

## The Rufford Foundation

### Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Small Grants Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to [jane@rufford.org](mailto:jane@rufford.org).

Thank you for your help.

**Josh Cole, Grants Director**

Grant Recipient Details	
Your name	Grace Quiton-Domingo
Project title	Partners in Conservation and Typhoon Resiliency: Equipping Local Resource Managers and Stakeholders in Southern Leyte, Philippines
RSG reference	17820-1
Reporting period	October 2015 to September 2016
Amount of grant	£4791
Your email address	<a href="mailto:gracequinton@gmail.com">gracequinton@gmail.com</a>
Date of this report	October 7, 2016

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
Participatory coastal resource mapping (PCRM). ORC will gather and assemble data on the locations and kinds of coastal resources in Silago, in a visual, accessible, GIS-supported map format.			Yes	With counterpart funding from Department of Tourism (DOT), we were able to conduct resource assessment not just in five coastal barangays (villages) as initially indicated in the proposal but also in six upland barangays. We now have a more comprehensive perspective of the situation of Silago with both upland and coastal resources and issues identified in the map.
Replication training for local data-gatherers and facilitators. During the participatory coastal assessment (e.g. FGDs and household interviews) will undergo training as replication facilitators and trainers.			Yes	The replication training for our four local trainees (who were also our workshop facilitators and data gatherers) has been successful mainly because of the training methods we used. These three methods are as follows: shadowing our technical/science experts, learning by doing technique, and conducting feedback and evaluation after every activity for the trainees to assess what worked and what needed to improve. (see more details below for the relevant outcomes of the achievement of this objective)
Networking forum–The proposed platform will bring the PALMDEV* Chair		Yes		We coordinated with the PALMDEV* Chair (Mayor of San Juan Municipality, the provincial PALMDEV focal person and members of the technical working group

network together to collaborate on the Silago PCRM, sharing resources, experience, and ideas throughout the process.				(TWG) of PALMDEV but not with all mayors of the six Pacific municipalities, as we had hoped. PALMDEV, with the newly elected mayors, still has yet to convene for the year. However, we were able to present the results of the assessments and consult with PALMDEV's TWG members (who are agricultural and fisheries technicians in other Pacific municipalities). In the recent MPA management planning workshop, they shared with the Silago resource managers their technical advice and recommendations based on their experiences in their respective municipalities.
--	--	--	--	--

\*PALMDEV stands for Pacific Alliance of Local Government Units for Marine Development Council

**2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).**

There were no major difficulties except for the delay that the project experienced due to the nationwide elections in the Philippines that was held in May 2016. While the project was completed within RSG's required time frame (1 year), we could have finished the project earlier - within 9 months as originally planned. Coordinating and networking with local officials especially with the mayors of the PALMDEV was not possible even before the elections as this was the campaign period. We also had to wait until July 2016, when the newly-elected mayors of the municipalities were officially installed into office, so we could resume the networking aspect of the project. Nevertheless, our RSG project has given us more than enough momentum to continue working with PALMDEV. ORC is now one of the official partners that are active in the PALMDEV network.

**3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.**

a. The results of the project have emphasized the uniqueness of Silago, ecologically and socially, confirming the urgent need for an integrated ridge-to-reef approach to the conservation of Silago. No other municipality in the province of Southern Leyte can showcase such a complete ecosystem, having the largest land area that accommodates the last remaining primary forests (Mt Nacolod), with a coastal area that has shown marked signs of recovery and improvement (through its MPAs) in the last four years. Silago also has communities that are open and willing to conservation especially if the right support and systems are in place. While its protected areas are threatened by human encroachment and beset with weak institutional coordination and unclear resource management plans, Silago is currently the top performer in the provincial government's greening forest programme, and its federation of people's organisation is emerging as a voice for participatory governance. This puts ORC, as a Silago-based conservation organisation, in such a crucial position. The responsibility to properly steer the direction of resource management and conservation in Silago has never so important and timely to us.

b. The response of Silago municipal government to our presentation of the assessment results and community resource map was positive and immediate. Two weeks after the feedback workshop, the Silago government conducted an MPA management planning in response to the MPA management issues identified by the community. PALMDEVG TWG members were invited to Silago to assist the MPA management teams craft clearer and more relevant management plans. The Silago municipal government also decided to increase the budget for Silago's Coastal Resource Management Plan (CRMP). Such a response clearly demonstrates what verifiable feedback can do for local resource managers.

c. The results of the replication training gave us more than what we expected. It proved to be an empowering experience for our four chosen local conservation champions who served as replicator trainees. In comparison to our previous capacity building programs where most of our activities were lectures and focus group discussions, the replication training was different. The transfer of skills (especially in data gathering and workshop facilitation) was "on-the job" and thus much more experiential and effective. Also, gathering data on site allowed the trainees to see for themselves the reality and the extent of the situation of their environment, and according to them, it had deepened and broadened their level

of understanding of and appreciation for conservation. My team in ORC is now looking at how the replication training can be integrated into our local champions programme that we are currently designing.

**4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project (if relevant).**

Besides the replication training for local data gathers (see 3c above), the participatory resource mapping and assessment was a great feedback and dialogue opportunity for both ORC team and the local community members. Rather than simply extracting information from the community, it was a chance for us to hear out their issues and opinions thereby strengthening rapport and community relations with them, while at the same, widening our understanding of the situation of community. The participatory resource assessment also community members to actively identify resource issues in their barangays and to call for a more careful and inclusive management planning of their respective MPAs. In turn, it helped the ORC team identify potential local champions in the communities, who are crucial for conservation to continue and to truly work on the ground.

**5. Are there any plans to continue this work?**

Yes, but we would like to put more of our focus and efforts in Silago before scaling it up to the rest of the Pacific municipalities.

**6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?**

I plan to share the results of my work through the following:-

- Presentation of results in stakeholders' meeting and seminars across different sectors (municipal disaster risk management, tourism, solid waste management and agriculture and fisheries).
- Bulletin board that will be shown in a public event (festivals, town anniversaries, etc.).
- ORC's social media.

**7. Timescale: Over what period was the RSG used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?**

The RSG was used for one year, but we would have finished it at a shorter time (9 months) as originally planned, if it weren't for the project delay caused by the national election that was held in May 2016 (see # 2 for more details).

**8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.**

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
MPA Assessment - Tank fillings- electricity, tank maintenance, compressor maintenance (56 tanks)	204	220.60958	-16.61	
MPA Assessment - Land transport and boat rental (3 weeks)	175	175.53614	-0.54	
MPA Assessment - dive team (subsistence, professional fee and gear maintenance at 50 GBP/week, for 3 weeks, 2 divers)	300	428.27286	-128.27	
MPA Assessment - Supplies/materials	15	0	15.00	
<i>Subtotal</i>	694	824.41858	-130.42	Due to rough weather conditions, the MPA assessments took longer than expected
Manta Tow - Land transport and boat rental	50	0	50.00	

(1 wk.)				
Manta Tow - Snorkeling team (subsistence and professional fee at 40 GBP/week, for 1 wk., 2 scientists)	80	0	80.00	
Manta Tow - Supplies / materials	15	0	15.00	
	145		145.00	We decided not to do any manta tow as we felt the MPA underwater assessment and the PCRA had already given us enough data. We used the £ 145 here to cover for the extra costs in the MPA underwater assessment.
MPA Management Survey - transport (2 wks.)	15	14.513788	0.49	
MPA Management Survey - interviewer (subsistence and professional fee at 30 GBP/week, 2 wks., 1 interviewer)	60	58.055152	1.94	
To MPA Management Survey - supplies/materials	70	65.312046	4.69	
<i>Subtotal</i>	145	137.88099	7.12	
Orientation workshop with local government unit - transport	3	1.850508	1.15	
Orientation workshop with local government unit - catering	0	0	0.00	
Orientation workshop with local government unit - supplies/materials	3	0.5442671	2.46	

Orientation workshop with local government unit - facilitator (subsistence, professional fee, and facilitator's fee at 36 GBP/week- 1 wk., 1 facilitator, 1 workshop/wk.)	36	34.833091	1.17	
<i>Subtotal</i>	42	37.227866	4.77	
PCRA FGD - transport (2 sessions)	5	18.867925	-13.87	
PCRA FGD - participants allowance (50 pax)	201	216.25544	-15.26	
PCRA FGD - subsistence payment, professional fee, and facilitator's fee at 36 GBP/week- 2 wks., 2 facilitators, 1 workshop/week)	144	146.98113	-2.98	
PCRA FGD - supplies/materials (2 sessions)	30	16.255443	13.74	
PCRA FGD - venue (2 sessions)		0		
PCRA FGD- meals for facilitators (2 sessions)	14	4.3541364	9.65	
<i>Subtotal</i>	394	402.71408	-8.71	
PCRA Household Interviews - supplies/materials	22	18.417997	3.58	
PCRA Household Interviews - interviewers (subsistence and professional fee at 50 GBP/week- 2 wks., 3 interviewers, avg. 12 households/day)	300	307.38752	-7.39	
<i>Subtotal</i>	322	325.80552	-3.81	
PCRA site verification - transportation- 1 wk.	10	7.5036284	2.50	



PCRA site verification - science team (subsistence and professional fee at 30 GBP/per week- 1 wk., 2 scientists)	60	76.05225	-16.05	
PCRA site verification - supplies/materials (5 sessions)	18	0	18.00	
PCRA site verification - participants allowance (25 pax)	50.5	48.476052	2.02	
PCRA site verification - expert's fee (1 session)	30	29.027576	0.97	
<i>Subtotal</i>	168.5	161.05951	7.44	
Feedback and reporting workshop LGU - transportation (1 wk.)	10	9.4339623	0.57	
Feedback and reporting workshop LGU -facilitator (subsistence, professional fee, and facilitator's fee at 36 GBP/week- 1 wk., 1 facilitator, 1 workshop/wk.)	36	40.870827	-4.87	
Feedback and reporting workshop LGU - catering (15 pax)		0	0.00	
Feedback and reporting workshop LGU - supplies/materials (1 session)	10	8.6175617	1.38	
<i>Subtotal</i>	56	58.922351	-2.92	
Neighborhood IEC - MPA tarps (5 tarps)	36	34.90566	1.09	
Neighborhood IEC - local graphic designer professional fee at 6 GBP/tarp, for 5 tarps	30	43.541364	-13.54	

Neighborhood IEC- local content developer fee at 6 GBP/tarp, for 5 tarps	30	43.541364	-13.54	
Neighborhood IEC- facilitator (subsistence, professional fee, and facilitator's fee at 40 GBP/week, for 2 wks., 2 facilitators, 2.5 workshops/week	180	170.50798	9.49	
<i>Subtotal</i>	276	292.49637	-16.50	Instead of producing MPA tarps, we made a bulletin board to present the resource map and the key results of all assessments for with local resource managers as our target audience. The results of the MPA management survey had shown that the community members are generally are supportive of protected areas, but the management councils (especially MPAs') had a weak understanding of the status of their coastal resources and their management systems.
PALMDEV workshops - venue (3 sessions)	0	0	0.00	
PALMDEV workshop - transportation (3 sessions)	8.5	7.256894	1.24	
PALMDEV workshop (3		0	0.00	

sessions) - catering				
PALMDEV workshop (3 sessions) - supplies/materials	16	14.484761	1.52	
PALMDEV workshops - facilitator (subsistence, professional fee, and facilitation fee at 36 GBP PF- 3 wks., 2 facilitators, 1 workshop/week)	216	229.20174	-13.20	
<i>Subtotal</i>	240.5	250.9434	-10.44	
Operational and administrative expenses	0		0.00	
Communication (mobile, internet)	305	307.28592	-2.29	
Office utility expenses (electricity, printing, office supplies)	305	302.27925	2.72	
Project Coordinator Subsistence allowance (food, cooking fuel, transportation, insurance, miscellaneous living expenses)	1219	1214.7363	4.26	
Local GIS Mapping expert	436	436	0.00	
Contingencies (5%)	250	236.71988	13.28	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4998</b>	<b>2497.0213</b>	<b>9.51</b>	

(Exchange rate: 1 GBP=68.9 Php)

## 9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

- Strengthen coordination with existing partners especially those doing reforestation and upland projects in Mt Nacolod.
- Compile all other existing data (especially on the status of biodiversity of Mt Nacolod) to get a more in-depth and comprehensive perspective of the Silago ecosystem.

- Conduct a creative and relevant public campaign and awareness for Silago community members with the aim of enhancing their knowledge and appreciation of their unique natural assets and resources.
- Determine different ways to open up more opportunities for feedback of assessment results and dialogue with local resource managers and stakeholders.
- Plan how the replication training (in data gathering and facilitation) can be further developed and extended to other potential local champions in Silago.
- Determine how people's organizations of farmers and fisherfolk, especially the leaders, can expand their roles as partners in resource management and conservation in Silago, alongside the municipal local government.

**10. Did you use the RSGF logo in any materials produced in relation to this project?  
Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?**

Yes, (1) in the presentation of the project to the Silago municipality and PALMDEV, (2) in the presentation of the results to Silago local resource managers and PALMDEV, and (3) in ORC's website and Facebook page ([www.oceanactionresourcecenter.org](http://www.oceanactionresourcecenter.org), [www.facebook.com/oceanaction](https://www.facebook.com/oceanaction))