national conference on PHE. The conference attracted some 150 participants and culminated in a national PHE declaration, the *Antipolo PHE Declaration*. The declaration is a statement of support for leaders at all levels of government and civil society to recognize the linkages of population, health and environmental issues in the Philippines. The declaration was shared throughout various regions in the Philippines, and was signed and endorsed by more than 80,000 Filipinos in 17 regions.

- National PHE conference in 2006 and national PHE advocacy plan:

In 2006, PRB and PLCPD led a local team that hosted the second national PHE conference called “Population, Health, and Environment: Creating Our Future.” The conference included a site visit, information sharing, action planning, skills building, and networking opportunities. It was held in Cebu City, attracted 350 international and national attendees, and put forward the *Cebu PHE Accord*. The Accord provides a framework for reporting on regional action plans developed during the conference. Using the Accord as a planning framework, a series of regional working groups have formed to implement integrated PHE projects and policies in key target regions.

- Media coverage of PHE issues:

From 2004 - 2006, more than 200 print, radio and television media stories were filed throughout the country. This media coverage reflected a growing interest in covering this issue, and additional outreach by PHE programs to create media angles and newsworthy PHE stories. Many of the stories covered a specific episode or a particular event, such as coverage of the release of a PHE publication, the national conferences, or site visits.

³⁵ See John S. Williams and Roger-Mark De Souza, “Community Action Addresses Population Impacts on the Environment” at <http://www.prb.org/Articles/2007/CommunityActionAddressesPopulationImpactsEnvironment.aspx>

News outlets carrying PHE stories include the Philippine Daily Inquirer, Manila Bulletin, The Examiner, Inquirer News Service, Sunstar Cebu, Panay News, and MindaNews.

- Prestigious awards recognized PHE efforts:

Efforts to raise awareness of PHE issues have been recognized nationally. In 2006, PHE programs in Concepcion, a poor coastal municipality, were selected for the national Gawad Galing Pook award from 160 applicants. The award recognizes innovation and excellence in local governance. Concepcion also received the prestigious Rafael M. Salas Population and Development Award. The Salas award recognized the PHE as a groundbreaking approach in local governance. These organizations that give these awards also help replicate grantees' best practices.

Galing Pook sponsors a forum for LGU winners to share their experiences with international counterparts; a technology exchange workshop where LGUs, civil society organizations and governance experts analyze award-winning programs against their own situation; a community-based replication program for LGUs; and several country-wide conferences and media events to showcase exemplary municipal governance practices.³⁶

Community leaders have received similar recognition. Susan Dignadice was an environmental midwife managing several barangay health centers under SC's PESCO-Dev project. She distinguished herself as an environmental midwife because she always linked her family planning work to environmental conservation. In 2003, the Philippines Integrated Midwives Association and Johnson and Johnson gave Susan a national award for being one of the country's most outstanding midwives. She also received the Daggal ng Bayan Award from the Civil Service Commission for exemplary public service.

Other leaders in the Philippines have also helped to share this message. One of the most active and popular mayors is Dr. Raul Baniyas, Mayor of the town of Concepcion. He was elected as the most outstanding Municipal Mayor of the Philippines in 2001. Mayor Baniyas stresses to his constituents the importance of linking population and the environment. When asked why this is important he says, "We grow by three babies a day; the town of Concepcion has a population growth rate of 2.8% (which is) higher than the national average of 2.4% and (the province of) Iloilo's 2.1%. It stretches our resources, it stretches our services and if you factor the vulnerability of the ecosystem, especially in the islands, that will be a very big social problem if we do not address it now."

3.8 International Recognition of the Philippines as a Center of Excellence for PHE Integration

Because of a good track record of PHE programming, the Philippines has been recognized as a center of excellence for training and documentation on integrated approaches. PHE activists in the Philippines have been expanding the PHE network beyond the Philippines and tapping into international mentors who could help replicate PHE integration elsewhere. The following activities have been helping to build international recognition of integrated work in the Philippines:

- Internationalization of the second national conference: Conference organizers made a deliberate attempt to solicit participation from international partners in the second

³⁶ <http://www.galingpook.org/practices.htm>

national PHE conference in March 2006. Several conference participants came from Tanzania, Madagascar, Kenya, Uganda, the United States, Mongolia, India, the Caribbean, Australia, and Thailand. This international participation provided a unique opportunity for practitioners from all over the world to learn from projects in the Philippines and to share their experiences from their respective countries.

- U.S. activists' study tour to the Philippines: During the 2nd National Conference on PHE, 14 U.S. activists from the Izaak Walton League, Sierra Club, National Wildlife Federation, Audubon, and one member of the Asia Pacific Alliance for Reproductive Health attended the conference and visited several PHE projects in the Philippines. Since then these activists have been sharing their experiences from the Philippines, have written several media articles about PHE issues in the Philippines, and are working to integrate lessons learned into their home programs. As a follow up, Australian members from the Asia Pacific Alliance have expressed an interest in having a PHE activist talk to Australian parliamentarians about PHE activities in the Philippines.
- University of California summer leadership program: In 2006, 38 mid-career development specialists from 26 countries participated in the University of California Beahrs Summer Certificate Course in Sustainable Environmental Leadership at Berkeley. Four of the participants were PHE project managers from the Philippines.
- International workshops in the Philippines: Recently several international workshops around PHE issues have been held in the Philippines. In 2004, Conservation International sponsored a six-day Strategy Development and Gender Integration Workshop.³⁷ The workshop brought together population and environment staff from four country programs: Madagascar, Philippines, Mexico and Cambodia to share lessons learned in integrated program implementation and monitoring, demonstrating success stories in the field and fostering cross team collaboration and capacity building. Similarly, in 2006 PRB and the *MEASURE Evaluation* project at the University of North Carolina hosted a workshop on PHE monitoring and evaluation and strategic communications for all USAID PHE grantees.

³⁷ Summary Report on Gender Training for Conservation International Population and Environment Program Strategic Planning and Gender Workshop Tuguegarao, Philippines June 15-20, 2004 accessed on line at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADA445.pdf

SECTION 4

Constraints to Scaling Up and Development of PHE Programming

Attaining measurable and sustained outcomes in behavioral, environmental and policy change are large-scale commitments. Despite the successes of PHE programming, several obstacles exist to further scaling up and refinement of PHE programming in the Philippines. These include monitoring and evaluation challenges, gaps in technical knowledge, absence of user friendly tools, difficulties in sustaining momentum and challenges of coordinating impact at different scales.

4.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Challenges

Stakeholders working at the programmatic level are still developing concrete indicators to prove to other NGOs and funders that the PHE approach is effective. Several respondents stressed the need for concrete data to continue to sell the approach to policy makers and to people who make decisions about where the money goes. Overall, there is a sense of “the need for better data and better messages that can convince people.”

At the policy level, it was also important to measure the outcomes of efforts to engage policymakers. Projects need evidence that PHE issues have gained the attention of policy makers, have enhanced coalition efforts to increase the saliency of the issues, and that the information disseminated was used by policy audiences. Ultimately, there is a pressing requirement for evidence of impact—changes in policies (national, sector, or program level), programs, strategies, or resource allocation—resulting from analysis and communication.

A variety of tools such as questionnaires and structured interviews can be used to determine outcomes and potential impact. Real change, however, is hard to verify through testimonials alone. Also, because many projects don’t have the resources to interview all audiences in person, they often rely on relatively low-cost tools such as community questionnaires and post-workshop questionnaires for recipients of information and training participants. The responses, however brief, help document how communities view PHE linkages, how PHE information is received and used, and what possible behavioral, programmatic and policy changes result from that use.

Because of short funding cycles and limited budgets project evaluations often focus on assessing near-term satisfaction levels (intermediate results) with the training, knowledge and tools provided. For example, SIGUE coalition members noted that advocacy training improved their ability to communicate issues to policymakers, and helped them to better understand how a bill becomes a law. One participant noted, “The actual face to face interaction/advocacy with the policymakers [was the most useful activity/session]. It made us apply the skills and the right attitude that we’ve learned during the first day of the training.”³⁸ Such responses have been useful for gathering anecdotal evidence on the effects of such activities. But they are clearly not enough to measure impact.

³⁸ PRB internal project evaluation

Even though programs will track the impacts of interventions within communities and the use of advocacy skills, more in-depth investigation of programmatic impacts and of policy reforms requires more time-consuming (and therefore costly) evaluation tools. These might include independent operations research and analysis and in-depth interviews with key informants—selected policymakers, opinion leaders, and technical experts—involved in a particular policy issue. Ideally, standardized interviews would be conducted before and after an intervention, establishing a baseline of knowledge and attitudes toward an issue using a defined set of indicators, and following up to determine if programmatic interventions were effective, whether knowledge and attitudes changed, and whether a particular policy action resulted from the change in beliefs.

4.2 Gaps in Technical Knowledge

Stakeholders recognized that the complexity of project strategies and activities can make them difficult to sustain by local governments after the project ends. Even if the organizations are in place, however, there is often a gap in knowledge and skill at the ground level as conservation leaders may not be conversant in population health issues and vice versa. If informed leaders are not present it may be difficult to point out and explain the linkages between these different sectors and convey the importance of simultaneously working in more than one area. These gaps in technical knowledge can slow down rates at which others adopt PHE programs.

4.3 Absence of User-friendly Tools

The 2005 USAID and Packard independent assessment of PHE programs noted that most of the elements needed for broader PHE program replication and advocacy are in place in the Philippines: training materials have been developed, training methods have been tested and proven, local trainers have been trained, and a variety of project models have been tried and evaluated. These knowledge and tools exist, but not in ways that are easily usable by others. There is still a very strong need to build documentation of context-specific experiences through systematic analysis and presentation of these approaches. In addition, that information must be presented in appropriate formats, such as case studies, that others can use and share.

4.4 Difficulties in Sustaining Momentum

One of the biggest constraints to scaling-up that PHE confronts is lack of funding. Several foundations are reducing funding for PHE projects/programs and are supporting single-sector programs instead. Aside from the need for scientific and provable data of PHE effectiveness, integrated programs such as PHE often do not fall under organizations' high priorities, as "donors often have other priorities for more urgent needs such as HIV/AIDS." As one respondent noted, "Trustful, relevant, and provable information is crucial in order to place PHE projects/programs under donor organizations' priorities."

Sustaining the momentum on any particular policy issue requires keeping stakeholders engaged and informed over time. Policy decisions are rarely one-shot deals; ensuring implementation or expansion of any policy or program decision requires continuous effort. This means continued input from and cooperation among a

(potentially) large number of actors; distilling and disseminating the latest research findings and program experiences; meetings; outreach; media work – and developing the skills of local organizations to keep up these efforts. When there are few resources available locally to support ongoing policy and advocacy work, some external investment may continue to be necessary. Yet it may be harder to “sell” advocacy work to donors than on-the-ground program activities, however essential advocacy is to the change process.

One of the barriers to the momentum of PHE scale up and sustainability is change in administration every election, which is every three years in the country. This posed a challenge to start new advocacy all over again.

4.5 Challenges of Impact Scales

PHE interactions operate at different scales. Individual and community-level behaviors can have national impacts; correspondingly, a change such as global warming affects communities and individuals. At the local and national levels, policies and actions also play a key role in how population, health, and environmental issues are managed because this is the level at which many of the institutional, economic, and political mechanisms operate.

The intensity and effects of PHE interactions are also greatly affected by time. Some of those surveyed mentioned that introducing a local program and evaluating the results may take extensive time and investments, so in order to get a “measurable outcome, project duration must involve at least 3-5 years of implementation.” Donors are discouraged by the long timeframe needed for seeing the impacts of family planning on population and environment conditions.

In some cases, the evidence of change often cannot be discerned for years or decades. Global climate change may affect health, for example, through complex disturbances of natural systems over several decades. Toxic environmental pollutants in a local area might produce more immediate health effects. Generally, epidemiologists find it harder to quantify the adverse health effects of global environmental changes. Researchers have found it difficult to reconcile varying time and spatial scales within the same study or to analyze studies conducted at different scales.

Leadership and funding in terms of impact are both key in the sustainability of PHE. The IPOPCORM staff found that they had to provide capacity to the technical staff of the LGUs (health or other line agencies) once the project was completely turned over to them. This was needed to help them to roll out the project to the whole municipality; thus the integrated population and natural resource management initiative evolved from just IPOPCORM to a program that will benefit the whole a larger population, and not only coastal communities.³⁹

A lack of unanimity in the scaling-up definition can also pose challenges to scaling-up PHE projects/programs/approaches, even though none of the respondents’ perceptions can ultimately be considered wrong. Those who work in the field have specific focuses on the scaling-up process according to the needs of the community they work with. However, stakeholders in Washington, D.C. believed that the absence of a coherent definition limits the ability to generate financial support for community-based

³⁹ Personal communication

programs. International organizations want to support programs that will reach a significant number of people. Thus, it is important for people on all sides of this process—those working in the field, international stakeholders, and those in government and larger organizations—to understand that although the individual focuses of each particular program may seem to vary, they all have the same ultimate objective in mind: expanding the benefits of PHE for environmental and human well-being.

SECTION 5

Future directions

Despite challenges, the PHE approach continues to be valued and valuable in the Philippines context. Of the Filipino project managers surveyed, 92 percent of respondents noted that PHE integration is embraced by communities, helps policymakers and communities address issues that would be controversial on their own, promotes partnerships, and is cost-efficient.

Regardless of the specific needs of each community, there are several key elements that facilitate the scaling-up process. Those surveyed indicated the need for an easily replicated model of a PHE program; concrete scientific data to support the link; and governmental awareness, involvement, and support of the PHE approach. At the ground level, it is also important to ensure quality training for project managers, good leadership, and good communications between and within implementing partners. Additionally, those at the field level also mentioned the need for community acceptance, local capacity, sustainability, and stronger national policies related to PHE issues. A number of key lessons were learned by these projects they include the need for varied stakeholder involvement, technical capacity, need for third party intermediaries, and deconstructing knowledge.

5.1. Involve a Variety of Stakeholders

Getting continuing stakeholder involvement and leadership is key: PHE integration requires input and cooperation from a large number of stakeholders and agencies. There are many levels of government and various departments with separate areas of responsibility. The NGO partners also bring a range of skills and experiences that are necessary to realize the goals under the project. The national PHE network has been helping to promote this involvement at various levels and to get the stakeholders to assume responsibility for identifying and setting the direction for the network.

5.2 Build Technical Capacity

There is a continuing need to develop the technical capacity of PHE program managers. In order to ensure effective input and cooperation, project partners need to continue to develop their technical skills for project implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Scaling up will require these managers to share these skills with targeted implementing partners through a variety of means such as technical workshops, focus groups and open discussions.

5.3 Work with Third Party Intermediaries

There is currently no set of approved well-defined policies on the integrated PHE approach or a clear working definition of scaling up for PHE projects. In the absence of such a framework, PHE advocates need to work with third party intermediaries inside and outside of the Philippines who can serve as advocates and advisors. Intermediaries such as PRB can help bring communities of practice together and serve as a convener of

information on PHE issues, at times working with experts outside of the Philippines to bring results of latest research and project implementation to the partners.

Reaching out to these intermediaries can also help expand the PHE network beyond the Philippines, tapping into international mentors who could help Filipinos refine their approaches and could help advocate for the Philippines in their home countries. In addition, such intermediaries could help establish demonstration sites and centers of learning for Filipino nationals and international visitors putting a face to advocacy efforts.

5.4 Develop Knowledge Managers

It is imperative that PHE experts deconstruct their knowledge in ways that others can benefit from their experiences. From their vantage points on the “front lines,” PHE project managers can be superb resources in providing insights and lessons learned from their direct experience in designing, implementing, and evaluating PHE projects. However, project managers may not have the time to reflect on the broader implications of their work, and may have difficulty extracting the lessons learned from their experience in a way that can be effectively shared with other project managers and development professionals. Most project managers are accustomed to reporting results to funders, and the more results they can report, the better. Knowledge managers need to learn how to highlight key components of the broad and deep experience developed in their projects in a way that provides others with a comprehensive and nuanced understanding, not of the results of the project, but of the backstory – what happened before the results were achieved.

Conclusion

The population, health, and environment approach is not a relatively new idea as it has evolved from previous integrated programs. However, as a strategy for development programming it involves more sophisticated methods of addressing environmental and population issues and helps create a synergy that will bring better results than single-sector interventions.

Significant momentum around PHE has been generated in the Philippines. The work of local and international NGOs, champions, journalists, and policymakers is proving to be extremely fruitful. The PHE approach seems to have a high relative advantage compared with a single-sector approach; it effectively addresses target community’s priorities and problems in a more holistic way; is easily implemented with limited resources; and has observable results. Based on early successes, stakeholders in the Philippines are enthusiastic about the idea of scaling-up these successful steps and lessons learned.

This paper outlines the two types of scale up that occurred in the Philippines. First is the traditional definition of scale up – that is reaching a broader number of people with services. This can be done several ways (through replication, expansion and collaboration) and at several scales (population based scale or geographic scale). The service delivery components of Pesco-Dev and IPOPCORM are examples of how this occurred in the Philippines.

A second type is the policy advocacy scale up- this describes PRB’s work to promote PHE policy advocacy to higher levels, develop the National PHE Network for shared

policy advocacy, training opportunities and sharing of success. An important component of this was also the local level policy-advocacy that Pesco-Dev and IPOPCORM implemented at the LGU level.

Even though the Philippines provides a good opportunity to scale-up PHE projects, there is a long path ahead. Some constraints that hinder PHE programs from being scaled-up include insufficient funding due to the lack of effective and proven models that can be taken and replicated easily; need for clarity on the definition of scaling-up; and lack of solid scientifically based evidence to prove to government and other organizations that the PHE approach is a viable method of achieving development goals.

Local efforts need to continue working to build local expertise to contribute to policy decisions, support expert partnership, and increase understanding of PHE linkages. In addition, PHE advocates should develop concrete indicators to prove to other NGOs and funders that the PHE concept is a good approach to achieve development goals.

What is needed are model-driven, programmatic and policy activities that include a detailed, prospective evaluation to support the development of program and policy change benchmarks. Future evaluation efforts would ideally start with a detailed assessment of the program and policy environment and data available to illuminate problems and solutions, then move into the design and implementation of activities based on the PHE approach.

Continuous assessment would help determine which efforts at policy change can be used as a predictive tool to guide the development and evaluation interventions. The development of indicators and benchmarks could help future interventions identify both where to start and how to gauge their accomplishments. In the real world, many confounding factors in the political environment might trump best efforts at promoting change, but a careful documentation of that environment would nevertheless be valuable and instructive for future efforts.

The strengthening of the national PHE network would enable it to position itself as the formal national advocacy network and scaling up mechanism for PHE integration. The network has a key role to play: providing training, technical assistance and documentation to local advocates; and rapidly responding to emerging national issues.

Population, health, and the environment issues in the Philippines are intricately interconnected and complex. Collaborative efforts that address the complexity of these interconnections can improve Filipinos' health, environment, economy, and future. As the largest generation of Filipinos in history comes of age in the next several years, renewed efforts will be necessary to meet citizens' needs and to achieve development goals. The challenge lies in ensuring that all Filipinos will be able to count on health and well-being for their families, their communities, and the natural resources upon which they depend.

Annex

THE ANTIPOLO DECLARATION on Population, Health & Environment (PHE) Antipolo City, November 10, 2004

“The earth’s natural resources and systems and its human population are inherently connected. People rely on food, water and air for life. Earth provides energy and raw materials for human activity and those activities in turn affect the resources and ecosystem.”

PREMISED on the fundamental relationship of social-economic and environmental crisis that threaten the health and well being of the Filipinos and the protection and sustenance of its natural resources; integration of population, health and environment should be brought into the consciousness of everyone.

Gradual and persistent loss of natural life support systems like forest, fresh and marine waters, food-sustaining lands, diverse flora and fauna, minerals, mineral oils, sources of potential energy, food insecurity, high nutritional deficiency among Filipino children, women and gender issues, high maternal and infant mortality rate, and the run-away population growth rate of 2.36 percent per year amid mass poverty that affects 80% of the population are all inter-related.

COGNIZANT of this inter-relatedness, we, the participants to the First National Conference on Population, Health and Environment composed of development professionals, local government executives, policy makers, health and conservation workers, members of the academe, social scientists, indigenous people and religious sector representatives, artists, business, national and international development agencies – practitioners and advocates of PHE , do hereby declare that:

WE BELIEVE in the basic right of every Filipino to a clean, balanced and secured environment; to a healthy and sound body and freedom from poverty.

WE BELIEVE that as caretakers of natural resources for future generations, harmonizing people and the environment is the key to sustainability. That, accountability demands, in meeting today's needs, the ability of future generations to meet their own needs should not be compromised.

WE ADHERE to the goals and objectives of International Covenants where the Philippines is a signatory to: the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, the Program of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Rio de Janeiro Declaration on Sustainable Development.

WE BELIEVE that our problems are linked and so should our solutions be; that the integrated and comprehensive approaches that acknowledge and address the complexities but vital linkages between and among population, health and environment effectively respond to the citizens' aspirations for a better quality of life and sustainable human development; that equity and equitability concerns can be addressed through PHE.

AS PHE PRACTITIONERS, we know this can be done as evidenced by field experiences and community recognition that a synergized approach to population management, health development and environmental security bring greater results than when these are addressed separately.

AS PHE ADVOCATES, WE COMMIT to support and continue to initiate integrated PHE programs in our own organizations and communities, sustain PHE advocacy and help build people's capacities for them to effectively participate in policy formulation and decision-making as well as in program planning and implementation at all levels of democratic governance.

TODAY, WE URGE THE PRESIDENT AND THE GOVERNMENT TO MAKE THE PHE LINK! PHE integration is a key to upholding the Philippine Government's commitment to the abovementioned International covenants and attains a just, humane, sustainable and equitable development for all.

TODAY, WE URGE CONGRESS TO MAKE THE PHE LINK! Legislate national policies that unify population management, health development and environmental protection and security. Link and bridge the gaps on existing policies on population and development, reproductive health and family planning, land use plan, sustainable forest management and other PHE related policies.

TODAY, WE URGE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND THEIR INSTRUMENTALITIES TO MAKE THE PHE LINK! Implement existing policies such as the National Integrated Protected Area System Act, Clean Air Act, Solid Waste Management Act, Clean Water Act and the Indigenous Peoples Rights Acts and align to health and population measures.

TODAY, WE URGE LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS TO MAKE THE PHE LINK! Integrate and implement population, health and environment projects down to the barangay levels.

TODAY, WE URGE FAITH-BASED GROUPS, NON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS AND PEOPLE'S ORGANIZATIONS TO MAKE THE PHE LINK! Join the broad-based movement for the promotion and advancement of PHE in the Philippines.

TODAY, WE URGE THE NATIONAL & INTERNATIONAL DONOR AGENCIES AND THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY TO MAKE THE PHE LINK! Support PHE programs. Allocate resources for policies and programs that encourage PHE integration and cross- sectoral collaboration.

FINALLY, WE URGE EVERYONE TO MAKE THE PHE LINK TODAY. This we owe to the next generation and the generations after them.

We affirm our commitment to this Declaration by affixing our signatures this 10th day of November 2004 in Antipolo City, Philippines.

Bibliography

Abrahamson, Eric and Lori Rosenkpf, "Social Network Effects on the Extent of Innovation Diffusion: A Computer Simulation," *Organization Science* 8, no. 3 (May-June 1997): 289-309.

Adelman, Howard S. and Linda Taylor, "On Sustainability of Project Innovations as Systemic Change," *Journal of Education and Psychological Consultation* 14 (2003):1-25.

Ashford, Lori S., Rhonda R. Smith, Roger-Mark De Souza, Fariyal F. Fikree and Nancy V. Yinger. "Creating Windows of Opportunity for Policy Change: Incorporating Evidence into Decentralized Planning in Kenya." Geneva, Switzerland: Bulletin of the World Health Organization 84 (8). August 2006.

Castro, Joan Regina; Leona Ann D'Agnes, and Carmina Angel Aquino. *Mainstreaming reproductive health and integrated coastal management in local governance: The Philippines experience*. Prepared for the Coastal Zone Asia-Pacific (CZAP) conference: Cebu Philippines, 2004

Castro, Joan R., Leona A. D'Agnes, and Carmina A. Aquino, *Mainstreaming Reproductive Health and Integrated Coastal Management in Local Governance: The Philippines Experience (Manila: PATH Foundation Philippines Inc., 2004): 10.*

Cooley, Larry and Richard Kohl. "Scaling up – from vision to large scale change: A management framework for Practitioners," Management Systems International, March 2006

Conservation International. Summary Report on Gender Training for Conservation International Population and Environment Program Strategic Planning and Gender Workshop Tuguegarao, Philippines June 15-20, 2004 accessed on line at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADA445.pdf

Chan-Pongan, Norma. (Save the Children, U.S.-Philippines Country Office) "Building Local Partnerships with Local Government Units: PHE programming in the Municipality of Concepcion" Population Reference Bureau. September 2006. Accessed on line at <http://www.prb.org/pdf06/PHE-BuildingPartnerships.pdf> - a case study in "Strategies for Sustainable Development: Case studies of community-based Population, Health and Environment Projects"

Courtney, Catherine A. et al., *Coastal Resource Management for Food Security* (Cebu City: Coastal Resource Management Project Philippines, 1998): 4.

Dearing, James W. et al., "Portraying the New: Communication Between University Innovators and Potential Users," *Science Communication* 16, no. 1 (September 1994): 11-42.

De Souza, Roger-Mark, "An Agenda for Population, Health, and Environment," *Environmental Change and Security Project Report* 10 (2004): 30-35.

De Souza, Roger-Mark, "Harmonizing Population and Coastal Resources in the Philippines," *Worldwatch* 17, no. 5 (Sept/Oct 2004): 38-40.

De Souza, Roger-Mark. *Second Annual Conference on PHE Develops Concrete Strategies for Sustainable Development*. Population Reference Bureau.

Engelman, Robert, *Plan and Conserve* (Population Action International, 1998).

Gillespie, Stuart, "Scaling up Community-Driven Development: A Synthesis of Experience," *International Food Policy Research Institute*, FCND Discussion Paper no. 181.

Greenberg, Michael R., "The Diffusion of Public Health Innovations," *American Journal of Public Health* 96, no. 2 (Feb. 2006): 209-210.

Hernandez, Enrique PATH Foundation Philippines Inc. *From Roadblock to Champion: PHE Advocacy and Local Government Executives*. Case Study.

Hernandez, Enrique, Leona D'Agnes, Joan Castro and Carmina Aquino, PATH Foundation Philippines, Inc. (PFPI) "Policy Reforms in Local Governance: The Integrated Population and Coastal Resource Management Initiative (IPOPCORM) Experience" accessed on line at http://www.pfpi.org/PDF/14_Policy%20Reforms%20in%20Local%20Governance.pdf
Howell, Janes M. and Chris A. Higgins, "Champions of Change," *Business Quarterly* 54 (Spring 90): 31.

Joaquin-Yasay, Cecile and Eric R. Jensen, "Population, Development And Environment In The Philippines: An Introduction To This Issue" Number 42, Volume XXIII, No. 2, Second Semester 1996 *Journal of Philippine Development* accessed on line at <http://dirp3.pids.gov.ph/ris/pjd/pidsjpd96-2population.pdf>

Lin, Nan and Ralph Hingson, "Diffusion of Family Planning Innovations: Theoretical and Practical Issues," *Studies in Family Planning* 5, no. 6 (Jun., 1974): 89-194.

Lucero, Rainera L. and Robert Layng, "Understanding Reproductive Health/Natural Resource Management Integration in the Philippines," *World Neighbors* 28, no. 2 (2002)

Luna, Cesar Z. et al., "Sustaining Philippine Marine Fisheries: Key Management Issues and Opportunities," in *Overseas: The Online Magazine for Sustainable Seas*, 7, no. 2 (February 2004).

Melana, D.M. et al., *Mangrove Management Handbook* (Manila: Coastal Resource Management Project of the Department of Natural Resources, 2000).

Mogelgaard, Katie. *Breaking New Ground in the Philippines: Opportunities to Improve Human and Environmental Well-being*. Population Reference Bureau. Policy brief.

National Statistical Coordination Board, preliminary labor and employment statistics for April 2004, accessed online at http://www.nscb.gov.ph/secstat/d_labor.asp, on July 28, 2004.

National Statistical Coordination Board, “Fact Sheet: 4.3 Million Filipino Families are Living Below the Poverty Line” (FS-200310-SS1-01, posted October 2, 2003), accessed online at http://www.nscb.gov.ph/factsheet/pdf03/fs3_07.asp, on July 28, 2004.

Packard Foundation, David and Lucile. Report on its grantmaking in the Philippines 2007 accessed on line at http://www.packard.org/assets/files/population/program%20review/2007%20pop_report_philippines_041707.pdf

Philippine Legislators’ Committee on Population and Development Foundation, Inc., *A Legislative Agenda in Pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs): Policy Proposals for the 13th Congress* (Quezon City: PLCPD, 2004).

Population Commission *PPMP Directional Plan 2001-2004*, pp 65-75 accessed on line at <http://www.popcom.gov.ph/pdf/PPMPDirectionalPlan.pdf>

Porter, Robert W., *Knowledge Utilization and the Process of policy Formation*

Ramirez, Ricardo and Wendy Quarry “A medium for innovation in Natural Resource Management,” *Communication for Development* (2004)

Rogers, Everett M. *Diffusion of Innovation* (New York: Free Press, 2003).

Save the Children. People and Environment Co-Existence Development (PESCO Dev.) Project Year 3 Report October 2001 to December 2002. p12.

Successful Communities from Ridge to Reef in the Philippines
http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/global_health/pop/news/philippines_reef.html

Sunstar Cebu, September 2, 2007. accessed on line at http://www.sunstar.com.ph/static/ceb/2007/02/09/life/medical.dental.mission.set.for.pasil_indigents.html on August 22, 2007

USAID Fisheries Improved for Sustainable Harvest (FISH) Final Mid-Term Report, January 2007

Walt, Gill, “How far does Research influence policy?,” *European Journal of Public Health* 4 (1994): 233-235.

Weinmann, Gabriel, *The Influentials: People Who Influence People* (State University of New York Press, 1994).

Wenger, Etienne, "Communities of Practice: The Social Fabric of a Learning Organization," *The Healthcare Forum Journal* 39, no. 4 (Jul/Aug 1996): 20-26.

Wenger, Etienne et al., *Cultivating Communities of Practice* (Harvard Business School Press, 2002).

Wenger, Etienne, "Knowledge Management as a Doughnut: Shaping your Knowledge Strategy through Communities of Practice," *Ivey Business Journal* (Jan/Feb 2004).

World Bank, *Philippines Environment Monitor 2000* (Manila: World Bank Group, 2000): 30.

World Wildlife Fund (WWF) - Successful Communities from Ridge to Reef
<http://www.ehproject.org/phe/wwf-philippinesfinal.html>