# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name: Philippine Eagle Conservation Program Foundation, Inc**

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): *Toward Biodiversity Conservation Within the Eastern Mindanao Corridor: Biodiversity Archiving and Assessment Project***

Implementation Partners for this Project: University of the Philippines in Mindanao (UP Mindanao), Northern Mindanao State Institute of Science and Technology (NORMISIST), Department of Environment and Natural Resources Regions XI and XIII (DENR XI and XIII), and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (UMA)

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): September 1, 2004 to September 30, 2007**

**Date of Report (month/year): December/2007**

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The Biodiversity Archiving and Assessment Project's (EMCBAAP) goal is to build capacity within Eastern Mindanao Corridor to map biodiversity, set scientifically based conservation priorities, and then monitor progress in priority areas. While the project centers on Mt. Hamiguitan, Mt. Hilong-hilong, and Mt. Tagub-Kampalili, it aims to generate skills and information that will be used to develop a corridor-wide conservation framework for use by government and civil society working in partnership to conserve Eastern Mindanao's biodiversity.

EMCBAAP was designed with projects simultaneously funded by CEPF/CI. We interfaced with two projects in particular, the "Eastern Mindanao Corridor Facilitation for the Philippines" by Conservation International Philippines (CIP) and the "Expansion of the Mt. Hilong-Hilong Range Protected Landscape" project of the Surigao Economic Development Foundation (SEDF). Some of our project outputs have depended on the inputs and performances of these two projects.

The project was also implemented under the back drop of recent government investment on resource extraction outside protected areas, particularly mining and logging. The EMC is said to contain one of the largest remaining lowland forest in the country, the most profitable forest type for the timber industry. In March 2005, the government lifted the log ban in Southern Mindanao and the Caraga Region and led to the renewal of logging operations in Puting-Bato, Kampalili and Mayo KBAs. EMC is also considered a mining hotspot. Across all the KBAs, open pit and /or strip mining at various stages of application, exploration and extraction are underway.

The project also coincided with the peak of indigenous people claims over ancestral forest lands across the EMC. Between protected areas and ancestral domains, some indigenous tribal leaders prefer the former wherein they can exercise autonomy in deciding development activities within their lands, including allowing mining and logging.

The project was also very dependent on some assumptions, which was not always true in some instances during project implementation. For example, the assumption that "DENR willing to sponsor application to the national government" did not hold true in Region XI where a proposed expansion of a small protected area as called for by fresh biodiversity data was not encouraged.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose**: Stakeholders approve and endorse sites for declaration as protected areas, including 3 priority sites for declaration as a protected within 3 years after the proposed project, and work cooperatively towards meeting protected area requirements.*

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

| Indicator | Actual at Completion |
|---|---|
| **Purpose-level:** | |
| *Proposed framework for EMC conservation reviewed and finalized by major stakeholders from 3 cities and 7 provinces and an agreement to endorse the framework signed by them by January 2007* | Accomplished. Proposed framework for EMC Conservation has been presented, reviewed and endorsed for implementation by participants to a stakeholder summit in June 2007. |
| *Official endorsements by stakeholders for protected areas submitted to appropriate agencies (i.e. Provincial LGU, Regional and National DENR)* | In progress. Endorsements still to be submitted. |
| *At least one local legislation supporting the establishment of protected areas passed by each partner LGU (e.g., barangay and municipal resolution, executive orders) or before March 2007* | We got one provincial, two municipal and two League of Barangay Council for Mount Hamiguitan PA expansion. SEDF through its PA expansion project was responsible for Mount Hilong-hilong. Endorsement for a proposed Tagub-Kampalili PA was momentarily shelved with the change in local government leadership. |

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

The project was a success in that it faithfully adhered to and documented participatory processes to achieve the indicators. The project also pioneered the use of biodiversity science as a basis for discussion on land or forest use and legislation. Although some indicators were not delivered at the exact time projected, enough awareness has been built and healthy deliberation has been facilitated which ensured that stakeholder and local government decisions were informed and were based on consensus.

For example, the Mount Hamiguitan Range Multi-Stakeholder Council (MHRMSC) worked on the endorsements after they were provided with biodiversity information and materials from the biodiversity inventories and mapping made. The multi-stakeholder "Maragusan Watershed Coordinating Council (MWCC)" facilitated stakeholder dialogues on land/forest use within Mount Tagub-Kampalili. The project also helped SEDF with the mapping and technical description of the proposed Mount Hilong-hilong expanded PA. Biodiversity information and the scientific bases were also provided to aid in public education and advocacy for PA expansion.

In concert with another CEPF funded project that surveyed plant diversity, better awareness on the biological importance of Hamiguitan KBA was built. Fresh data from fieldwork showed that Hamiguitan KBA is a center for diversification by itself. At least two new species of forest rodents were found and a number of globally threatened species resides outside the existing PA. To continue with building awareness, complementary copies of popular biodiversity reports for a non-technical audience will be distributed soon. Similar popular reports will be available for Mount Tagub-Kampalili and Mount Hilong-hilong soon.

Despite strong stakeholder support to a proposed Mount Hamiguitan Wildlife Sanctuary (area, c. 6000 ha) expansion, DENR XI is not as enthusiastic. Part of the reason is that the government has already endorsed mining within the Hamiguitan KBA, which covers about 32000 ha of forests. There are also already existing forms of land tenure such as CBFM, ancestral domains and the DENR can no longer forgo these commitments. In this light, we are currently finding other solutions to the biodiversity crisis in Hamiguitan through means acceptable to DENR Region XI.

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

No other significant impacts were noted

## IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

The project targeted five major outputs namely:

**Output 1: Established two operational GIS Laboratories**
**Output 2: Generated GIS-based landscape analysis**
**Output 3: Biodiversity assessment completed**
**Output 4: Generated GIS-based analysis of biodiversity threats**
**Output 5: A conservation framework for EMC developed**

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

| Indicator | Actual at Completion |
|---|---|
| **Output 1: Established two operational GIS Laboratories** | |
| *2 full time staff and 2 part time staff recruited for each of the GIS lab by November 2004* | Accomplished. Each of the GIS laboratories at UP Mindanao and NORMISIST had the following core team: 1 part time GIS Laboratory Director, and 3 full time staff. At NORMISIST, we hired a part time remote sensing specialist to assist in image classification. All were sustained until June 2007, while staff at UP Mindanao who was in charge of the biodiversity and map data base was sustained until September 2007. |
| *Laboratory furnished by November 2004* | Accomplished. |
| *Computer hardware and software acquired by November 2004* | Accomplished. |
| *GIS operational and sustainability plan developed by December 2004* | Accomplished. |
| *Training of GIS staff and project end users (biodiversity team, project partners, etc.) completed by January 2005* | Accomplished. Several GIS capability-building training workshops were held with the help of CIP, UMA, and DENR NAMRIA |
| **Output 2: Generated GIS-based landscape analysis** | |
| *Systems analysis and design for landscape information completed in Nov 2004* | Accomplished. |
| *Continuing collection of secondary data and maps on landscapes from Conservation International- Phils. and other agencies until December 2006* | Accomplished. |
| *Digitized contour and other landscape data completed by March 2007* | In progress. Five out of 23 1:50000 priority contour maps are still being digitized and quality-controlled. Edge matching and quality control of DENR NAMRIA will follow. |
| *Gap identification on landscape data completed on March 2005* | Accomplished. Gaps on landscape data identified and prioritized for collection/digitizing |
| *GIS on landscape (20 m contour, land use and other land cover features) completed by April 2007* | In progress. |
| **Output 3: Biodiversity assessment completed** | |
| *Institutional partners for data collection forged and TORs drafted by October 2004* | Accomplished. Agreements in various forms (e.g. Memorandum of Agreement, Memorandum of |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Understanding, Letter of Engagements) executed with institutional partners (e.g. Field Museum of Natural History FMNH, Central Mindanao University, Davao Oriental State College of Science and Technology) and science consultants. |
| *All prior informed consent (PIC) documents secured by January 2005* | Accomplished. All consents for field collection obtained |
| *Primary data on terrestrial vertebrates (mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians) collected and processed by March 2007* | Accomplished. Both primary and secondary data archived in a web-based Biodiversity Information System (EMBCIS) accessible to the public during day time: (http://www.gis.upmin.edu.ph/biodiversity) |
| *GIS species distribution maps completed by September 2007* | Accomplished. Can be viewed through the EMBCIS web site. |
| **Output 4: Generated GIS-based analysis of biodiversity threats** | |
| *Systems analysis design for Threat Analysis completed by October 2004* | Accomplished. |
| *Results of threat analysis collected from Conservation International- Phils. by November 2006 and other threat data from other agencies by Dec 2006* | Draft report received. |
| *Digitized landscape data on threats collected from CI-Phils and archived by March 2007* | Threat analysis from CI had no spatial data. |
| *GIS of biodiversity threats completed by March 2007* | GIS of biodiversity threat completed for Mount Hamiguitan. Final report still to be turned over by UMA. Threat analysis for Mount Hilong-hilong and Mount Tagub-Kampalili unaccomplished. |
| **Output 5: A conservation framework for EMC developed** | |
| *GIS of EMC biodiversity priority areas based on threat analysis, landscape analysis and species distribution completed by September 2007* | Accomplished. CI Philippines took the lead in mapping the biodiversity priority areas (i.e. Key Biodiversity Areas) . |
| *Conservation framework drafted by the Technical Working Group in December 2006* | Conservation Framework drafted |
| *Stakeholders summit completed by June 2007*<br>*a) Present and validate EMC conservation framework*<br>*b) Identify priority areas*<br>*c) Endorse protected area establishment* | Accomplished |
| *Five hundred (500) copies of EMC biodiversity information and the conservation framework in CD ROM distributed among EMBC stakeholders by September 2007* | Accomplished. 500 CDs for distribution |
| *One thousand (1000) primer on EMC Conservation Framework distributed by September 2007* | In progress. Framework for final review, endorsement and printing. The EMBC Facilitation Project is supposed to shoulder the rest of the printing cost, but because the termination dates of the two projects were not in sync, the project is no longer able to contribute money for printing. To remedy these problem, and ensure that project momentum and impact to conservation on the ground is sustained, we have requested CEPF to allow us to use CEPF Mamboogook funds for printing and for follow through advocacy activities for the framework . We have submitted a proposal |

| | |
|---|---|
| | to amend Project Mamboogook so that these actions are absorbed and continued. |
| **Output 6: Project administration, monitoring and evaluation in place and operational** | |
| *Full time staff recruited and part time staff identified at the onset of project implementation* | Accomplished. |
| *Project materials and equipment purchased by first quarter of Project Year I* | Accomplished. |
| *Financial sustainability scheme to leverage CEPF project funding developed by First Quarter of Project Year I* | Accomplished. |
| *Project monitoring and evaluation system developed by First Quarter of Project Year I* | Accomplished. |
| *Quarterly meeting among technical staff to monitor project progress sustained for 2 years* | Accomplished. |

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

The project's success in delivering the intended outputs was greatly influenced by partners as the components of some outputs were very dependent on their products, inputs and performances.

Output 1 and Output 3 (biodiversity assessment) for instance was very successful mainly because local and junior researchers/staff were well trained, supervised and guided by the country's best practitioners/scientists and institutions. CIP, UMA, and NAMRIA-DENR contributed significantly in setting up the GIS laboratories and in building local capacities. FMNH, CMU and independent/consultant senior researchers helped ensure that biodiversity assessments were sound and that popular information was appropriate and accurate

Getting help from other agencies was very successful for Output 2. Digital 100 m interval contour maps from the Department of Agriculture-Bureau of Agricultural Research (DA-BAR) were used for mapping thematic overlays for Mount Hilong-hilong, Mount Tagub-Kampalili and Mount Hamiguitan. DENR NAMRIA and CIP land cover maps were also used. Comprehensive land use/forest land use maps collected from LGUs were supposed to enhance our PA mapping for Mount Hilong-hilong, Tagub-kampalili and Hamiguitan. But almost all maps collected were not properly geo referenced and thus, can not be digitized and used for overlays.

Digitizing of 23 contour maps is almost 80 % complete. We digitized 1:50000, 20 m interval contour maps for distribution as a common base map for mapping institutions in the region. This output was meant to address local governments' and other map users' clamor for a unified base map that will allow sharing of map products. We expect at most 4 more months of work to digitize and quality control (QC) 5 more maps, match 26 map edges, and for NAMRIA to QC these maps and give certification for its circulation. More work was needed than previously estimated.

Output 4 (GIS-based analysis of biodiversity threats) depended on spatial data on threats from partners and UMA for the threat analyses. In the absence of these data, UMA have successfully finished threat models for Mount Hamiguitan using spatial data on population density, change, and road occurrences. The final report and documentation of the procedures has yet to be submitted though. UMA relied upon UP Mindanao GIS staff with the threat modeling for Mount Tagub-Kampalili and Mount Hilong-hilong, but as the procedures from UMA was not yet available, work progress by GIS local staff was slow.

Output 5 (Conservation framework) is a joint effort with CIP, who has the best experience as they led framework development for the Sierra Madre and the Palawan Corridors. Unfortunately, some shortcomings in facilitation on the part of the regional CIP support staff, miscommunication over the course of the implementation, and failure to promptly install remedial measures led to delays.

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

Output 2, 4 and 5 were partially completed. Output 2 intends to deliver 23 digitized contour maps, but our estimate of the man power and time to finish them was very much underestimated. Fund limitations partly as an effect of US dollar depreciation (from 1 US $ to Php 56 to 1 US $ three years ago, to current 1 US $ to Php 42 exchange rate) prevented us from hiring new people and adding more computer units for digitizing. Local governments and map institutions need to wait for at most 4 more months to complete the 23 priority maps before its public dissemination. DENR NAMRIA certification is a crucial part of the process which we should not forgo. CIP is currently facilitating the establishment of a Regional GIS Network (RGIN) in Caraga Region and will soon do a similar initiative in Region XI. We will make sure that all of the 23 digitized maps are available in a few months time to all RGIN members.

Output 4 was intended to benefit both framework development and local initiatives for PA establishment/expansion. In the absence of threat maps, we used qualitative threat data instead as framework reference. With the exception of Mount Hamiguitan, qualitative data was also used for PA initiatives at Mount Hilong-hilong and Mount Tagub-Kampalili. Use of qualitative information in lieu of GIS generated threat maps was very effective.

The final work phase of Output 5 which included final review, endorsement by authorities, printing and distribution of the framework is also yet to be completed and it is the completion of Output 5 which is most urgent to allow long-term project impacts. The framework is a crucial document. It is intended as a blue print from which stakeholder and local government future initiatives for biodiversity conservation would be based. Without it, civil society efforts may continue to be piece meal and uncoordinated.

However, advocacy and awareness campaign for the framework as an effective planning reference among local governments and the civil society is crucial to maximize its utility. Thus, impacts will be maximized if we also invest on getting authority endorsements (i.e. from the two Regional Development Councils that cover the EMC) and local legislations for the use of the framework. This is all the more important as a new set of local government leaders have emerged after the local elections in May and October 2007.

Such milestones were missing in the original design, but were incorporated in a request for the carry over of Output 5 to an on-going PEF project on Philippine Eagle conservation with CEPF. Little funds are also available to mass produce the framework, mainly because of dollar depreciation. Impacts that will be achieved from these additional investments will certainly offset any lost in momentum caused by the momentary delay in the delivery of Output 5.

## 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.

## 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.***

**For projects that aim to build local capacity, it is important that the right tools and the enabling environment are present to sustain people and the utility of products.** For example, a lot of investment was made training GIS staff but owing to the lack of follow up projects, trained personnel were not sustained and they ended up working with high paying companies.

**A carefully devised multi-year strategic plan should precede fund sourcing for short term projects.** Short term projects should be lined up, with each designed to build on the success of the other until project goals are eventually achieved. For example, biodiversity information are already available, but investments must still be made so that these information find its way into the planning offices and legislative halls of local governments, strategic plans of NGOs and POs, and management plans of PAs, Ancestral Domains, and CBFMs. Once plans are in place, assistance to make sure that plans are implemented properly – at least the biodiversity conservation component- should be available, including building capacity for implementation and monitoring.

**Within the EMC in particular, enhancing management of existing PAs and finding ways for the people to achieve quality life through these PAs is a fruitful future investment.** In between these PAs, setting up and strengthening other forms of management regimes (e.g. critical habitats, Community-based Forest Management Agreements, Ancestral Domains, Municipal Watersheds, etc.) to build a corridor of protection for key biodiversity areas is also a better alternative than creating new protected areas. Thousands of hectares of ancestral domains were already declared and, a lot more will get established soon. Strengthening the biodiversity protection components of each domain's management plan and local capacity building for plan enforcement are specifically needed.

**Partnerships bring individual strengths together, but close coordination is crucial, especially for outputs that rely on each of the partners' input and performance.** Aside from making sure that schedules are synchronized, joint assessments must be implemented with the goal of arriving at mutually agreed actions. This is even more crucial for situations that require urgent remedies.

**Local government units (LGUs) should be a priority end user of biodiversity information and partner for local conservation investments.** For example, San Isidro LGU used new biological information on Mount Hamiguitan to bolster its eco-tourism plans. Maragusan LGU under the previous administration yearned for fresh biodiversity information to bolster its forest land use plan. Mati LGU has adopted the Philippine Eagle as a flagship for forest and water conservation and is hosting the setting aside of 7,000 hectares of eagle territory as protected. With the Local Government Code of 1991, the LGUs have more autonomy and lead role in protecting wildlife and habitats. Initiatives to build capacity and to provide tools and information is crucial.

**Stakeholder groups or alliances that have shown a track record of passion and advocacy against any development that harms the environment are potent local conservation champions.** The MHRMSC in Mount Hamiguitan are at the forefront of getting public support for the expansion of the Mount Hamiguitan Wildlife Sanctuary. They have always opposed logging and mining within Mount Hamiguitan. Organizations such as these should be provided with scientific tools and information to back up their advocacies. Funds and training can also help them do more systematic and more effective advocacy campaigns.

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

The use of GIS in archiving, managing and analyzing biodiversity information greatly assisted in building a visual representation to the stakeholders of the EMC's biodiversity and its occurrence. And this helped them better decide over what actions must be prioritized, where they should be implemented and how to conserve the most biodiversity. However, the capability of the GIS as a tool for forecasting was under utilized. The problem partly lies on the lack of in-house GIS experts in the institution where it was lodged.

The decision to engage senior biodiversity experts to supervise the development of the survey design and its execution was successful in ensuring the soundness and credibility of the results. All field data were properly archived and specimens properly measured, processed and catalogued so that its utility for further taxonomic work, particularly in confirming potentially new species through both molecular and morphological analysis, is ensured. Local and junior researchers were well trained and now represent a pool of young biologists who can be engaged in the region for similar biodiversity studies.

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

The role of CIP, UMASS, and DENR NAMRIA in training UP Min and NORMISIST GIS staff was very critical to the project. We started out with staff that had very little experience with GIS and ended with skilled staff, so competent that they were all immediately hired by private companies when the project ended.

Homing in on local conservation champions and complementing their advocacies helped the project a lot in achieving project impacts. When the MHRMSC presented the proposed Hamiguitan expansion using biological justifications, all except one of four LGUs issued endorsement. The MWCC (as steered by the Municipal Environment and Natural Resources Office MENRO of Maragusan) although now operating under a new set of municipal leaders have recently convened and intends to continue on with dialogues regarding land use within Mount Tagub-Kampalili.

CIP's (Manila Office) guidance over framework development and the processes that lead to it was also very important. The "EMC Socio-economic benchmark study" clearly illustrated that EMC, with its wealth of biodiversity is also where the poorest reside, further reiterating the link between human welfare and biodiversity conservation. It was an important reference during the drafting of the framework. The "EMC Biodiversity Threat Study" that CIP also commissioned was equally enlightening, but could have been more effective if spatial data on threats were included. However, over-all CIP facilitation would have worked best if the right CIP EMC corridor support staff was matched with the regional partners.

## 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.***

| Donor | Type of Funding* | Amount | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| University of Massachusetts at Amherst | A | $US 11,000.00 | In kind, calculated in terms of licensed software, GPS, laptop and books donated, resource use and time spent on the project, travel expenses of |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | training resource persons to and from the US, etc. |
| University of the Philippines in Mindanao | A | $US 3,428.00 | In kind, electricity, room use and security provision for the GIS laboratory for the whole project duration |
| Northern Mindanao State Institute of Science and Technology (NORMISIST) | A | $US 3,428.00 | In kind, electricity, room use and security provision for the GIS laboratory for the whole project duration |
| Upland Development Programme (UDP) | C | $US 20,000.00 | UDP engaged PEF to coach 5 local government units in Davao Oriental to delineate, profile and protect community forest areas |
| International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) | C | $US 71,428.00 | PEF was engaged by Green Mindanao, Inc. to implement an IUCN funded "dugong" *Dugong dugong* conservation project in marine protected areas along the coast of Mount Hamiguitan |
| American Express (AMEX) | C | $ 11,904.00 | AMEX donated funds for the construction of a grade school building to support biodiversity education in one community within Mount Hamiguitan Range |

***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 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 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.***

In the short term, we have requested CEPF for the amendment of our Philippine Eagle project to accommodate completion of digitizing for 23 contour maps (Output 2), final review and publication of framework (Output 5), and other follow through activities to achieve project impacts. We are also working with UP Min in finalizing GAP analysis for Mount Hamiguitan to find an approach acceptable to DENR Region XI for expanding biodiversity conservation in this KBA.

Long-term plans include:

1. Develop a multi-year strategy to pursue an expanded conservation measure for Hamiguitan KBA in the light of DENR prior commitments to mining, ancestral domains and other forms of tenure.

2. Fund sourcing to continue profiling for 6 more KBAs along the EMC, archiving of new data and maintenance of the web-based Eastern Mindanao Biodiversity Corridor Information System EMBCIS at UP Min. We are drafting a new Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with UP Min for continuing collaboration.

## VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PA establishment across the corridor is slowed down by resistance from resource prospectors, exploiters and their allies. Candidate PAs are also the same places where you have operations and applications for CBFM, IFMA, mining, logging, and ancestral domains. In most cases, these tenures prevail over protected area proposals. In Caraga Region for example, CBFM sites were excised from the proposed Mount Hilong-hilong Protected Landscape. In Davao Oriental and Compostela Valley, a proposed mining reservation within the heart of the proposed Tagub-Kampalili PA was provided with consents by LGUs and ICs. In Mount Hamiguitan, 3 MPSA holders are resisting expansion of protection for Mount Hamiguitan.

This current trend in land use decisions puts to light future investments on conserving KBA sections critical to biodiversity (e.g. nesting sites of critically endangered species, primary habitat of restricted-range species). We echo one of the lessons discussed in the CEPF 5 year Assessment for the Philippines where “regional conservation strategies should carefully review and explicitly consider the costs and benefits of prioritizing protected area network expansion over increasing the effectiveness of existing protected areas”. However, we recommend that strengthening the effectiveness of the biodiversity conservation component of existing tenures (e.g. CBFM, Ancestral Domains) and other management regimes (FLUP, Watershed Areas) should be considered as well. Additionally, investments for effective monitoring of environmental safeguards within IFMAs, TLAs and MPSAs by multi-stakeholders should be included too. These are important as the government seemed to be less likely to forego its commitments to these corporate resource users in favor of biodiversity conservation.

The EMBC Biodiversity Archiving Project (EMBCBAP) yielded convincing proof that KBAs across the EMBC (at least in 3 KBAs) are important biologically and ecologically. For example, Mount Hamiguitan, a relatively small KBA was found to harbor at least two new species of mammals. Researchers at the Field Museum of Natural History believe that Hamiguitan is a center for biological diversification by its own right. A similar case is most likely true for the rest of the KBAs. Scientific data is indeed available and an EMBC conservation framework will be out soon. Next crucial steps then include: 1) translate this information into better awareness and appreciation through education, training and advocacy among LGUs and Indigenous Communities (ICs) 2) for the EMBC framework to really work as a planning tool for the LGUs and the ICs, and 3) to install human welfare projects in the uplands wherein biodiversity conservation subsequently increase the quality of life of ICs.

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Dennis I. Salvador, Project Director
Organization name: Philippine Eagle Foundation
Mailing address: VAL Learning Village, Ruby St., Marfori Heights, 8000 Davao City
Tel: 06382-224-3021
Fax: 06382-224-3022
E-mail: djispldt@dsl.net