

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

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

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** *Establishing the Link between Biodiversity and Human Well-being: Developing a Suitable Framework under Philippine Conditions*

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** Major partner agencies at the national, regional and local level were from the government sector and civil society. The lead government agency was the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, particularly its units, the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB) and the Forest Management Bureau. Regional line agencies and local government units in Sierra Madre, Palawan and Eastern Mindanao Biodiversity Corridors were engaged: the National Economic Development Authority; provincial, municipal and barangay local government units (LGUs), particularly the planning and development offices. Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) were NORMINGOAL (a network), LEAF, SEDF, Philippine Eagle Foundation, PROCESS, CAVAPPED, and PNNI (a network). Other national-level agencies were the National Statistics Office; UP Population Institute; Resources, Environment and Economics Center for Studies, Inc.; Foundation for the Philippine Environment; Counterpart International. An alliance of agencies, also both government and non-governmental, are members of the Population, Health and Environment Network with close to thirty national member agencies.

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** 1 April 2006 to 30 November 2007

**Date of Report (month/year):** 4 December 2007

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The status of human dimensions is not yet well considered in direct and indirect conservation actions particularly in the Philippines because of weak institutions, gaps and conflicts in policy, and competing goals in development. Assessed as 117<sup>th</sup> in the global ranking in ecosystem and human well-being (out of 140 countries surveyed), the country's situation has to be addressed, but analyses and action frameworks have yet to be assessed, integrated, strengthened in science-based components, and efficiently articulated as well as disseminated to guide conservation actions.

The project is a trail-blazing effort in scaling up methodologies in conservation in several ways: (i) it adopts the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment framework in the Philippine setting, (ii) applies CI's pillars in conservation (science, human welfare and partnership) in advancing analytical frameworks that link the human dimensions with the environment, and (iii) recommends a human wellbeing strategy (approaches in actions). These aspects are integrated in the project results.

The success of the project is clearly recognized in the PAWB's acknowledgement of the major output, the Human Wellbeing Framework and Strategy, which through recent funding by the UNDP is currently being disseminated through a roadshow in the three corridors where CI-P operates.

### III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** *To develop concrete tools for CI and members of the conservation community, government and other donors that will lead to conservation and human well-being outcomes.*

#### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
<i>A set of biodiversity and human well-being indicators, including ecosystem services, examined in terms of access, and types, and information compiled in a database for three CI-P corridors by January 2007.</i>	Indicators of human wellbeing and links to biodiversity have been examined according to institutional availability, access for utilization, and efficient use by program developers and implementers. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and Status, Pressure and Responses
<i>A biodiversity and human well-being integration framework developed and validated by key partners in the three CI-P corridors in the Philippines by March 2007.</i>	<p>The human and ecosystem wellbeing analytical and action framework was successfully accomplished according to target schedule (with a no-cost extension up to June 2007). Key partners and stakeholders nationally and in each corridor validated sections as these are relevant to their respective mandates and scope of work as early as January 2007, then the integrated framework was launched by CI-P in June at the national level with over 100 stakeholders and agency representatives from the corridors.</p> <p>To facilitate widespread dissemination and training, the final product preparation for the human wellbeing framework and strategy is in different forms efficiently packaged for varied users, ranging from conceptual and methodological content to practical operational guidelines : (i) a full report in book form, (ii) summary of the strategy (action framework) in two fact sheets, issues and recommended actions in a (iii) 2-sheet poster and (iv) handy back-to-back field guide.</p>

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

Producing the analytical and action framework is a cutting-edge accomplishment of Conservation International-Philippines, being a unique and leading initiative easily accepted and adopted by partners from the national to the local level. The accomplishment assesses the handling of ecosystem-human wellbeing dynamics, specifies conservation and development links to explore how these may be addressed in action, and identifies as well as locates in the institutional structure the inherent issues in governance and management to be considered in conservation actions.

The comprehensive scope of the human wellbeing framework is the first and only attempt to connect human dimensions in conservation in the Philippines. The type of project is very crucial in the state of conservation initiatives in the country. Human well-being has been handled in a very segmented, disjointed, disparate mode and manner by many institutions, and often not related to environmental sustainability. Among agencies we interacted with, the idea of crafting a framework and strategy on human well-being is most welcome not only by the environment sector. Recognizing some resource constraints, partners and even not-yet-partners have been very supportive and helpful.

Knowledge of the situation in Philippine agencies and civil society groups guided the design of project activities and processes in both the work on indicators and human well-being programs. From accessing data sources to understanding the status and results of utilization, as well as ascertaining the strengths, limitations and gaps in selected human well-being domains of the agencies' programs and services, stakeholders (local communities, government agencies, NGOs) were engaged.

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

There were no unexpected negative impacts, but the value of the crafted framework and strategy which is getting recognized in the subsequent dissemination, with institutional support of PAWB and UNDP, is doubly unexpected too in a very positive way. The response of civil society is similarly very positive.

**IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS**

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

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<p><b>Output 1: Stocktaking of human well-being indicators used in previous studies and conservation initiatives, checked against the State-Pressure-Response and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Frameworks by January 2007.</b></p>	
<p><i>Identify, evaluate and prioritize human well-being indicators through literature review and consultations with conservation community by June 2006.</i></p>	<p>Human wellbeing indicators were reviewed in the literature of various agencies and consultations with their representatives (such as the UNDP, health sector and census-taking agencies under the National Statistical Board, poverty reduction units, universities and research units). Work on indicators for this project was connected as one of the major tasks of CIP under the Biodiversity Monitoring Alliance which integrates outcomes monitoring at the level of species, habitats, and human dimensions.</p> <p>For identification and evaluation, the review of literature, project reports, and primary data sets from official agencies (government) and consultations were completed in October 2006. Prioritization of indicators guided by the MA and SPR frameworks was reached in November 2006. Indicators from these sources were evaluated and iteratively prioritized up to November 2006. Time frame for completing this stage was extended on account differences in parameters of data generating agencies.</p>
<p><i>Establish consolidated benchmark indicators in the CI-P corridors (Sierra Madre, Palawan and Eastern Mindanao), for subsequent two-time period analysis on human well-being and ecosystem services, based on available data bases through</i></p>	<p>Finalization of a long list of human well-being indicators was reached in November 2006. The next step, the prioritization of indicators (for standardization as database) according to appropriateness and usefulness, had to be extended for several reasons : i. institutions</p>

<p><i>literature review and consultations by July 2006.</i></p>	<p>generating data are not the same and have different assumptions and parameters in the three corridors; ii. the corridor units have different data sets in their respective benchmarking initiatives; and iii. corridor units have yet to agree on the database coverage that this project will recommend.</p> <p>Lastly, the work of the CI technical units involved in M&amp;E of outcomes has been shelved pending availability of funding. The work on human well-being indicators is the only one that has been advanced through this project opportunity.</p> <p>The prioritized indicators were tested for availability, completeness and appropriateness relative to human well-being and ecosystem services beginning November 2006.</p> <p>The choice of indicators was further streamlined (to poverty indicators and forest cover) after testing in the corridors for two-time period analysis beginning December 2006; final write up is expected in end of April 2007.</p>
<p><i>Complete data gaps for the three corridors through survey and key informant interviews by November 2006.</i></p>	<p>Data gaps of baseline with improvement was completed in two corridors (Sierra Madre and Palawan) by December 2006. Benchmarking in Eastern Mindanao is a recent accomplishment, with the socio-economic coverage completed in May 2007.</p>
<p><i>Validate findings through focused group discussions/small workshops per corridor by January 2007.</i></p>	<p>Workshops, focused group discussions, interviews, brief semi-structured interviews in the three corridors were undertaken incessantly on field and during stakeholders meetings, fora, workshops and conferences, The validation was completed in February 2007.</p>
<p><b>Output 2: Develop an analytical and action framework (or human well-being strategy) linking biodiversity conservation and human well-being, as enhancement of the Corridor and Hotspot strategy of CIP by March 2007.</b></p>	
<p><i>Prioritize KBAs for the Sierra Madre, Palawan and Eastern Mindanao corridors for the case study component of human well being strategy development by June 2006, capturing exchanges across hierarchic levels from the barangay to municipal to the corridor-level.</i></p>	<p>Final decision on the KBA as case study was reached with corridor unit in November 2006. For the specific barangays, however, final recommendation by the corridor unit was achieved in the end of January 2007. Surfacing and completion of data for selected barangay level was achieved only in March 2007 because of (i.) constrains in institutional arrangements of data generators and (ii.) delays in corridor unit's choice of sites recommended for the case study.</p>
<p><i>Complete data gaps through survey, FGDs and key informant interviews by November 2006.</i></p>	<p>Gaps were completed in iterative process early on, but partnership with other agencies were maximized for enrichment of analyses of approaches especially with extensive exchanges on the Millennium Development Goals.</p>
<p><i>Prepare the human well-being framework paper by January 2007.</i></p>	<p>Field-level analysis of how human well-being is linked to conservation was completed in December 2006, validation with corridor unit for focus KBA (PPLS) was done in January 2007. Comparison in other corridors and beyond based on practices of partner agencies was also studied</p>

	to ensure that the human well-being framework being developed will be a distinct contribution of CIP.
<i>Validate the human well-being framework with agencies and stakeholders within the conservation community by February 2007.</i>	<p>Draft of the core framework in human well-being has been going through validation for applicability for CIP corridors up to February 2007 (beyond the level of focus KBA).</p> <p>Specific learnings from practices were integrated in the revised target output (a full paper). Issues in institutional mechanisms and policy required extended consultations with selected partners, which were continued up to mid-May 2007 toward finalizing the strategy formulation.</p>
<i>Develop/refine strategy by March 2007.</i>	<p>Drafting of the strategy proceeded with work on the framework in human well-being. Refinement of the draft strategy was advanced to surfacing specific project concepts from corridor units in January 2007.</p> <p>Further enrichment and validation of the draft strategy involved CEPF partners beyond the CIP focus sites as well as key national agencies and non-governmental organizations beyond CIP's partners; this exercise was extended up to mid-May.</p> <p>Targeted packet of strategy elements and practical guidelines were all successfully completed with unexpected but delivered outputs in the form of popular, summarized brochures or fact sheets, posters, a full book material</p>
<b>Output 3: Develop a training module for capacity building among key partners, to integrate human well-being and biodiversity conservation concerns by January 2007.</b>	
<i>Determine training needs of CIP staff and stakeholder groups in each corridor to generate appreciation of the human well-being strategy by October 2006.</i>	<p>The draft training module components were not completely selected in December 2006. Experiences across scales were analyzed in order to finalize the training design within an extended period up to February.</p> <p>The packet of materials for the training is being finalized up to mid-May 2007, for testing and finalization in the last two weeks of May.</p> <p>The training module will be finally launched in June 2007.</p>
<i>Engage CIP partners from government and civil society groups in the design of a training program toward integrating the human well-being strategy in the corridor management and work plans by January 2007.</i>	<p>Being sustained at the national and corridor levels by the unit in developing projects, enriching proposals, guidance to units and contracted experts.</p> <p>To ensure integration of conservation and human well-being, a national network (Population, Health and Environment) is co-facilitated in its programs related to research, IEC and capability building, policy advocacy, and resource mobilization. A 3rd National Conference of this network being convened by the unit is expanding the partnerships in human well-being and conservation.</p>
<b>Output 4: Leverage funds from human well-being/human development donors to invest in pilot KBAs in Sierra Madre and Palawan,</b>	

<b>implementing the integrated human well-being and biodiversity conservation strategy by March 2007</b>	
<i>Develop and submit human well-being and biodiversity conservation proposals to potential donors by February 2007.</i>	Project concept development and proposal preparation started in 2006. Discussions with corridor units was held in January 2007 as targeted.
<i>Organize meetings with donors to advocate the human well-being and biodiversity conservation strategy by March 2007.</i>	Proposals already developed by CIP included well-being and conservation linkages as major component. Those being crafted also sustain CIP's three pillars in conservation (science, human well-being and partnership).

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

Dissemination of Human Wellbeing Framework and Strategy in published form (launched in June 2007) started outside of CI-P in October and is very much welcome to partner agencies nationally. The published products were unexpected; the conservation community welcomes the materials. Research for a in at least four nationwide activities included presentations of the human wellbeing strategy, with at least two more recently requested.

Training at the operational level that has been requested by key formations in the corridors could not be widely provided within the project time frame because of limited resources. But recognition of the project's output is demonstrated in PAWB's official support with financial assistance from UNDP to widely disseminate the Human Wellbeing Strategy in a series of roadshows. Representatives of regional and provincial national agencies as well as the civil society sector who have participated express their interest in developing their own project initiatives to apply the recommended strategies in poverty reduction, stepped up sustainable financing to protect ecosystem services, improve ecosystem-based settlement management, and scaled up partnering.

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

None.

**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.***

1. The nature of the project (very methodological type of research project) to develop an analytical and action framework from past and on-going practices requires a longer time frame. The research needs at most two years (as originally proposed). This kind of project (research even if for use in M&E) is not readily engaged in by units with priority in implementation of their own projects.
2. The realistic funding is larger than what was allotted for the project for the work on indicators. What was supposedly a review of collated benchmark data was almost a separate research project in coverage, staff requirements, time, special meetings with institutions by CI units (in the corridors) and institutions (government units and agencies).

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

The project design allowed flexibility in focusing only at the level of case studies to select indicators based on two time-period analysis of benchmark data.

The requirement to hold a training on the developed strategy within the same year of crafting the action framework was a difficult requirement, for which reason the training was undertaken only at the last month of the project time frame. It was a positive turn that donors and partner agencies who participated in the national launching have extended unwavering support by giving assistance to subsequent dissemination and training activities (which are continuing).

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

Having an extensive network of partners that can be engaged in the intricate aspects of indicators research as well as the examination of what works positively or negatively in conservation actions is a plus factor why the project succeeded and delivered accepted products. CI-P management gives as much leeway and support as needed to achieve targets very well.

**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>
UNDP	C	\$ 19,500.00	Being used in dissemination and training (roadshow)
Members of PHE Network	C	\$ 3,575.00	Counterpart research
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	

**\*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.***

Sustaining partnership and institutional commitment within CIP to connect conservation and human dimensions - the application of the three pillars -- are basic in the approach of the organization. The human wellbeing framework and strategy will always be re-examined and updated since there are always new challenges that will surface .

## **VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Having regular updating and continuous scaling up are important in conservation and human wellbeing links, which all program designs must include (as components in implementation and in M&E).

## **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](http://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: Rowena Reyes-Boquiren

Organization name: Conservation International - Philippines

Mailing address: #6 Maaalalahanin St., Teachers Village, Diliman, Quezon City 1101  
Philippines

Tel: +632 433 5129; +632 433 8235

Fax: +632 436 6446

E-mail: [rboquiren@conservation.org](mailto:rboquiren@conservation.org)