

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Conservation International-Philippines

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Defining and Monitoring Conservation Outcomes for the Philippines

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** Haribon Foundation and Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** July 1, 2004 - April 30, 2006 (3 months extension approved, with final project end date extended to July 30, 2006)

**Date of Report (month/year):** September 2006

## II. OPENING REMARKS

*Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.*

Conservation International (CI) use "conservation outcomes" as the scientific underpinning for focusing conservation investment geographically and thematically. These conservation outcomes comprise the effective conservation of a set of species, sites, and broader-scale corridors that is essential for preventing biodiversity loss. Identifying these outcomes for the Philippines ensures that conservation action focuses on the species at the greatest risk of extinction, and on the sites and landscapes that are most important for their protection. These also provide a baseline upon which a systematic approach to monitoring can be set in place. Such a monitoring system will permit the objective comparative assessment of conservation results against which the success of investments can be measured, thereby building donor trust and improving on-the-ground conservation action.

Conservation outcomes at the species level are those that are globally threatened with extinction, meeting the criteria of Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. According to the 2004 Red List, there are 491 threatened species in the Philippines, of which 209 are vertebrates. Outcomes at the site level, termed "key biodiversity areas" (KBAs), are sites of global biodiversity conservation significance that are actually or potentially manageable for conservation. A total of 128 KBAs were identified for 209 globally threatened and 419 endemic species of amphibians, mammals, birds, reptiles, and freshwater fish, using confirmed locality data for each target species. Conservation outcomes at the landscape level are called "biodiversity conservation corridors", and aim to ensure the persistence of threatened species and KBAs. 17 biodiversity conservation corridors were identified, primarily to maintain connectivity among KBAs in areas of intact forest habitat. These includes the three existing CI/CEPF priority corridors of Eastern Mindanao, Sierra Madre and Palawan, where Conservation International Philippines plays a lead role in the consolidation of conservation initiatives that are designed to ensure the conservation and long-term persistence of threatened species, key biodiversity areas and ecological processes, as well as contributing to social and economic development.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** CI and relevant stakeholders participate in the design, refinement and implementation of corridor conservation strategies as well as the establishment of an outcomes monitoring program for the 3 corridors.

### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
<i>At least 10 new PAs / reserves encompassing identified Key Biodiversity Areas over the 3 corridors established by 2010.</i>	Twenty Protected Areas have been established under the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) Act framework in the 3 corridors as of August 30, 2006, of which 13 overlap with the identified Key Biodiversity Areas, five each in Sierra Madre and Palawan and 3 in the Eastern Mindanao Corridor. Fifteen additional Key Biodiversity Areas within the three corridors are currently undergoing protected area establishment.
<i>At least 3 provincial government budgets and at least 8 municipal budgets include explicit support for conservation programs in identified area protected site outcomes by 2006</i>	Three provincial governments provided support for the creation of protected areas within the Sierra Madre and Palawan Biodiversity Corridors. These are the provinces of Quirino (Quirino Protected Landscape), Palawan (Southern Palawan Planning Zone for Mt. Mantalingahan), and Cagayan (Northeastern Cagayan Protected Landscape and Seascape). In Quirino, five municipalities were involved in the establishment of the protected landscape. In Southern Palawan, five municipalities are supporting the creation of the PA for Mt. Mantalingahan. In the proposed Northeast Cagayan Protected Landscape and Seascape, five municipalities were also involved.
<i>At least 3 provincial governments and at least 8 municipal governments adopt / refine their development plans to support conservation of area protected site outcomes by 2006</i>	The Province of Cagayan has provided about \$23,500 as counterpart fund (to the \$75,000 CEPF funded project) to establish the Northeastern Cagayan Protected Landscape and Seascape (PLS) covering 5 municipalities. In the Southern Palawan Planning Zone, 5 municipalities have allocated \$30,000 total as counterpart funding for the establishment of the Mt. Mantalingahan protected areas.

<p><i>At least 3 key private sector players, e.g. the Palawan Tourism Council, endorse the strategy and incorporate its priorities into their corporate investment portfolios by 2007.</i></p>	<p>Haribon Foundation, the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (PAWB-DENR) and the Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) have been actively involved in the socialization of the Outcomes Process to private sector partners through meetings and dissemination of monitoring workshop reports. The KBAs and outcomes definition process was presented during the regional consultations on the revision of the Implementing Rules and Regulations of the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) Act spearheaded by PAWB-DENR. The KBAs were also used as a basis for prioritizing investments for the GEF 4 Resource Allocation Framework. Partners were also involved in the KBA presentation of the KBAs to donors like the UNDP and World Bank.</p>
<p><i>At least three international and/or national biodiversity conservation organizations agree to work in partnership on achieving and monitoring conservation outcomes (refining and monitoring) by 2005.</i></p>	<p>An MOU establishing a National Biodiversity Monitoring Alliance has been signed with partners, namely: Haribon, FPE and PAWB-DENR. The development of a monitoring manual based on the monitoring framework established through two workshops with partners is ongoing, with opportunities to fundraise through UNDP and FPE. The existence of the Alliance will serve to strengthen fundraising for sustaining monitoring activities, and to standardize measures and methodologies for collecting and reporting biodiversity data.</p>
<p><i>At least US\$ 3 million of non-CEPF funds is raised to support CI and partners in continuing conservation projects that target the identified species and site based outcomes by 2007.</i></p>	<p>A concept paper outlining the long-term funding needs for Conservation International Philippines' continuing conservation projects was prepared and presented to Conservation International President Peter Seligman to use as a basis to discuss potential funding opportunities with Mr. Oscar Lopez of the First Philippine Holdings Corporation.</p> <p>Examples of other funds raised to support CI and partners' conservation projects within the KBAs and other initiatives include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corporate partners (i.e. Nestle &amp; Unilever) through the Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP) provided \$70,000 through the creation of a Trust Fund for the development of the Mt. Irid-Angelo protected area.</li> <li>2. The Butuan City Water District allotted \$34,000 to develop a watershed protection plan for the Tag Ibo Watershed, part of the Mt. Hilong-hilong KBA, and together with the LEAF Foundation has allocated \$38,300 to establish a special fund for watershed protection and management within the Siargao Protected Landscape and Seascape.</li> <li>3. The Cagayan province has provided a budget of about \$23,500 and five municipalities have allocated an additional \$30,000 for the establishment of the North Eastern Cagayan Protected Landscape as</li> </ol>

	<p>counterpart to the \$42,000 invested by the FPE.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. \$ 5,000 was leveraged as counterpart funds from Haribon Foundation and FPE to conduct the National Biodiversity Monitoring Workshop held last June 2005,</li> <li>5. UNDP thru PAWB-DENR provided \$8000 to conduct the Monitoring Protocol Writeshop, held last Nov. 2005.</li> <li>6. The Regional Natural Heritage Programme (RNHP) of the Australian Government provided \$60,000 to fund the project entitled Conservation of Key Biodiversity Areas within the Sierra Madre Mountain Range, Luzon Island, Philippines and has recently approved an additional funding of around \$152,500 to expand the coverage of the project to include the conservation of threatened lowland species in the Sierra Madre.</li> <li>7. The Global Environment Center has recently approved an \$80,000 grant for a Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) project feasibility study combining reforestation, agroforestry and biomass energy development within the Sierra Madre Biodiversity Corridor.</li> </ol>
--	--

***Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.***

This project has been very successful in identifying conservation outcomes for the Philippines at the species, site and landscape levels. Involvement in the definition process and acceptance of the conservation outcomes by partners was assured because they built upon and refined previous prioritization initiatives that includes the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), Important Bird Areas (IBAs) and the Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Priorities (PBCP). It might be too early to fully assess the performance indicators; however there is clear evidence that an increasing number of projects are being focused on the conservation targets identified by the project. Furthermore the establishment of baseline on the four core indicators provides an informative portfolio of data that can be utilized to guide future investment and policy decision making in the Philippines. The dissemination and ultimate use of this outcomes data can also form the basis of future strategic planning and collaborative fundraising initiatives that aim to ensure sustainability in monitoring systems through networks of key national and local partners.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

No.

<b>IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS</b>
----------------------------

***Project Outputs:*** Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Output 1:</b> <i>Species and site outcomes refined and prioritized for implementation in the three corridors.</i>	
<b>1.1.</b> <i>Outcome Coordinator and Outcomes team</i>	The terms of reference of the Outcomes Definition

<p><i>identified by month 2</i></p>	<p>and Outcomes Monitoring Coordinators were approved on the 2<sup>nd</sup> month of project implementation leading to the eventual hiring of the two coordinators.</p>
<p><b>1.2.</b> <i>Species outcomes for 3 corridors refined in collaboration with hotspot-wide effort: information on globally threatened and restricted-range species (distribution, threats, conservation actions, references, contacts) synthesized by month 6</i></p>	<p>Refinement and synthesis of the species outcomes (globally threatened and restricted range species) completed for the entire Philippines hotspot, including the three CEPF priority corridors Species outcomes are based on the 2004 IUCN Red List. . Please refer to the “Species Outcomes” report from the Outcomes Database. Congregatory species and restricted range species were also identified as additional KBA trigger species, with endemic species being used as a proxy for restricted range species. Please refer to the “All Species” report from the Outcomes Database. Species data were gathered from the published literature, the University of Kansas, the Smithsonian, Field Museum of Natural History, National Museum of the Philippines and other institutions.</p>
<p><b>1.3.</b> <i>Species outcomes entered into Outcomes Database by month 6</i></p>	<p>Overall species outcomes entry completed. Endemic species manually added to the database and relevant data entered. Additional data for freshwater fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals have been entered into the database. Initial plant data has also been added. The outcomes database will continue to be updated after the end of the CEPF project, to include new data. Migration to a new data system is planned for next year. (Please refer to the Outcomes Database).</p>
<p><b>1.4.</b> <i>Species in need of species-specific conservation action are documented by month 6</i></p>	<p>A listing of highly threatened species has been compiled. These are the highest priority species outcomes, and are potential candidates for species-specific conservation action in the future. These species can be currently adequately conserved at the site-scale. As more data become available, additional species may be highlighted that require species-specific action.</p>
<p><b>1.5.</b> <i>Sites holding populations of globally threatened species, restricted-range species, and globally significant congregations are identified, documented and delineated/mapped as manageable units.</i></p>	<p>128 Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) have been identified and delineated based on the presence of species for which site-scale conservation is deemed necessary to avoid extinctions in the short- and medium- term: globally threatened species, restricted-range species and globally significant congregations of species. Protected area boundaries and other relevant management data were considered during delineation, to generate KBAs that are manageable units. Please refer to the large format map of KBAs and Corridors.</p>
<p><b>1.6.</b> <i>Information on species synthesized for each site (i.e. key biodiversity area) and entered into Outcomes Database by month 6.</i></p>	<p>Species information for each KBA has been synthesized and entered into the Outcomes Database. Information on restricted range species was added</p>

	to the species form after the upgrade of the Outcomes database (please refer to the "Species per KBA" report from the Outcomes Database).
<b>1.7.</b> <i>Corridors evaluated for their representation of landscape species and key biodiversity areas, and borders modified as necessary.</i>	Biodiversity corridors identified during the Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Priority-setting Program were refined using the latest information on extent of remaining habitat, and to meet the needs of area-demanding species (e.g. Philippine Eagle). Seventeen biodiversity conservation corridors were delineated, primarily to maintain connectivity among KBAs in areas of intact forest habitat. Please refer to the large format map of KBAs and corridors.
<b>1.8.</b> <i>Map of refined site outcomes within corridors created by month 8.</i>	Map of the Key Biodiversity Areas and Biodiversity Conservation Corridors completed.
<b>1.9.</b> <i>List of species and site outcomes compared to ongoing initiatives/actors created and assessed for gaps in protection by month 10.</i>	Sites analyzed and prioritized to highlight where new protected areas are to be created, and where strengthened management of existing protected areas is needed for effective conservation of target species. Forty-five of the 128 KBAs, or 35% of KBAs currently benefit from official safeguard status in the Philippines. The remaining 83 KBAs lack formal governmental protection.
<b>1.10.</b> <i>High priority sites (based on criteria of irreplaceability and vulnerability) identified for the creation of new protected areas and improved management of existing protected areas by month 12.</i>	Initial prioritization completed based on the evaluation of each site in relation to the others using the same basic principles that led to their identification in the first place: irreplaceability and vulnerability. Prioritization methodology adapted from process currently being developed by CABS/Conservation Synthesis. AZE sites were highlighted as the highest priorities for immediate conservation action on the ground.
<b>Output 2.</b> <i>Outcomes Monitoring System developed in collaboration with partners. Baseline data delivered for state, pressure and response indicators of the global Outcome Monitoring Protocol.</i>	
<b>2.1.</b> <i>Initial background information on species, area and change detection collected by month 3.</i>	Outcomes monitoring workbook containing initial background on species, area and change detection completed (please refer to 'Outcomes Monitoring background workbook')
<b>2.2.</b> <i>CI-Philippines Executive Director engages stakeholders in bilateral and multilateral discussions with the purpose of creating a network of partners to develop and implement a hotspot-wide monitoring plan (discussions occur by month 6).</i>	MOU establishing a National Biodiversity Monitoring Alliance has been forged with partners, namely: Haribon, FPE and PAWB-DENR.
<b>2.3.</b> <i>Stakeholders assessed for capacity to carry out elements of monitoring framework by month 6.</i>	Stakeholder assessment for capacity to carry out elements of monitoring framework completed

	(Please refer to 'Philippines monitoring capacity workbook').
<b>2.4.</b> <i>Training and monitoring needs, as well as gaps in monitoring capacity, are identified (through intense stakeholder evaluation) by month 6</i>	Training and monitoring needs, as well as identification of gaps in monitoring capacity of partners completed during the National Monitoring Workshop (please refer to 'Proceedings of the National Biodiversity Monitoring Workshop Report').
<b>2.5.</b> <i>Detailed monitoring implementation work plan developed with partners through workshop by month 12.</i>	National Monitoring Workshop and Monitoring Writeshop outputs were synthesized to form the basis of the Biodiversity Monitoring Alliance strategy work plan.
<b>2.6.</b> <i>Baseline information on state, pressure and response indicators captured and reported on</i>	Baseline information on state, pressure and response indicators completed and included in the National Monitoring Workshop and Monitoring Writeshop proceedings.
<b>Output 3.</b> <i>Annual forest cover change analysis and production of a change detection map (1990-2000) for the 3 corridors completed as part of the global Outcome Monitoring protocol.</i>	
<b>3.1.</b> <i>Both DC and in-country processing team assembled, initial image database created, and aerial survey data options researched by month 4</i>	Completed extensive search of satellite imagery. Downloaded available free satellite images from the <a href="#">Global Land Cover Facility website</a> and purchased additional scenes to fill in cloudy areas. For two scenes, the 1990 data are completely cloud-covered and cannot be used in the mapping effort. Investigated the availability of aerial photographic data, but the only available dataset is from mid 1980's, and therefore not useful for map validation.
<b>3.2.</b> <i>Remote sensing trainer's training workshop for 2 specialists to be held in Manila by month 6</i>	Training manual and material preparation completed by the CI-DC team. Remote sensing specialist of the Philippines CBC and a GIS specialist from Palawan participated in Remote Sensing Training Workshop from June 2-10, 2005, conducted by the CI-DC remote sensing trainer. Initiated image pre-processing and classification during the training.
<b>3.3.</b> <i>Collection and processing of aerial survey data through workshop by month 6</i>	Processing of the collected aerial survey data and its use for validation and ground-truthing completed.
<b>3.4.</b> <i>Second workshop to review and finish change detections, by month 8</i>	Second workshop completed. Image classifications reviewed and assessed by CI-DC remote sensing specialist. New methodology implemented to improve speed and accuracy of mapping effort. A third workshop was also conducted to finalize the classifications. A subset of the collected aerial survey data from the above output were used at this time to improve interpretation.
<b>3.5.</b> <i>Finalization and regional mosaic by month 10</i>	Regional mosaic completed.
<b>3.6.</b> <i>Validation using aerial surveys and available</i>	Aerial and ground surveys completed. Additional

<i>supplementary ground data performed by team</i>	information about local vegetation types and conditions was provided through consultation with regional experts.
<b>3.7.</b> <i>Fragmentation and overlay analyses models run on data.</i>	Fragmentation analysis/statistics for Sierra Madre, Palawan and Eastern Mindanao Corridor completed (please refer to the document entitled "Status of the Outcomes Report for the Philippines" for results).
<b>3.8.</b> <i>Paper map production and CD sets produced of final forest cover change map by month 12</i>	Production of paper map and CD sets of the final forest cover map completed.

***Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.***

All of the intended project outputs have been completed. Additional outputs beyond the scope of the CEPF project include the development and printing of publications to include outcomes monitoring brochure, KBA booklet, KBA foldout map, and Outcomes Database CD for distribution among partners and other stakeholders.

***Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?***

No.

**V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

***Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.***

Not applicable, since this was mainly a desk study.

**VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT**

***Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.***

Purpose-level targets would have taken more time to meet without the cooperation of partners and the assistance, facilitation, and leveraging provided by the Philippines Center for Biodiversity Conservation (CBC) team. Their output has tremendously contributed to meeting most of the purpose-level targets and, often, exceeding them. It would be to the advantage of the Philippine CBC, however, to have a formal partnership and grants-making unit that will not only meet CEPF commitments in the CEPF priority corridors, but also serve the other non-CEPF corridors and leverage funds for their outcomes.

There was also a need to request for the extension of the project to allow time for its full completion. Interpretation of imagery data for the Philippine target corridors (e.g., cloud cover, haziness, and elevation) was as difficult and time-consuming as expected and has affected the target date for the finalization of the regional mosaic. The learning curve of the trainees to interpret technically challenging images is also a factor. Perhaps in the future, specific examples of desired end products could be provided to the field, as well as examples of software that the video products are processed through - so vendor final products could be tested to ensure functionality.

Another problem that was not anticipated was the difficulty in scheduling the aerial survey due to constraints posed by the weather, an important element in all field work. It is therefore important to include flexibility in the project timeline to deal with this issue.

***Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)***

Conservation International (CI) has been using "conservation outcomes", defined at three scales: species, areas, and corridors, as the scientific underpinning for focusing conservation investment geographically and thematically and has defined a process that relies on an understanding of both how biodiversity is distributed on the land, in lakes, in rivers, in streams, and in the sea, and how it is being threatened. A detailed methodology has been set to be implemented by all of CI's regional programs built on defining conservation outcomes, developing and implementing strategies to attain them, and monitoring whether our actions are indeed resulting in the delivery of conservation outcomes.

Through this project, we learned that more time needs to be built in to outcomes projects in the future, to ensure needed flexibility. Also, more funding should be built into future grants for product development, dissemination, and communication with stakeholders. In the current project, additional funding had to be secured from other donors to cover workshop costs and publications.

***Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)***

The key to getting stakeholders interested in CI's line of thinking and strategy appears to be building partnerships, information dissemination, and continued dialogue. The development of the KBAs, whose main ingredients were the outputs from the PBCPP and the IBAs of Haribon and Birdlife, would not have been successful without the participation of Haribon. Though there were apprehensions on the side of Haribon about the KBA concept, in the end, the dialogue between CI, Haribon and Birdlife was critical o ensuring Haribon's participation. A partnership based on a formal agreement such as the MOU CI has forged with Haribon defines explicitly the role and contribution of each. In this MOU, the contribution of each organization is recognized for their effort in developing the KBAs. The essential link up catalyzed by Conservation Synthesis through Birdlife was a telling factor in getting the partnership going.

**VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

***Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.***

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
FPE	A	\$3,000	To conduct the National Monitoring Workshop
Haribon Foundation	A	\$2,000	To conduct the National Monitoring Workshop
UNDP	A	\$8000	To conduct the Monitoring Writeshop

***\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:***

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF funded project)*

- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

**Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.**

The next phase of the project is to ensure that information on the “conservation outcomes” is disseminated and widely distributed to partners and other interested parties. We are currently Developing outcomes definition and monitoring publications, for which we have secured funding. This will include a KBA booklet, KBA foldout map and Outcomes database CD, and an outcomes monitoring brochure (entitled ‘Monitoring Biodiversity Conservation Outcomes in the Philippines). A KBA directory and more comprehensive ‘Status of Outcomes’ Report are also planned for development in the future. These are currently a high priority for the outcomes team to source funding. These publications will be critical to communicating project results within the hotspot, and will also serve as a very useful case studt for other regions.

A very high priority is to fundraise for the implementation of conservation action at the site, species, and landscape scales, both within the CEPF priority corridors, and nationwide. Fundraising for monitoring at these scales needs to be pursued through the Biodiversity Monitoring Alliance. Field validation of candidate KBAs in cooperation with CI partners is also planned. Since this is an iterative process, additional activities include refining the outputs as new and updated data become available.

**VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**VIII. INFORMATION SHARING**

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes   X    
 No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please also complete the following:

**For more information about this project, please contact:**

Name: David Hess  
 Mailing address: 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500  
 Tel: 1-703-341-2464  
 Fax: 1-703-271-0137  
 E-mail: dhess@conservation.org