

Please provide the following details on the origin of this report

Contracting Party	PHILIPPINES
National Focal Point	
Full name of the institution:	Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Name and title of contact officer:	Wilfrido S. Pollisco Director
Mailing address:	Ninoy Aquino Parks and Wildlife Nature Center, Quezon Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines
Telephone:	(63)(2) 924-6031
Fax:	(63)(2) 924-0109
E-mail:	<u>pawb-plan@psdn.org.ph</u>
Contact officer for national report (if different)	
Full name of the institution:	
Name and title of contact officer:	
Mailing address:	
Telephone:	
Fax:	
E-mail:	
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting national report:	
Date of submission:	

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material which was used as a basis for the report

The Second Philippine National Report to the CBD went through the tedious preparation process consisting of research, survey and interviews, meetings, workshops, and several levels of public consultation. Below are the details of said process:

1. Review of CBD Guidelines for the National Report Preparation and the National Reporting Format

The CBD Guidelines for the Preparation of the Second National Report to the CBD was reviewed and modified to suit national processes.

The format for the National Report has also been reviewed and taken into account in the preparation of the data gathering instruments and workshop/consultation designs.

2. Review of relevant national documents

Relevant key national documents were also reviewed including the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), Philippine Agenda 21 (PA 21), Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP), among others.

3. Preparation of data gathering instruments, interview schedules, workshop and consultation designs

Two forms were designed to capture national initiatives on biodiversity conservation and to have a preliminary assessment of the country's NBSAP. Another matrix used was the framework recommended in the Guidelines which was designed to assess implementation of specific articles for the prescribed time period.

4. Data gathering and processing activities

A listing of respondents covering representations from all stakeholders were drawn up from existing list databases. The initial list of respondents was about 75 individuals and organizations active in biodiversity work. The list was enriched by additional recommendations during interviews, meetings, and consultations. The survey questionnaires were sent and retrieved after 2-3 weeks.

5. Meetings, Workshops, Consultations

After the data was processed, the Technical Working Group based at the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau met to set the dates of meetings and consultations that would seek to validate the results of the preliminary assessment. The levels of consultations were as follows:

- a) Philippine Council for Sustainable Development - Sub-Committee on Biodiversity

This is a multi-sectoral body that was tasked to function as the Drafting Committee of the National Report Preparation. The Sub-Com, as it is popularly known, met a number of times to discuss the national reporting process, decide and approve the consultation/workshop design, formulate the criteria for prioritization of the implementation of CBD articles and review the list of survey respondents.

In a 2-day workshop, the Sub-Com, along with the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB) prepared the working documents that

were used for the Consultations including the preliminary NBSAP Assessment and the CBD Implementation Assessment, and the initial version of the National Report.

b) Regional Consultations

To capture regional and local inputs, consultations were held covering the three major clusters or island groups namely Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. At each of these consultations, eminent persons are invited to provide guidance and to act as resource persons in the discussions.

c) National Consultation

The outputs of the Sub-Com and the regional consultations were consolidated and processed. These were presented in the National Consultation held in Metro Manila for purposes of rationalization, validation, and adoption. To ensure transparency of the process, regional participants are represented in this national forum. Members of the Sub-Committee on Biological Diversity were also at the National Consultation as well as representatives of the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development.

Please provide information on any particular circumstances in your country that are relevant to understanding the answers to the questions in this report

Scope and Limitations of the Second National Report

Aside from time and financial constraints, not to mention the changes in the national administration that the country went through for the past three to four years, the following are the scope, limitations, and challenges that confronted the preparation of this Second National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity:

Time Period Covered by the Report

This Report takes off from where the First National Report left off. It covers activities undertaken to implement the relevant provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity from 1998 to 2001. Since this Report is being submitted after the deadline but in time for the Sixth Conference of the Parties in April 2002, it took advantage of reporting significant activities that occurred in the first quarter of 2002.

Although the report covers a specific time period, there are instances when activities reported in the First National Report are again mentioned to provide background, context, and/or point of comparison. This is also true when activities are anchored on relevant legislation or policies that were enacted earlier but are still the basis for such action, or when the initiative is a continuing one that has extended even after the cut off for the First National Report.

Sources of Information and Data Processing

In the preparation of this Report, key national documents were reviewed including the Philippine Agenda 21 (PA21), the Philippine Medium Term

Development Plan (MTPDP), the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), other national strategies and action plans, relevant policies and legislation, and numerous agency/organizational annual/accomplishment reports. Specific information on initiatives came from stakeholders themselves who were respondents to the survey questionnaire earlier administered. Further, verification of information was done through personal or telephone interviews, email messages, and through the meetings, workshops, and consultations. The data gathering process had been very tedious since there is no monitoring and reporting mechanism in place that would have made this process a lot easier. Aside from time constraints, data collection and processing had been limited by the fact that information at the source is also not in a format that could be readily accessed for this purpose. Almost all sources had to go through the tedious task of going through voluminous reports to comply with the reporting requirements necessary to produce this Report. The Report heavily relied on what information were available at the time this was being prepared. It is therefore recommended a monitoring and reporting process be immediately put in place so that updating of this Report could be done continuously and in a more systematic manner. This will greatly facilitate future National Report preparation.

Responses to the Questions in the National Report Format

The answers reflected in this Final Version of the National Report represent the harmonized responses from the different stakeholders that were consulted nationwide. The output of the meetings and workshops of the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development Sub-Committee on Biological Diversity for purposes of drafting the report served as the working documents of the various consultations. Although the responses from the various consultations were most of the time in agreement, there were instances when the responses differ. In cases like these, the national consultation became the venue for the resolution of a response. It was observed that regional differences most of the time stem from lack of information. Most issues were resolved at the national consultation since the forum had a more macro perspective than the other consultations, and since information is more readily available at this level.

To determine the level of priority in terms of implementation of each of the CBD Articles, a set of criteria was formulated for purposes of uniformity and comparability.

- 1.0 Law (was there a law enacted to support the implementation of the Article) - 20 points

Explanation: The perfect score is 20 points. The article can be rated from a range of 0 to 20. For example, if a law has been enacted, this criterion will be given 20 points. If however, the proposed act or law had been shelved for the past 4 years, it can be given a 0 rating. If the proposed bill is in process or has gone through readings in Congress, then it can be given a score of anywhere between 1 and 19 depending on the what stage the document is currently in.

- 2.0 Executive Order, Implementing Rules and Regulations, Administrative Order, Memorandum Order or Memorandum Circular among others (were any of these measures issued to support the implementation of the Article?) - 20 points

Explanation: The perfect score is 20 points. The article can be rated from a range of 0 to 20. For example, if an Executive Order, Implementing Rules and Regulations, Administrative Order, Memorandum

Order or Memorandum Circular among others was issued to support the implementation of the Article, then this criterion will be given 20 points. If however, no executive or administrative measures or guidelines were issued to support the implementation of the Article, then this criterion could be given a score of 0. If the proposed measure is in process, then it can be given a score anywhere between 1 to 19, depending on what stage of processing the document is currently in.

- 3.0 Budget (was there budget for the implementation of this Article?)- 20 points

Explanation: The perfect score is 20 points. The article can be rated from a range of 0 to 20. For example, if budget has been allocated and released, then the implementation of this Article is given 20 points. If there was no budget allocation, then the score is 0. If budget had been allocated but releases have been slow then it can be given a score anywhere between 1 to 19.

- 4.0 National plans and programs (is the implementation of the Article covered in any of the national plans and programs, e.g. PA 21, MTPDP, NBSAP, Wetlands Action Plan Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act, National Physical Framework Plan)- 20 points

Explanation: The perfect score is 20 points. The article can be rated from a range of 0 to 20. For example, if it is included as a priority in any of the national plans and programs, then it can be given a score of 20. If it is not a priority in any of the major national plans and programs, a 0 rating can be assigned. If the initiative is only implied or subsumed in another priority activity, the implementation of this Article can be given a score of anywhere between 1 and 19.

- 5.0 Project implementation (were there projects implemented in relation to the implementation of this Article?) - 20 points

Explanation: The perfect score is 20 points. The article can be rated from a range of 0 to 20. For example, if there are projects/activities that support the implementation of the article, then it can be given a score of 20. If there are no projects or activities being implemented for the period under review, a 0 rating can be assigned. If the initiative is only implied or subsumed in another activity, the implementation of this Article can be given a score of anywhere between 1 and 19.

After each of the criteria has been assigned a rating, the scores are then added. Below are the total scores and the level of priority given by the country to the implementation of an Article:

Total score of 80 above	- High Priority
Total score of 60 to 79	- Medium Priority
Total score of 40 to 59	- Low Priority
Total score of 40 below	- Not Relevant

The assignment of rating between 0 to 20 is highly based on judgement call. This is justified since the stakeholders that participated in the consultation workshops are assumed to be knowledgeable in the field of biodiversity in the country. Further, the consultation-workshops were participated in by some eminent persons who provided guidance during the proceedings. The assignment of rating is first done by small groups during a

workshop then presented and discussed in plenary. The above criteria is far from perfect but it served its purpose of assessing priorities in the implementation of the CBD Articles. It is hoped that this could later be refined to facilitate ease of reporting in the future.

The COP has established programmes of work that respond to a number of Articles. Please identify the relative priority accorded to each theme and the adequacy of resources. This will allow subsequent information on implementation of each Article to be put into context. There are other questions on implementation of the programmes of work at the end of these guidelines.

Inland water ecosystems

1. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?	
a) High	
b) Medium	
c) Low	X
d) Not relevant	
2. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting	

Marine and coastal biological diversity

3. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?	
a) High	X
b) Medium	
c) Low	
d) Not relevant	
4. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting	

Agricultural biological diversity

5. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?	
a) High	
b) Medium	
c) Low	X
d) Not relevant	

6. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting	

Forest biological diversity

7. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?	
a) High	X
b) Medium	
c) Low	
d) Not relevant	
8. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting	

Biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands

9. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?	
a) High	
b) Medium	
c) Low	
d) Not relevant	X
10. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	
d) Severely limiting	

Further comments on work programmes and priorities

Article 5 Cooperation

11. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?					
a) High	X	b) Medium		c) Low	
12. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting					
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					
<p>The Government places high priority on cooperation with other Contracting Parties. This is evidenced by the fact that one of the main strategies under the Philippine NBSAP is to advocate stronger international cooperation on biodiversity conservation through a) the fulfilment of Philippine commitments to international agreements and the related creation of oversight institutions; b) strengthening of NGO linkages with their international counterparts; c) establishment of the ASEAN Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation; and, d) establishment of a pool of Filipino experts in biodiversity. However, it is noted that the resources (financial and technical) are not enough to meet the demands of carrying out activities that would enable the country to meet its commitments and obligations to the CBD.</p> <p>Aside from the CBD, the Philippines is signatory to the various international conventions and other international agreements that are concerned with the conservation of biodiversity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals • Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna • Convention on Wetlands of International Importance • ASEAN Working Group on Nature Conservation and Biodiversity 					
13. Is your country actively cooperating with other Parties in respect of areas beyond national jurisdiction for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity?					
a) bilateral cooperation (please give details below)					X
b) international programmes (please give details below)					X
c) international agreements (please give details below)					X

Decision IV/4. Status and trends of the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems and options for conservation and sustainable use

14. Has your country developed effective cooperation for the sustainable management of transboundary watersheds, catchments, river basins and migratory species through bilateral and multilateral agreements?	
a) no	X
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not applicable	

Decision IV/15. The relationship of the CBD with the CSD and biodiversity-related conventions, other international agreements, institutions and processes or relevance

15. Has your country developed management practices for transboundary protected areas?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	X
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not relevant	

Decision V/21. Co-operation with other bodies

16. Has your country collaborated with the International Biodiversity Observation Year of DIVERSITAS, and ensured complementarity with the initiative foreseen to be undertaken by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity to increase scientific knowledge and public awareness of the crucial role of biodiversity for sustainable development?	
a) no	X
b) to a limited extent	
c) to a significant extent	

Decision V/27. Contribution of the Convention on Biological Diversity to the ten-year review of progress achieved since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development

17. Is your country planning to highlight and emphasize biological diversity considerations in its contribution to the ten-year review of progress since the Earth Summit?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

For the past four years (1998-2001), the Philippines has undertaken biodiversity conservation initiatives that were supported by grants from bilateral, multilateral, and other funding sources. Below are some of the details regarding these activities:

a) Bilateral Cooperation

- o Biodiversity Research Programme for Development in Mindanao: Focus on Mount Malindang and Environs, funded by the Ministry for Development Cooperation of the Netherlands

This project aims to build the capacity for local communities, government, academe, and other stakeholders to promote and undertake the sustainable use of biological resources and effective decision-making on biodiversity conservation.

- o New Zealand Development Assistance Philippines National Ecotourism Strategy Project

The project is based on a three-year programme of technical assistance to the Government of the Philippines between January 2001 to December 2003. The Philippines National Ecotourism Project stems from the Philippine Government Executive Order 111 issued in 1999 which calls for the preparation of a National Ecotourism Strategy. The EO also established the framework for the preparation and implementation of the National Ecotourism strategy. This included a formal Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Tourism and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. It also established a National Ecotourism Development Council, a National Ecotourism Steering Committees an Ecotourism Technical Working Group and Regional Ecotourism Committees.

The New Zealand programme of assistance is focused on four key areas:

- 1) assistance with the preparation of the National Ecotourism Strategy
- 2) assistance with building capacity of the Ecotourism Technical Working Group
- 3) Identification of a network of key ecotourism sites in the Philippines
- 4) Assistance with the provision of technical assistance to selected ecotourism projects.

- o Turtle Islands Heritage Protected Area (TIHPA)

Joint management of the Turtle Islands Heritage Protected Areas (TIHPA) which is the world's first transfrontier PA for marine turtles and the only major rookery of green turtles in the ASEAN region. The TIHPA is composed of six islands from the Philippines (Baguan, Langaan, Taganak, Great Nakkungan, Lihiman, and Boan) and three islands from Malaysia (Selingan, Gulisaan, and Bakkungan Kenchil).

- o Nordic Agency for Development and Ecology Technical Assistance for Improving Biodiversity Conservation in Protected Areas in the Philippines (NORDECO-TABC)

The Government of Denmark through the NORDECO is providing technical assistance on biodiversity conservation to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and Northern Sierra Madre Natural Park in Isabela Province. The Project aims to improve conservation and

participatory resource management and capacitate Protected Area staff, PA Management Board, local decision-makers and local communities in this aspect; and institutionalize a Biodiversity Monitoring System and develop capacity of PA staff to implement it.

- o Support to the Implementation of Executive Order 247 re: Bioprospecting and its Implementing Rules and Regulations Project

This project which is supported by the German Agency for Technical Cooperation is being implemented to strengthen the technical capability of the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau and the decision-making capacity of the Inter-Agency Committee on Biological and Genetic Resources (IACBGR) in the implementation of Executive Order 247 and to define important provisions of EO 247 such as sharing of benefits, payment of bioprospecting fees, setting of guidelines for bonds and royalties for its effective implementation.

b) Multilateral Cooperation

- o Conservation of Priority Protected Area Project (CPPAP)

The CPPAP is pilot testing the NIPAS Law in the first ten priority sites identified in the IPAS Final Report. The project has four major components: a) site development; b) resource management; c) socio-economic management; and, d) technical assistance, monitoring, and coordination. Designed to involve local organizations in its implementation, the DENR is executing the project in collaboration with the NIPA, Inc., a consortium of 18 local NGOS engaged in development, environment and social preparation activities. This project is due for completion in June 2002 and has a budget of US\$20 million, financed by the Global Environment Facility through the World Bank.

- o National Integrated Protected Areas Project (NIPAP)

Though similar to the CPPAP in that it espouses *in-situ* conservation as a major strategy to conserve biodiversity, this project differs in project management and strategies. In this project, a European Co-Director and a local Project Director have the full authority to decide on the financial and operational matter provided that the National Program and Policy Steering Committee (NPPSC) initially approves the Annual Work and Financial Plan.

The sites selected for the NIPAP-EU are: Mount Guiting-Guiting Natural Park; Mount Pulag; Mount Isarog; Mount Iglit-Baco and Mount Malindang National Parks; Coron Island; Malampaya Sound; and El Nido Marine Reserve. The Project was completed in December 2001 with a total funding of US\$15.4 million.

- o Samar Island Biodiversity Project (SIBP)

SIBP envisions to establish the Samar Island Natural Park (SINP), covering a core area of 347,000 hectares of natural forests and about 123,000 hectares of buffer zone. The project area covers about 189 barangays in 35 municipalities in the three provinces of the island.

The new protected area will be zoned for multiple uses centering on protection, but providing for conservation-compatible livelihood opportunities such as sustainable harvests of non-timber forest products, ecotourism and sustainable farming. It will institute a comprehensive range of ancillary conservation measures to insulate the park from human pressures. Park management would be operationalized in partnership with forest-edge communities with the aim of establishing a "social fence" against threats. Interventions will strengthen

participatory planning, process-response monitoring, surveillance and enforcement functions, and enhance the conservation management capacities of the communities. It will impart conservation values to the wider Samareño society to backstop advocacy operations.

The project implementation will be in two phases, each with 4 years duration with a total funding of US\$5,809,407.00.

- o National Biodiversity Conservation Priority Setting Project for the Philippines

This activity was aimed to identify, assess, and prioritize specific geographic areas with high biodiversity values that can be given priority when allocating resources and strengthening partnerships.

- o Coastal Resources Management Project (CRMP)

CRMP is working at the national level to improve formulation and implementation of a national coastal resource management policy, and at the local level through participatory assessment, planning and implementation of coastal resource management plans.

c) International Programs / International Agreements

- o Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

As an ASEAN-member nation, the Philippines for the past four years had been active in its biodiversity conservation programs. Among the important activities undertaken under this partnership are a) the establishment of links and cooperation through the ASEAN Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation; and, b) chairing the meeting of the ASEAN Working Group on Nature Conservation and Biodiversity (AWGNCB) held in Malaysia in July 17-18, 2001.

- o Other International Agreements

The country also tries to enhance and strengthen cooperation with other Parties through other international agreements where it is a Party specifically the Convention on Migratory Species, Ramsar Convention, CITES, among others. It has developed effective cooperation for the sustainable management of migratory species through bilateral and multilateral agreements. Aside from being a Party to the aforementioned agreements, the Philippines has bilateral agreements with Malaysia on the establishment of the Turtle Island Heritage Protected Area.

Article 6 General measures for conservation and sustainable use

18. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?					
a) High	X	b) Medium		c) Low	
19. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting					
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					
<p>For the period covered by this Report, the implementation of this Article was given high priority by the Philippines. As stated in the First National Report, the Philippines has a clear policy on biodiversity conservation and that the general measures for its conservation and sustainable use is explicitly stated in the Philippine Agenda 21. The country also has completed its Country Study on Biodiversity and has developed and adopted its national biodiversity strategy and action plan (NBSAP). These were all reported in the First National Report.</p> <p>In terms of the availability of resources for the implementation of this Article, it is still limiting considering that the country is one of the world's hottest of hotspots in terms of biodiversity. Major support for biodiversity conservation in the country for the past four years consisted mostly of previous assistance for the CPPAP and NIPAP. One major project that commenced in 2001 is the Samar Island Biodiversity Project (SIBP) with a total funding of US\$5,809.470.00 from the UNDP-GEF.</p>					

20. What is the status of your national biodiversity strategy (6a)?	
a) none	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) completed ₁	
e) completed and adopted ₂	X
f) reports on implementation available	X
21. What is the status of your national biodiversity action plan (6a)?	
a) none	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) completed ₂	
e) completed and adopted ₂	X
f) reports on implementation available	X
22. Do your national strategies and action plans cover all articles of the Convention (6a)?	
a) some articles only	

1/ Please provide information requested at the end of these guidelines.

b) most articles	X
c) all articles	
23. Do your national strategies and action plans cover integration of other sectoral activities (6b)?	
a) no	
b) some sectors	
c) all major sectors	X
d) all sectors	

Decision II/7 and Decision III/9 Consideration of Articles 6 and 8

24. Is action being taken to exchange information and share experience on the national action planning process with other Contracting Parties?	
a) little or no action	
b) sharing of strategies, plans and/or case-studies	X
c) regional meetings	X
25. Do all of your country's strategies and action plans include an international cooperation component?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
26. Are your country's strategies and action plans coordinated with those of neighbouring countries?	
a) no	
b) bilateral/multilateral discussions under way	
c) coordinated in some areas/themes	X
d) fully coordinated	
e) not applicable	
27. Has your country set measurable targets within its strategies and action plans?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) programme in place	
e) reports on implementation available	
If a developing country Party or a Party with economy in transition -	
28. Has your country received support from the financial mechanism for the preparation of its national strategy and action plan?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
If yes, which was the Implementing Agency (UNDP/UNEP/World Bank)?	UNDP, UNEP

Decisions III/21. Relationship of the Convention with the CSD and biodiversity-related conventions

29. Are the national focal points for the CBD and the competent authorities of the Ramsar Convention, Bonn Convention and CITES cooperating in the implementation of these conventions to avoid duplication?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Status of NBSAP Implementation -

The Philippine NBSAP was adopted in 1997. A directive to integrate the strategies and action plan into the sectoral plans and programs of government agencies was issued by then President Fidel V. Ramos through a Memorandum Order. Said directive also instructed government offices to "submit a report on the status of your compliance to my office, through the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development and copy furnished the Executive Secretary and the Head, Presidential Management Staff, not later than 30 July 1997." As of 1998 as stated in the First National Report, integration of the strategies and action plans into sectoral programs were in progress.

While the strategies were broad enough to allow ease of integration, the identified priority projects were too specific. The national planning agency had been using the NBSAP as the main reference document for approving and rationalizing projects and proposals on biodiversity. However, because the identified priority projects were too specific, projects are mainly evaluated based on the general strategies.

Further, as mentioned in the First National Report, there is a need to come up with a clear-cut mechanism for its implementation. The directive issued by President Ramos did not specify clear-cut procedures and feedback mechanisms that would have institutionalized the integration of biodiversity strategies and actions plans into agency programs. Thus, there is a need to define tasking, funding mechanism/source, and time frame.

To fully implement the NBSAP, it is imperative that the NBSAP be reviewed taking into consideration national priorities and commitments to the CBD. It is noted that not all commitments to the CBD are clearly addressed by the NBSAP. In doing so, indicators for monitoring and evaluation have to be established to ensure that the NBSAP is being implemented as planned and that it remains a living document.

Article 7 Identification and monitoring

30. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
31. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>One of the main strategies in the Philippine National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan is stated as "Expanding and Improving Knowledge on the extent, characteristics, uses and values" which promotes the objective of this Article. The Philippines' First National Report to the CBD reported that as of 1998, there has been limited work in basic inventory of the country's biological diversity. Four years after, initiatives to come up with a comprehensive inventory of the country's biological diversity has not taken off in the desired manner due to several reasons. These include lack of financial resources, lack of clear-cut priorities in taxonomic research, and lack of indicators for systematic monitoring of activities and its effects on biodiversity, among others. Further, in the last five (5) years or so, Executive Order 247 has made collecting activities for taxonomic purposes difficult.</p>							

32. Does your country have an ongoing inventory programme at species level (7a)?	
a) minimal activity	
b) for key groups (such as threatened or endemic species) or indicators	X
c) for a range of major groups	X
d) for a comprehensive range of species	
33. Does your country have an ongoing inventory programme at ecosystem level (7a)?	
a) minimal activity	
b) for ecosystems of particular interest only	
c) for major ecosystems	X
d) for a comprehensive range of ecosystems	
34. Does your country have an ongoing inventory programme at genetic level (7a)?	
a) minimal activity	
b) minor programme in some sectors	X
c) major programme in some sectors	
d) major programme in all relevant sectors	

35. Does your country have ongoing monitoring programmes at species level (7a)?	
a) minimal activity	
b) for key groups (such as threatened or endemic species) or indicators	X
c) for a range of major groups	X
d) for a comprehensive range of species	
36. Does your country have ongoing monitoring programmes at ecosystem level (7b)?	
a) minimal activity	
b) for ecosystems of particular interest only	X
c) for major ecosystems	X
d) for a comprehensive range of ecosystems	
37. Does your country have ongoing monitoring programmes at genetic level (7b)?	
a) minimal activity	X
b) minor programme in some sectors	X
c) major programme in some sectors	
d) major programme in all relevant sectors	
38. Has your country identified activities with adverse affects on biodiversity (7c)?	
a) limited understanding	
b) threats well known in some areas, not in others	X
c) most threats known, some gaps in knowledge	X
d) comprehensive understanding	
e) reports available	
39. Is your country monitoring these activities and their effects (7c)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of programme development	X
c) advanced stages of programme development	X
d) programme in place	
e) reports on implementation available	X
40. Does your country coordinate information collection and management at the national level (7d)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of programme development	X
c) advanced stages of programme development	
d) programme in place	
e) reports on implementation available	

Decision III/10 Identification, monitoring and assessment

41. Has your country identified national indicators of biodiversity?	
a) no	
b) assessment of potential indicators underway	X
c) indicators identified (if so, please describe below)	
42. Is your country using rapid assessment and remote sensing techniques?	
a) no	
b) assessing opportunities	X
c) yes, to a limited extent	X
d) yes, to a major extent	
e) reports on implementation available	X
43. Has your country adopted a "step-by-step" approach to implementing Article 7 with initial emphasis on identification of biodiversity components (7a) and activities having adverse effects on them (7c)?	
a) no	
b) not appropriate to national circumstances	
c) yes	X
44. Is your country cooperating with other Contracting Parties on pilot projects to demonstrate the use of assessment and indicator methodologies?	
a) no	
b) yes (if so give details below)	X
45. Has your country prepared any reports of experience with application of assessment methodologies and made these available to other Contracting Parties?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
46. Is your country seeking to make taxonomic information held in its collections more widely available?	
a) no relevant collections	
b) no action	
c) yes (if so, please give details below)	X

Decision V/7. Identification, monitoring and assessment, and indicators

47. Is your country actively involved in co-operating with other countries in your region in the field of indicators, monitoring and assessment?	
a) no	
b) limited co-operation	X
c) extensive co-operation on some issues	
d) extensive co-operation on a wide range of issues	

48. Has your country made available case studies concerning the development and implementation of assessment, monitoring and indicator programmes?	
a) no	X
b) yes - sent to the Secretariat	
c) yes - through the national CHM	
d) yes - other means (please specify)	

49. Is your country assisting other Parties to increase their capacity to develop indicator and monitoring programmes?	
a) no	X
b) providing training	
c) providing direct support	
d) sharing experience	
e) other (please describe)	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Inventory Programs

Most of the work done on inventory for the past four years were components of bigger projects. Examples are:

- Biodiversity Research Programme for Development in Mindanao: Focus on Mount Malindang and Environs (component on assessment of arthropods, development of participatory methodology for the inventory and assessment of floral resources and their characterization in the montane forests of Mount Malindang)
- Building a National Constituency for Biodiversity Conservation in the Philippines (component on strengthening knowledge base on biodiversity, specifically on birds)
- Catmon-Carmen and Balamban Survey (faunal survey of Mount Kapayas range and Mount Masurila, Cebu)
- Cloud Rats Conservation Program (field status surveys)
- Conservation Research of Philippine Birds and Mammals Project (avian inventories in selected areas in the country)
- Elasmobranch Biodiversity in the Sulu-Sulawesi Large Marine Ecosystem (study of the diversity and taxonomy of Elasmobranch in the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Environment)
- Faunal Inventory of Nug-as Forest (terrestrial fauna inventory)

- Philippine Biodiversity Inventory (surveys of all vertebrate groups and selected invertebrates in 10 potential centers of biodiversity in the country)
- Philippine Owl Conservation Program (field inventories/surveys)
- Philippine Spotted Deer Conservation Program (population surveys)
- Protected Area Suitability Assessment of Liguasan Marsh (inventory of fauna)
- Terrestrial Ecosystems Programme - Sustainable Management of Mount Isarog Territories

Another observation is that most of the inventory programs reported that are species-specific are either done by the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources or the Philippine National Museum since these are the two government agencies with such mandates. Some academic institutions and NGOs also conduct taxonomic studies although to a limited extent. It is also worthy to note that efforts in inventory are very few at the genetic level.

Monitoring

At present, there are several monitoring activities but these are done on a project level and although there are attempts to integrate these efforts especially from the government side, there is still no overall mechanism in place for coordinating these initiatives.

Some of the initiatives to monitor biodiversity include:

- Agencies Working for Ecological Sustainability on Mount Malindang's Environs Project
- Biodiversity Monitoring System (BMS)
- Biodiversity Research Programme for Development in Mindanao: Focus on Mount Malindang and Environs
- Cetacean By-Catch Fisheries Assessment Project
- Coastal Resource Management Project
- El Nido Integrated Conservation and Development Project: Biodiversity Component
- Monitoring of Marine Turtles
- Monitoring of Selected Priority Wetlands and Migratory Birds
- Pawikan Conservation Programme
- Technical Assistance for Improving Biodiversity Conservation in Protected Areas of the Philippines

The Country Study was able to identify the threats to biodiversity in the Philippines. Monitoring of effects of these threats, however, have not been undertaken on a systematic manner because of several constraints. Activities in marine and coastal ecosystems are more closely monitored than activities in the terrestrial ecosystems. Aside from funding, there is a limited know-how and capacity on monitoring systems that could be used easily by biodiversity practitioners and can be employed at the community level. The Biodiversity Monitoring System is one tool that can help in making considerable progress in this area.

Another constraint is the lack of indicators for monitoring biodiversity. Currently, some indicators that are accepted are in the Biodiversity Monitoring Programme and those identified indicator species per Protected Area. The country shares experience to a limited extent, with other Parties to demonstrate the use of assessment and indicator methodologies especially through joint projects like the Turtle Islands Heritage Protected Area, Bird-Life Asia, and the ASEAN Regional Centre on Biodiversity Conservation.

On a final note, the Philippines has still to undertake a national taxonomic needs assessment in order to come up with a national taxonomic action plan. The Philippine Biodiversity Priority Setting Project could guide the prioritization of taxonomic work in the Philippines.

Decisions on Taxonomy

**Decision IV/1 Report and recommendations of the third meeting of SBSTTA
[part]**

50. Has your country carried out a national taxonomic needs assessment, and/or held workshops to determine national taxonomic priorities?	
a) no	
b) early stages of assessment	X
c) advanced stages of assessment	
d) assessment completed	
51. Has your country developed a national taxonomic action plan?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) action plan in place	
e) reports on implementation available	
52. Is your country making available appropriate resources to enhance the availability of taxonomic information?	
a) no	
b) yes, but this does not cover all known needs adequately	X
c) yes, covering all known needs	
53. Is your country encouraging bilateral and multilateral training and employment opportunities for taxonomists, particularly those dealing with poorly known organisms?	
a) no	
b) some opportunities	X
c) significant opportunities	
54. Is your country investing on a long-term basis in the development of appropriate infrastructure for your national taxonomic collections?	
a) no	
b) some investment	X
c) significant investment	
55. Is your country encouraging partnerships between taxonomic institutions in developed and developing countries?	
a) no	
b) yes - stated policy	X
c) yes - systematic national programme	
56. Has your country adopted any international agreed levels of collection housing?	
a) no	
b) under review	
c) being implemented by some collections	X
d) being implemented by all major collections	

57. Has your country provided training programmes in taxonomy?	
a) no	
b) some	X
c) many	
58. Has your country reported on measures adopted to strengthen national capacity in taxonomy, to designate national reference centres, and to make information housed in collections available to countries of origin?	
a) no	X
b) yes - in the previous national report	
c) yes - via the clearing-house mechanism	
d) yes - other means (please give details below)	
59. Has your country taken steps to ensure that institutions responsible for biological diversity inventories and taxonomic activities are financially and administratively stable?	
a) no	
b) under review	
c) yes for some institutions	X
d) yes for all major institutions	
60. Has your country assisted taxonomic institutions to establish consortia to conduct regional projects?	
a) no	
b) under review	
c) yes - limited extent	X
d) yes - significant extent	
61. Has your country given special attention to international funding of fellowships for specialist training abroad or for attracting international experts to national or regional courses?	
a) no	
b) under review	
c) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
62. Has your country provided programmes for re-training of qualified professionals moving into taxonomy-related fields?	
a) no	
b) some	X
c) many	

**Decision V/9. Global Taxonomy Initiative: Implementation and further
advance of the Suggestions for Action**

63. Has your country identified its information requirements in the area of taxonomy, and assessed its national capacity to meet these requirements?	
a) no	
b) basic assessment	X
c) thorough assessment	
64. Has your country established or consolidated taxonomic reference centres?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
65. Has your country worked to increase its capacity in the area of taxonomic research?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
66. Has your country communicated information on programmes, projects and initiatives for consideration as pilot projects under the Global Taxonomy Initiative to the Executive Secretary?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
67. Has your country designated a national Global Taxonomy Initiative focal point linked to other national focal points?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
68. Has your country participated in the development of regional networks to facilitate information-sharing for the Global Taxonomy Initiative?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
<i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i>	
69. Has your country sought resources through the financial mechanism for the priority actions identified in the decision?	
a) no	
b) applied for unsuccessfully	X
c) applied for successfully	

Further comments on implementation of these decisions

Taxonomic Centers in the Country

The Philippine National Museum as well as some academic institutes are considered taxonomic centers in the country. Some of these centers have existing Memorandum of Agreement with other collection housing that follow provisions of internationally-agreed terms. To a limited extent, the Philippine Government has taken steps to ensure that the institutions responsible for biological diversity inventories and taxonomic activities are financially and administratively stable. It has provided funding for the Philippine National Museum for its operations and has continued to support smaller initiatives of other agencies like the Ecosystems Research and Development Bureau, the Philippine Institute of Traditional and Alternative Health Care, and some academic institutions. However, current funding is so limited that it is barely enough for these centers' operations. There is, thus, a need to invest on a long-term basis on the development of appropriate infrastructure for national taxonomic collection.

National Capacity to do Taxonomic Work

The field of taxonomy has not been attracting young blood in the past few years. There are not many taxonomists in the country and they are already overloaded with their regular jobs either in the academe or in the institutions that they are connected with. The need, therefore, to develop this expertise in the country cannot be over-emphasized.

Aside from proactive means of encouraging young people to engage in taxonomic research, incentives for doing so should be put in place. There should be a review of the related courses being offered and make these more attractive to high school graduates. There should also be a conscious effort to entice science-oriented high schools in the country to influence their graduates to go into taxonomic work. Another measure that could help develop this expertise is to design training programs that would turnout para-taxonomists. Further, the country should endeavor to access bilateral and multilateral taxonomic training opportunities to improve national capacity for taxonomic work.

Article 8 In situ conservation [excluding Articles 8h and 8j]

70. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High	X	b) Medium		c) Low			
71. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>The establishment of an integrated protected areas systems is the centerpiece response of the Philippine government to protect and conserve its biodiversity resources. The legal basis for this policy is embodied in two major legislations namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Order 192 (series of 1987), creating the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB), which is mandated to consolidate all government efforts in the conservation of natural biological resources through the establishment of a network of protected areas system • Republic Act 7586, otherwise known as the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) Law, which provides for the establishment and management of a comprehensive system which encompasses outstandingly remarkable areas and biologically important public lands that are habitats of various species of plants and animals. The specific provisions of the NIPAS Law are: a) identification of protected area categories; b) establishment of a standard planning process; c) NIPAS administration by the DENR; d) recognition of ancestral rights; and, e) institutionalization of environmental impact assessment. The Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau is mandated to implement this Law. <p>Other major legislations that protect and conserve the country's biodiversity resources are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic Act 9147, the Wildlife Conservation and Protection Act, was enacted into law to conserve the country's wildlife resources and their habitats for sustainability. Towards this end, the following objectives shall be pursued: a) conserve and protect wildlife species and their habitats to promote ecological balance and enhance biological diversity; b) regulate the collection and trade of wildlife; c) pursue, with due regard to the national interest, the Philippine commitment to international conventions, protection of wildlife and their habitats; and e) initiate or support scientific studies on the conservation of biological diversity. • Republic Act 8550, known as the Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998, requires all government agencies, as well as the private firms and entities who intend to undertake activities or projects which will affect the habitats of the rare, threatened and endangered aquatic species to prepare a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment that shall be submitted to the DENR for review and evaluation. 							

- Republic Act 9072, the National Caves and Cave Resources Management and Protection Act, is the declaration of policy of the country to conserve, protect and manage caves and cave resources as part of the country's natural wealth.

Although funding was sourced from the financial mechanism, resources were still limiting for the implementation of the NIPAS law.

72. Has your country established a system of protected areas which aims to conserve biological diversity (8a)?	
a) system under development	
b) national review of protected areas coverage available	
c) national protected area systems plan in place	X
d) relatively complete system in place	
73. Are there nationally adopted guidelines for the selection, establishment and management of protected areas (8b)?	
a) no	
b) no, under development	
c) yes	X
d) yes, undergoing review and extension	
74. Does your country regulate or manage biological resources important for the conservation of biological diversity with a view to ensuring their conservation and sustainable use (8c)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) programme or policy in place	X
e) reports on implementation available	X
75. Has your country undertaken measures that promote the protection of ecosystems, natural habitats and the maintenance of viable populations of species in natural surroundings (8d)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	
c) potential measures under review	
d) reasonably comprehensive measures in place	X
76. Has your country undertaken measures that promote environmentally sound and sustainable development in areas adjacent to protected areas (8e)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	X
d) reasonably comprehensive measures in place	
77. Has your country undertaken measures to rehabilitate and restore degraded ecosystems (8f)?	

a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	X
d) comprehensive measures in place	
78. Has your country undertaken measures to promote the recovery of threatened species (8f)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	X
d) comprehensive measures in place	
79. Has your country undertaken measures to regulate, manage or control the risks associated with the use and release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology (8g)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	X
d) comprehensive measures in place	
80. Has your country made attempts to provide the conditions needed for compatibility between present uses and the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components (8i)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	X
d) programme or policy in place	X
e) reports on implementation available	X
81. Has your country developed and maintained the necessary legislation and/or other regulatory provisions for the protection of threatened species and populations (8k)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	X
d) legislation or other measures in place	X
82. Does your country regulate or manage processes and categories of activities identified under Article 7 as having significant adverse effects on biological diversity (8l)?	
a) no	
b) under review	
c) yes, to a limited extent	
d) yes, to a significant extent	X

If a developed country Party -

83. Does your country cooperate in providing financial and other support for *in-situ* conservation particularly to developing countries (8m)?

If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -

84. Does your country receive financial and other support for *in situ* conservation (8m)?

a) no	
b) yes (if so, please give details below)	X

Decision II/7 Consideration of Articles 6 and 8 of the Convention

85. Is action being taken to share information and experience on implementation of this Article with other Contracting Parties?

a) little or no action	
b) sharing of written materials and/or case-studies	X
c) regional meetings	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Milestones in the Establishment of the National Integrated Protected Areas System of the Philippines (has also been reported in the First National Report):

Protected Areas (PAs) are set aside to conserve species that cannot be preserved off-site (*ex-situ*). They are considered as the most cost-effective manner for preserving genes, species and habitat, and for maintaining various ecological processes of importance to humanity. Species diversity of PAs is maintained by protecting the range of different habitat types and by allowing for changes in species distribution. It is in this context that the Philippines has created a comprehensive integrated protected areas system. Its goal is to protect and preserve all representative ecosystems and habitat types, as well as the species of plants and animals found therein.

As early as 1986, a project called Integrated Protected Areas System (IPAS) was initiated through a project grant by the World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF - United States). One year after, Executive Order 192 was issued creating the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB) under the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). The agency is mandated to consolidate all efforts in the conservation of natural biological resources through the establishment of a network of protected areas.

In 1988, the IPAS Project was completed and a report containing a listing and mapping of potential PAs was submitted to the DENR. The potential PAs were classified as terrestrial, wetland and marine, indicating levels of priorities for each site.

The IPAS was further pursued in the World Bank's FFarm Study through the IPAS I Project of the DENR. This was funded by the Japanese Government through a grant to the Philippine Government under the administration of the World Bank. The main objective of the IPAS I Project was to select ten priority sites from an indicative NIPAS of 342 potential sites. The other objective was to prepare as draft legislation for PAs and to conduct a crash course on PA management for DENR and NGOs.

The ten priority sites were selected based on a set of criteria including:

- Ecosystem type considerations. The ten sites should include terrestrial, wetland, and marine ecosystems (five terrestrial, two wetlands, and two marine, and one mixed ecosystems)
- Conservation values. endemism, biodiversity, endangered species, remaining pristine habitats, size, uniqueness, and scenic values
- Other considerations. legal, security, and financing

The ten priority sites selected were: Subic-Bataan, Northern Sierra Madre, Apo Reef, Mount Kanlaon, Mount Kitanglad, Turtle Island and Mount Apo National Parks; Batanes and Siargao Landscapes/Seascapes; and Agusan Marsh Wildlife Sanctuary.

In 1992, upon the passage of the NIPAS Law, some areas were immediately designated as the initial components of the National Integrated Protected Areas Management. These are areas proclaimed or designated pursuant to a law, presidential decree or proclamation, or executive order as a national park; game refuge or bird sanctuary; wilderness; mangrove reserve; fish sanctuary; natural and historical landmark; protected and managed landscape/seascape as well as identified virgin forest. There are 203 areas that comprise the initial components of the System, covering an aggregate area of approximately 3.8 million hectares distributed all over the country and representing 12.8 percent of the total land area of the Philippines. These are comprised of 67 national parks/marine reserves, 8 game refuge and bird sanctuaries, 16 wilderness areas, 85 watershed forest reservations, 27 mangrove swamp forest reserves, and identified old growth forest covering about 8,000 hectares.

Areas previously identified as initial components have to undergo Presidential Proclamation and congressional enactment to be included in the System. The requirements and process for the proclamation are:

- a) compilation of maps and technical descriptions of the identified areas;
- b) initial screening of these areas for their sustainability for inclusion in the NIPAS
- c) studies and public hearings to build a case for formal establishment of suitable areas in this group as protected areas.

The third requirement includes initial consultation with communities within or near the identified areas, census and registration of the occupants of the identified areas and the preparation of a land use plan for the area in coordination with the Regional Development Council.

To date, 83 PAs have been proclaimed under the NIPA category with a total area of 2,407,682.825 hectares.

Major *in-Situ* Programs

- Conservation of Protected Areas Project (CPPAP) funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) of the World Bank

The CPPAP is pilot testing the NIPAS Law in the first ten priority sites identified in the IPAS Final Report. The project has four major components: a) site development; b) resource management; c) socio-economic management; and, d) technical assistance, monitoring, and coordination. Designed to involve local organizations in its implementation, the DENR is executing the project in collaboration with the NIPA, Inc., a consortium of 18 local NGOS engaged in development, environment and social preparation activities. This project is due for completion in June 2002

and has a budget of US\$20 million, financed by the Global Environment Facility through the World Bank.

- National Integrated Protected Areas Project (NIPAP) funded by the European Union (EU)

Though similar to the CPPAP in that it espouses in-situ conservation as a major strategy to conserve biodiversity, this project differs in project management and strategies. In this project, a European Co-Director and a local Project Director have the full authority to decide on the financial and operational matter provided that the National Program and Policy Steering Committee (NPPSC) initially approves the Annual Work and Financial Plan.

The sites selected for the NIPAP-EU are: Mount Guiting-Guiting Natural Park; Mount Pulag; Mount Isarog; Mount Iglit-Baco and Mount Malindang National Parks; Coron Island; Malampaya Sound; and El Nido Marine Reserve. The Project was completed in December 2001 with a total funding of US\$15.4 million.

- Samar Island Biodiversity Project (SIBP)

SIBP envisions to establish the Samar Island Natural Park (SINP), covering a core area of 347,000 hectares of natural forests and about 123,000 hectares of buffer zone. The project area covers about 189 barangays in 35 municipalities in the three provinces of the island.

The new protected area will be zoned for multiple uses centering on protection, but providing for conservation-compatible livelihood opportunities such as sustainable harvests of non-timber forest products, ecotourism and sustainable farming. It will institute a comprehensive range of ancillary conservation measures to insulate the park from human pressures. Park management would be operationalized in partnership with forest-dge communities with the aim of establishing a "social fence" against threats. Interventions will strengthen participatory planning, process-response monitoring, surveillance and enforcement functions, and enhance the conservation management capacities of the communities. It will impart conservation values to the wider Samareño society to backstop advocacy operations.

The project implementation will be in two phases, each with 4 years duration with a total funding of US\$5,809,407.00.

- Biodiversity Research Programme for Development in Mindanao: Focus on Mount Malindang and Environs

This project aims to build the capacity for local communities, government, academe, and other stakeholders to promote and undertake the sustainable use of biological resources and effective decision-making on biodiversity conservation. It has funding from the Netherlands Government of approximately US2.5M.

- Mount Isarog Integrated Conservation and Development Program / Sustainable Management of Mount Isarog

This project aims to conserve the biodiversity of Mt. Isarog National Park and develop ecologically sustainable livelihood for communities around it. The project, which is estimated to be completed in 2004, is being funded by Commission of European Communities, UNDP-Global Environment Facility, CARE - Austria, CARE - USA, and Jeff Peierls Foundation.

Management of Buffer Zones

The NIPAs Law requires the designation of an added layer of protection to the area by establishing buffer zones to stabilize protected area boundaries. PAWB has already developed specific guidelines for the establishment of buffer zones for PAs as a DENR policy document. These guidelines intend to operationalize buffer zones as part of the protected area planning and management strategy.

Ecosystems Rehabilitation and Restoration

In 1990, the DENR issued Memorandum Circular No. 20 to hasten the restoration of degraded or disturbed natural habitats within the national parks and other protected areas. It sets the guidelines on the restoration activities for the enhancement of biological diversity of protected areas.

Recovery of Threatened Species

The country has programs for the recovery of some threatened species:

- Philippine Raptors Conservation Programme
- Tamaraw Conservation Programme
- Pawikan Conservation Programme
- Crocodile Farm Institute/Palawan Wildlife Rescue
and Conservation Center
- Philippine Teak Project
- Philippine Spotted Deer Conservation Programme

Financial Support

The country received financial and other support for *in situ* conservation from several sources. Major funding came from the UNDP and WB Global Environment Facility for the CPPAP, SIBP, SUMMIT; European Union for the NIPAP, Netherlands Government for the BRP Mt. Malindang Project, among others.

Article 8h Alien species

86. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium	X	c) Low			
87. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting		d) Severely limiting	X
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>The implementation of this Article had been given medium priority by the Philippines for the period covered by this Report. Although the concern on alien species is covered by the strategies in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), there had been very few initiatives in this area. The country has some existing measures in place to implement this Article, like the provisions in the CITES, the Wildlife Act, Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries/Aquaculture, among others. Actual activities, however, have been limited by lack of awareness and understanding, not to mention lack of funds and capacity.</p> <p>Since there is very limited understanding of this subject, there is a need to undertake studies on the impacts of alien species. There should also be a strategic communication program on the alien invasive species and its effect on the environment.</p>							

88. Has your country identified alien species introduced?	
a) no	
b) only major species of concern	X
c) only new or recent introductions	X
d) a comprehensive system tracks new introductions	
e) a comprehensive system tracks all known introductions	
89. Has your country assessed the risks posed to ecosystems, habitats or species by the introduction of these alien species?	
a) no	
b) only some alien species of concern have been assessed	X
c) most alien species have been assessed	
90. Has your country undertaken measures to prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	
c) potential measures under review	X
d) comprehensive measures in place	

Decision IV/1 Report and recommendations of the third meeting of SBSTTA

91. Is your country collaborating in the development of projects at national, regional, sub-regional and international levels to address the issue of alien species?	
a) little or no action	
b) discussion on potential projects under way	X
c) active development of new projects	
92. Does your national strategy and action plan address the issue of alien species?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	

Decision V/8. Alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species

93. Is your country applying the interim guiding principles for prevention, introduction and mitigation of impacts of alien species in the context of activities aimed at implementing article 8(h) of the Convention, and in the various sectors?	
a) no	
b) under consideration	
c) limited implementation in some sectors	X
d) extensive implementation in some sectors	
e) extensive implementation in most sectors	
94. Has your country submitted case-studies to the Executive Secretary focusing on thematic assessments?	
a) no	X
b) in preparation	
c) yes	
95. Has your country submitted written comments on the interim guiding principles to the Executive Secretary?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
96. Has your country given priority to the development and implementation of alien invasive species strategies and action plans?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
97. In dealing with the issue of invasive species, has your country developed or involved itself in mechanisms for international co-operation, including the exchange of best practices?	
a) no	X
b) trans-boundary co-operation	
c) regional co-operation	
d) multilateral co-operation	
98. Is your country giving priority attention to geographically and evolutionarily isolated ecosystems in its work on alien invasive species?	

a) no	X
b) yes	
99. Is your country using the ecosystem approach and precautionary and bio-geographical approaches as appropriate in its work on alien invasive species?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
100. Has your country developed effective education, training and public-awareness measures concerning the issue of alien species?	
a) no	X
b) some initiatives	
c) many initiatives	
101. Is your country making available the information which it holds on alien species through the CHM?	
a) no	X
b) some information	
c) all available information	
d) information available through other channels (please specify)	
102. Is your country providing support to enable the Global Invasive Species Programme to fulfil the tasks outlined in the decision and its annexes?	
a) no	X
b) limited support	
c) substantial support	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

In May 2001, the ASEAN Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation (ARCBC) held a Seminar-Workshop on Biodiversity and Management of Alien Invasive Species. The highlights of the Forum give an indication of the state of knowledge and the level of activities in the country as far as alien invasive species are concerned:

- Only a few of the alien species introduced are identified. The Philippine Council for Marine and Aquatic Resources Research and Development (PCMARRD) identified five (5) alien species that are currently being monitored. About eight (8) other terrestrial species were reported in the forum.
- Only those species identified have been the subject of studies on the risks posed to the ecosystem.
- There are measures being undertaken to prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species, but to a very limited extent. The Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of the Department of Agriculture is tasked with the responsibility of granting permits for such importations and for implementing quarantine regulations for aquatic species. Guidelines for the conduct of risk assessment and biosafety measures for introduced species have been formulated by the National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines. However, the importation of alien species from other countries continues to be practiced for one reason or another (i.e. for food, recreation, or research) with or without government permit.
- The country has limited collaboration in the development of projects at national, regional, sub-regional, and international levels to address the issue of alien species. There are initiatives by Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), activities related to CITES, and NACA-Network of Aquaculture in Asia.

Article 8j Traditional knowledge and related provisions

103. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
104. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>The 1987 Philippine Constitution already contains provisions relevant to the indigenous peoples (IPs) /indigenous cultural communities (ICCs). Two sections in the Constitution specifically contains provisions that: 1) recognize and promote the rights of indigenous cultural communities within the framework of national unity and development; and, 2) protect, subject to the provisions of the Constitution and national development programs, the rights of indigenous cultural communities to their ancestral lands to ensure their economic, social, and natural well-being.</p> <p>In October 1997, the Philippine Congress enacted the Indigenous People’s (IPs) Rights Act (IPRA Law). The IPRA Law is the embodiment of the long struggle for the recognition of the rights of the IPs to their ancestral domain as well as their cultural identity. Under IPRA, “the State shall recognize, respect and protect the rights of Indigenous Peoples to preserve and develop their cultures, traditions, and institutions. It shall consider these rights in the formulation of national laws and policies. The rights referred to include the right to claim ancestral domains which covers not only the physical environment but also the spiritual and cultural bonds associated with it (Section 4 of IPRA). In return, the IPs are charged with the responsibility of maintaining ecological balance and restoring damaged areas (Section 9 of IPRA).</p> <p>The Law also protects the right of the IPs to exclude others in exploiting natural resources within their ancestral domain. Before any person is allowed access to these resources, free and prior informed consent of the community obtained in accordance with the customary laws, is required. The regulations governing bioprospecting (EO 247) further requires that benefits derived from the utilization of biological and genetic resources shall be shared fairly and equitably with the community.</p> <p>The Law, however, has not been fully implemented. In September 21, 1998, the government issued Memorandum Order No. 21 that froze the NCIP budget funds for Programs and Projects thus paralyzing the operations of the Commission. This, coupled with the question on the constitutionality of the IPRA filed by former Justice Isagani Cruz have made the IPs a non-priority in the national programs of the previous administration.</p>							

105. Has your country undertaken measures to ensure that the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity are respected, preserved and maintained?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	X
d) comprehensive measures in place	
106. Is your country working to encourage the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) programme or policy in place	X

Decision III/4 and Decision IV/9. Implementation of Article 8(j)

107. Has your country developed national legislation and corresponding strategies for the implementation of Article 8(j)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) legislation or other measures in place	X
108. Has your country supplied information on the implementation of Article 8(j) to other Contracting Parties through media such as the national report?	
a) no	
b) yes - previous national report	X
c) yes - CHM	
d) yes - other means (please give details below)	
109. Has your country submitted case-studies to the Executive Secretary on measures taken to develop and implement the Convention's provisions relating to indigenous and local communities?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
110. Is your country participating in appropriate working groups and meetings?	
a) none	
b) some	X
c) all	
111. Is your country facilitating the active participation of representatives of indigenous and local communities in these working groups and meetings?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision V/16. Article 8(j) and related provisions

112. Has your country reviewed the programme of work specified in the annex to the decision, and identified how to implement those tasks appropriate to national circumstances?	
a) no	X
b) under review	
c) yes (please provide details)	
113. Is your country integrating such tasks into its ongoing programmes, taking into account the identified collaboration opportunities?	
a) no	X
b) not appropriate to national circumstances	
c) yes - to a limited extent	
d) yes - to a significant extent	
114. Is your country taking full account of existing instruments, guidelines, codes and other relevant activities in the implementation of the programme of work?	
a) no	
b) not appropriate to national circumstances	
c) yes - to a limited extent	X
d) yes - to a significant extent	
115. Has your country provided appropriate financial support for the implementation of the programme of work?	
a) no	X
b) not appropriate to national circumstances	
c) yes - to a limited extent	
d) yes - to a significant extent	
116. Has your country fully incorporated women and women's organizations in the activities undertaken to implement the programme of work contained in the annex to the decision and other relevant activities under the Convention?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
117. Has your country taken measures to facilitate the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the implementation of the Convention?	
a) no	
b) not appropriate to national circumstances	
c) yes - to a limited extent	X
d) yes - to a significant extent	

118. Has your country provided case studies on methods and approaches concerning the preservation and sharing of traditional knowledge, and the control of that information by indigenous and local communities?	
a) no	
b) not relevant	
c) yes - sent to the Secretariat	
d) yes - through the national CHM	
e) yes - available through other means (please specify)	X
119. Does your country exchange information and share experiences regarding national legislation and other measures for the protection of the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities?	
a) no	
b) not relevant	
c) yes - through the CHM	
d) yes - with specific countries	X
e) yes - available through other means (please specify)	X
120. Has your country taken measures to promote the conservation and maintenance of knowledge, innovations, and practices of indigenous and local communities?	
a) no	
b) not relevant	
c) some measures	X
d) extensive measures	
121. Has your country supported the development of registers of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities, in collaboration with these communities?	
a) no	
b) not relevant	
c) development in progress	X
d) register fully developed	
122. Have representatives of indigenous and local community organizations participated in your official delegation to meetings held under the Convention on Biological Diversity?	
a) not relevant	
b) not appropriate	
c) yes	X
123. Is your country assisting the Secretariat to fully utilize the clearing-house mechanism to co-operate closely with indigenous and local communities to explore ways that enable them to make informed decisions concerning release of their traditional knowledge?	
a) no	
b) awaiting information on how to proceed	X
c) yes	

124. Has your country identified resources for funding the activities identified in the decision?	
a) no	
b) not relevant	
c) partly	X
d) fully	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The newly-commenced Add-On Enabling Activity on Biodiversity Project funded by the UNDP-GEF has a component that will assess the country's capacity for the preservation of biodiversity-related knowledge of indigenous and local communities. It will come up with a comprehensive national capacity development strategy for the preservation of biodiversity-related knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities.

Article 9 Ex situ conservation

125. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
126. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>There are already a number of policy issuances with their attendant rules and regulations relative to <i>ex-situ</i> conservation. Most of these regulations have something to do with the government's compliance to international treaties such as the CITES. Some of these regulations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DENR Special Order No. 1044, Series of 1991, issued on 13 November 1991, Creating an Inter-Agency Committee to Evaluate Wildlife Permit Applications and Allocation of Quota b) DENR Administrative Order No. 30, Series of 1993, Providing Incentives for the Wildlife Breeding Industry. c) DENR Administrative Order No. 96-20 spells out the implementing Rules and Regulations of Executive Order No. 247, regulating the prospecting of biological and genetic resources. d) DENR Administrative Order No. 95-22 provides the guidelines on the accreditation and registration of zoos and wildlife facilities of private collector/s, including wildlife maintained thereat. e) DENR Administrative Order No. 97-33 sets the guidelines on the issuance of permit for the collection and the transport of biological specimens from protected areas for use by DENR biodiversity conservation programs/projects. <p>Resources for the implementation of this Article have been limiting. Some <i>ex-situ</i> conservation projects received financial and other support in the establishment and maintenance of <i>ex-situ</i> conservation facilities, i.e. rattan (IBRC), crocodile (Japan), tamaraw (local), bamboo (FAO).</p>							

127. Has your country adopted measures for the <i>ex situ</i> conservation of components of biological diversity native to your country (9a)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	

128. Has your country adopted measures for the <i>ex situ</i> conservation of components of biological diversity <i>originating outside your country</i> (9a)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	
129. If the answer to the previous question was yes, is this being done in active collaboration with organizations in the other countries (9a)?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
130. Has your country established and maintained facilities for the <i>ex situ</i> conservation of and research on plants, animals and micro-organisms that represent genetic resources <i>native to your country</i> (9b)?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
131. Has your country established and maintained facilities for the <i>ex situ</i> conservation of and research on plants, animals and micro-organisms that represent genetic resources <i>originating elsewhere</i> (9b)?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
132. If the answer to the previous question was yes, is this being done in active collaboration with organizations in the other countries (9a)?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
133. Has your country adopted measures for the reintroduction of threatened species into their natural habitats under appropriate conditions (9c)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	
134. Has your country taken measures to regulate and manage the collection of biological resources from natural habitats for <i>ex situ</i> conservation purposes so as not to threaten ecosystems and <i>in situ</i> populations of species (9d)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	

If a developed country Party -

135. Has your country cooperated in providing financial and other support for ex situ conservation and in the establishment and maintenance of ex situ conservation facilities in developing countries (9e)?

If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -

136. Has your country received financial and other support for ex situ conservation and in the establishment and maintenance of ex situ conservation facilities (9e)?

a) no	
b) yes	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

- Some of the *ex-situ* conservation efforts in the Philippines are focused on the following:
 - a) Botanical Gardens
 - b) Gene Bank/s
 - c) Seed Bank
 - d) Zoological Gardens
 - e) Wildlife Sanctuary/s
 - f) Rescue Centers
- The International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) Germplasm Center in Los Baños, Laguna is the largest rice seed bank in the world. It has seeds from rice-growing countries in the world systematically stored in specifically built rooms kept at sub-zero temperatures that can be readily available for research. The Center is maintained by the IRRI.
- Other facilities for the *ex-situ* conservation of and research of plants, animals and micro-organisms that represent genetic resources native to the country are the Institute of Plant Breeding, IRRI, Biotech, and the Ecosystems Research and Development Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, among others.
- The Philippines has also adopted measures for the reintroduction of threatened species into their natural habitats under appropriate conditions, although only on species of great importance to the country's biodiversity. Examples are the programs of the Philippine Eagle Foundation and the project of the Marine Science Institute of the University of the Philippines.
- The country has likewise taken measures to regulate and manage the collection of biological resources from natural habitats for *ex-situ* conservation purposes so as not to threaten ecosystems and *in-situ* populations of species. An example of this is the collection of monkeys.

Article 10 Sustainable use of components of biological diversity

137. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
138. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>The Philippines has adequate policies in place to support the implementation of this Article. However, resources for actual implementation is limiting.</p> <p>There are several landmark policies and legislations that stipulate the integration of conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into national decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation of the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) • The Philippine Agenda 21 (PA 21), the blueprint to achieve sustainable development in the country contains action agenda on biological diversity; • The Philippine National Biodiversity and Action Plan (NBSAP) promotes sustainable use of biodiversity components through valuation studies and giving importance to indigenous knowledge systems • The integration of NBSAP in the national planning process of all government agencies as provided for in Memorandum Order from the President issued on 04 June 1997 • The Philippine EIA System that takes into consideration environmentally critical areas in the evaluation of EIA documents and in the subsequent issuance of an Environmental Clearance Certificate. 							

139. Has your country integrated consideration of the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into national decision making (10a)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) programme or policy in place	X
e) review of implementation available	X

140. Has your country adopted measures relating to the use of biological resources that avoid or minimize adverse impacts on biological diversity (10b)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	X
d) comprehensive measures in place	
141. Has your country put in place measures that protect and encourage customary use of biological resources that is compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements (10c)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	
142. Has your country put in place measures that help local populations develop and implement remedial action in degraded areas where biological diversity has been reduced (10d)?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	
143. Does your country actively encourage cooperation between government authorities and the private sector in developing methods for sustainable use of biological diversity (10e)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) programme or policy in place	X
e) review of implementation available	

Decisions IV/15. Relationship of the Convention with the Commission on Sustainable Development and biodiversity-related conventions

144. Has your country submitted to the Secretariat information on tourism and its impacts on biological diversity, and efforts to effectively plan and manage tourism?	
a) no	X
b) yes - previous national report	
c) yes - case-studies	
d) yes - other means (please give details below)	

145. Has your country submitted to the Secretariat information on biodiversity-related activities of the CSD (such as SIDS, oceans, seas and freshwater resources, consumption and production patterns)?	
a) no	
b) yes - previous national report	X
c) yes - correspondence	
d) yes - other means (please give details below)	

Decision V/24. Sustainable use as a cross-cutting issue

146. Has your country identified indicators and incentive measures for sectors relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity?	
a) no	
b) assessment of potential indicators underway	X
c) indicators identified (if so, please describe below)	
147. Has your country assisted other Parties to increase their capacity to implement sustainable-use practices, programmes and policies at regional, national and local levels, especially in pursuit of poverty alleviation?	
a) no	
b) not relevant	
c) to a limited extent	X
d) to a significant extent (please provide details)	
148. Has your country developed mechanisms to involve the private sector and indigenous and local communities in initiatives on sustainable use, and in mechanisms to ensure that indigenous and local communities benefit from such sustainable use?	
a) no	
b) mechanisms under development	
c) mechanisms in place (please describe)	X
149. Has your country identified areas for conservation that would benefit through the sustainable use of biological diversity and communicated this information to the Executive Secretary?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision V/25. Biological diversity and tourism

150. Has your country based its policies, programmes and activities in the field of sustainable tourism on an assessment of the inter-linkages between tourism and biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) to a limited extent	X
c) to a significant extent	

151. <i>Has your country submitted case-studies on tourism as an example of the sustainable use of biological diversity to the Executive Secretary?</i>	
a) no	X
b) yes	

152. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Year of Ecotourism?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

153. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Year of Mountains?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

154. Has your country undertaken activities relevant to biodiversity and tourism in support of the International Coral Reef Initiative?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

155. Has your country established enabling policies and legal frameworks to complement voluntary efforts for the effective implementation of sustainable tourism?	
a) no	
b) to a limited extent	
c) to a significant extent (please describe)	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

- The Philippines has developed mechanisms to involve the private sector and the local and indigenous communities on sustainable use and in mechanisms to ensure that indigenous and local communities benefit from such sustainable use.
- Republic Act 8371 otherwise known as the Indigenous People's Rights Act (IPRA), provided for the promotion and protection of rights of the IPs/ICCs related to their Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSP). Chapter VI of the said law specifically states the aforementioned provision, however, this was not fully implemented. Up to the present, the National Commission for Indigenous Peoples continuously receive field reports that the IPs/ICCs are used and exploited in the guise of Research and Development without respecting the Free and Prior Informed Consent.
- In some projects, however, progress in this area had been noted like in the case of Palawan Council for Sustainable Development and the Protected Areas Management Board.
- The Department of Environment and Natural Resources completed the Environment and Natural Resources Accounting Project that provided the framework for valuation of natural resources and the development of User's Fee as a tool for biodiversity management.
- National Ecotourism Strategy

"Ecotourism" as a concept was introduced in the Philippines in 1992 during the National Tourism Congress. Following this, a series of regional ecotourism seminars discussed the concept culminating in a 1998 Technical Workshop on Sustainable Tourism. At this forum, the elements of sustainable development framework were identified and key issues defined.

Consequently, Executive Order 111 entitled "Establishing the Guidelines for Ecotourism Development in the Philippines" was issued on 17 June 1999. It defined the country's policy on sustainable tourism and established a formal structure for tourism development in the Philippines. The introductory paragraphs of the EO states that:

"... it is the policy of the State to develop and promote sustainable tourism while enjoining the participation of the Filipino people in enhancing the growth and competitiveness of the Philippine economy;

...it is the policy of the State to ensure the sustainable use, development, management, protection and conservation of the country's environment and natural resources and cultural heritage for the enjoyment of present and future generations;"

Further, said EO provides for the formulation of a national ecotourism strategy and program for the promotion and development of ecotourism in the country.

To date, the draft Ecotourism Strategy has been subjected to consultations and is now being finalized. It is scheduled for formal adoption in the second quarter of 2002.

Article 11 Incentive measures

156. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		c) Low			X
157. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting		d) Severely limiting	X
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>Due to the limited understanding and capacity of the country in the implementation of this Article, activities supporting incentive measures for biodiversity conservation had been few.</p> <p>Incentive measures for biodiversity conservation is a novel idea that the country has not fully utilized as a strategy to manage and conserve biodiversity. Although there were initiatives that would have been promotive of such measures such as the Environmental Resources Accounting Project (ENRAP) of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, this has not yet translated into tangible incentive measures that could be considered as significant in the implementation of this Article.</p>							

158. Are programmes in place to identify and ensure the adoption of economically and socially sound measures that act as incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) programmes in place	
e) review of implementation available	
159. Do these incentives, and the programmes to identify them and ensure their adoption, cover the full range of sectoral activities?	
a) no	
b) some sectors	X
c) all major sectors	
d) all sectors	

Decision III/18. Incentive measures

160. Has your country reviewed legislation and economic policies to identify and promote incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) reviews in progress	X
c) some reviews complete	
d) as far as practically possible	
161. Has your country ensured the development of mechanisms or approaches to ensure adequate incorporation of both market and non-market values of biological diversity into plans, policies and programmes and other relevant areas, <i>inter alia</i> , national accounting systems and investment strategies?	
a) no	
b) early stages of identifying mechanisms	X
c) advanced stages of identifying mechanisms	
d) mechanisms in place	
e) review of impact of mechanisms available	
162. Has your country developed training and capacity building programmes to implement incentive measures and promote private-sector initiatives?	
a) no	
b) planned	
c) some	X
d) many	
163. Has your country incorporated biological diversity considerations into impact assessments as a step in the design and implementation of incentive measures?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
164. Has your country shared experience on incentive measures with other Contracting Parties, including making relevant case-studies available to the Secretariat?	
a) no	X
b) yes - previous national report	
c) yes - case-studies	
d) yes - other means (please give details below)	

Decision IV/10. Measures for implementing the Convention [part]

165. Is your country actively designing and implementing incentive measures?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) measures in place	
e) review of implementation available	
166. Has your country identified threats to biological diversity and underlying causes of biodiversity loss, including the relevant actors, as a stage in designing incentive measures?	
a) no	
b) partially reviewed	X
c) thoroughly reviewed	
d) measures designed based on the reviews	
e) review of implementation available	
167. Do the existing incentive measures take account of economic, social, cultural and ethical valuation of biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
168. Has your country developed legal and policy frameworks for the design and implementation of incentive measures?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) frameworks in place	
e) review of implementation available	
169. Does your country carry out consultative processes to define clear target-oriented incentive measures to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss?	
a) no	
b) processes being identified	X
c) processes identified but not implemented	
d) processes in place	
170. Has your country identified and considered neutralizing perverse incentives?	
a) no	
b) identification programme under way	X
c) identified but not all neutralized	
d) identified and neutralized	

Decision V/15. Incentive measures

171. Has your country reviewed the incentive measures promoted through the Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

172. Has your country explored possible ways and means by which these incentive measures can support the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity in your country?	
a) no	
b) under consideration	
c) early stages of development	X
d) advanced stages of development	
e) further information available	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

There are a few measures in place that could be considered as incentives for biodiversity conservation to a limited extent. Some examples are described below:

User's Fee

In 1997, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources through the Environment and Natural Resources Accounting Project identified market-based instruments for the management of the country's protected areas. The joint effort came up with a Manual that provides guidelines for estimation of fees for various users. This is envisioned to contribute to the sustainable financing of protected areas in the country, and eventually conserving biodiversity, by regulating use through an economic instrument.

The Laguna Lake Development Authority started the implementation of the Environmental User Fee System (EUFS) within the Laguna de Bay region. The system is essentially a market-based instrument that applies the "Polluters Pay Principle" and serves as an economic means to force polluters to reduce/abate water pollution while instituting remedial measures within their establishment. The authority to introduce such system in the region is drawn from Presidential Decree 813 and Executive Order 927.

The Environmental User Fee System, which is applied in all areas covered by the Laguna de Bay watershed, is a system where fee is paid for the amount of pollution that one discharges into the lake. The fee also covers the administrative cost of implementing the environmental user fee system.

The EUFS is being implemented in the Laguna de Bay for the following reasons:

- to influence the voluntary action of many industrial firms towards sharing the burden of environmental trust fund;
- to make people see more clearly the direct connection between their daily lives and their impact on the water quality of the Lake;
- to force companies to minimize the level of pollution in their wastewater discharges.

The implementation of the User's Fee in this context is premised on the assumption the industries will clean the waters of Laguna de Bay indirectly benefiting biodiversity.

Another measure is incorporated in the Community-Based Forestry Management Agreement (CBFMA), a social-forestry project of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Communities participating in this program have access to the harvest of forest resources, thus, there is social incentive to the communities.

Integrated Protected Areas Fund (IPAF)

The NIPAS Law provides for an Integrated Protected Areas Fund (IPAF), a trust fund for the purpose of promoting the sustained financing of the system. The fund may receive revenues generated within protected areas, donor support and other funds as provided by law, and disburse the same to finance projects of the NIPAS. The IPAF is in principle an incentive measure for biodiversity protection. In practice, however, its effectiveness has still to be proven since experiences for the past four years showed that accessing the Fund to finance NIPAS project is difficult. This mechanism has to be looked into seriously by the DENR so that this instrument could be fully utilized fully as a management and incentive tool for biodiversity conservation.

Article 12 Research and training

173. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
174. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>Research has always been identified as a priority as far as national policies and programs are concerned. This is evidenced by the creation of several agencies tasked with the different areas of research such as agriculture, health, ecosystems, energy, and many others. In reality, however, corresponding allocation of resources for research activities, especially for biodiversity is not adequate and is in fact limiting.</p> <p>The First National Report of the Philippines reported that research policies with respect to biodiversity are largely embodied or assumed under general conservation policies. It also stated that research efforts on biodiversity in the country can be generally described as inadequate, fragmented, uncoordinated, and donor-driven.</p> <p>The primary basis for biodiversity research in the country is embodied in the law that created the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Executive Order 192. The law states that the Ecosystems Research and Development Bureau (ERDB) was created primarily to "formulate and recommend an integrated research program relating to Philippine ecosystems and natural resources . . . as holistic and interdisciplinary fields of inquiry."</p> <p>Executive Order 247 is the first clear-cut national policy on biodiversity research. This landmark legislation was issued in 1995. However, it covers only biotechnology and bioprospecting and not the whole spectrum covered by biodiversity research.</p> <p>There is, thus, a need for a major national policy for biodiversity research that would integrate the fragmented research efforts being undertaken by public and private institutions.</p> <p>In response to this, a National Agenda for Biodiversity Research was formulated in March 2002.</p>							

175. Has your country established programmes for scientific and technical education and training in measures for the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and its components (12a)?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) programmes in place	X
176. Has your country provided support to other Parties for education and training in measures for the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and its components (12a)?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
177. Does your country promote and encourage research which contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (12b)?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
178. Does your country promote and cooperate in the use of scientific advances in biological diversity research in developing methods for conservation and sustainable use of biological resources (12c)?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	

If a developed country Party -

179. Does your country's implementation of the above activities take into account the special needs of developing countries?	
a) no	
b) yes, where relevant	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The National Biodiversity Research Agenda

The ecosystems approach was used as a framework in identifying researchable areas which should, to a large extent, respond to the gaps and issues in biodiversity management and conservation. The Agenda is categorized under major ecosystems heading as follows:

1. Coastal and Marine Ecosystems

Gaps and Issues: lack of baseline information, habitat destruction, over-exploitation, biological pollution, chemical pollution, weak institutional and legal capacities, biotechnology, ecotourism, domestication, bioprospecting, insufficient IEC on biodiversity

Priority Programs: assessment and mapping of resources at the species/ecosystem level; development of standard methods for biodiversity assessment, ecosystem health indices, an effective and standard evaluation and monitoring system, biological and physical remediation technologies, alternative/supplemental livelihood options, and an integrated and culture-responsive IEC program; socio-cultural demographic studies in relation to biodiversity; carrying capacity assessment of critical coastal and marine ecosystems and development of appropriate tools/methodologies for carrying capacity determination; impact assessment studies on exotic and introduced species, domestic/industrial/agricultural wastes and existing ecotourism on coastal and marine ecosystems; assessment and evaluation of the effect of mechanism strategies to strengthen the monitoring of EO 247; policy review and implementation

2. Forest Ecosystems

Gaps and Issues: no standard method for biodiversity assessment and monitoring, insufficient benchmark information on biodiversity valuation and accounting, lack of appropriate management, conservation and protection strategies/measures for protected areas and other biodiversity-rich areas, weak institutional capacities and linkages, inadequate understanding of the role of IPs in biodiversity conservation, gender concerns in biodiversity conservation, genetic erosion, alteration, introduction of exotic species, ecotourism and biodiversity, poorly conceived and outdated policies on biodiversity, policy support for wildlife trade and industry, insufficient IEC on biodiversity

Priority Programs: assessment/development of appropriate methodology for carrying capacity and biodiversity assessment; cultural studies; assessment and inventory of resources; inventory and study of conservation and protection strategies to include flagship species for protected areas and biodiversity-rich areas; review, evaluation and harmonization of policies

3. Freshwater Ecosystems

Gaps and Issues: habitat destruction, over-exploitation, biological pollution, chemical pollution, weak institutional and legal capacities, use of biotechnology, ecotourism, bioprospecting, management of freshwater wetlands, policy, insufficient IEC on biodiversity.

Priority Programs: assessment and mapping of resources at the species/ecosystem level; development of standard methods for biodiversity assessment, ecosystem health indices, an effective and standard evaluation and monitoring system, biological and physical remediation technologies, alternative/supplemental livelihood options, and an integrated and culture-responsive IEC program; impact assessment studies on exotic and introduced species, domestic/industrial/agricultural wastes and existing

ecotourism on freshwater ecosystems; studies on integrated management of wetlands, socio-cultural demography, local community protocols and resource sharing, hydro-biology, and habitat interconnectivity and ecosystems relationship; impact assessment studies of climate change, introduced species, chemical pollution, biotechnology, and ecotourism activities on freshwater ecosystems; assessment and evaluation of the effect of mechanism strategies to strengthen the monitoring of EO 247; policy review and implementation

4. Uplands and Agroecosystems

Gaps and Issues: lack of baseline information, habitat destruction, over-exploitation, industrialization in agroecosystems, chemical pollution, monoculture, inappropriate breeding, improper conservation, and biological pollution

Training on Biodiversity Management and Conservation

Formal Degree Courses

To date, those formal degree courses offered by universities that were mentioned in the First National Report are still considered as the established programmes for the identification, conservation, and sustainable use of biological diversity and its components. These include undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate degrees in the field of Biology, Botany, Marine Biology, Forestry, Biotechnology, Molecular Biology, Environmental Education, Environmental Studies, and Environmental Science.

Non-Formal Training Courses

As reported in the First National Report, opportunities for training in this field are not wanting, however, most of them are being conducted in relation to on-going projects. Further, there is no mechanism in place to keep track of these training courses that would have been useful in determining capacity enhancement in the field of biodiversity conservation. This is one reason why this Report does not have a comprehensive analysis of the training courses for the past four years.

One initiative that would, to a large extent respond to this gap is the new Enabling Activity Project on Biodiversity funded by the UNDP-GEF. The project commenced in January 2002 and is expected to assess capacity in certain areas of biodiversity conservation, such as indigenous knowledge, agrobiodiversity, and Protected Area Management Board (PAMB). This project is also expected to formulate a framework and a national strategy for capacity development for biodiversity conservation.

Article 13 Public education and awareness

180. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
181. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>Implementation of this Article is a major strategy in the Philippine National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and also included in the Philippine Agenda 21.</p> <p>Formal and Non-Formal Education</p> <p>Initiatives promotive of public education and awareness of biodiversity concepts were given medium priority for the period covered by this Report. In the First National Report, it was mentioned that formal courses relevant to biodiversity conservation are still limited to just a few academic institutions. Although the trend at that time was the offering by topnotch universities of new courses in line with biodiversity conservation, in reality, however, not many were added for the past four years. Moreover, although integration in the school curriculum has already been done, it covers only the most basic concepts.</p> <p>Non-Formal education strategies such as seminars, trainings, and workshops are mostly just added-on activities of major projects.</p> <p>Information and Awareness Campaigns</p> <p>There were numerous initiatives to raise the awareness of the general public on the importance of biodiversity. These efforts, however, are not coordinated and key messages not well directed. More importantly, the impacts on targeted audience are never measured. The use of the media in conveying these messages have been limited specially those coming from the government. Government efforts are largely complemented by television plugs sponsored by the private sector. The overall impact, however, is still very low considering that a recent study conducted by Haribon Foundation, a local NGO, showed that awareness of what biodiversity is in Metro Manila is almost non-existent.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that a National Information, Education, and Communication Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation be formulated, adopted, and implemented. This National Strategy should have a comprehensive action plan that contains appropriate key messages that promote strong environmental ethics. The National Strategy should contain elements that would respond to the need of bringing the message of biodiversity conservation to all levels of stakeholders - from the policy-makers to the grassroot communities. This would include translation of biodiversity concepts to local dialects and making available training modules that are complete with visual aids and other training tools, among others. Finally, the strategy should include an impact assessment tool to evaluate the effectiveness of such capacity-building and IEC strategies.</p>							

182. Does your country promote and encourage understanding of the importance of, and the measures required for, the conservation of biodiversity (13a) through media?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
183. Does your country promote and encourage understanding of the importance of, and the measures required for, the conservation of biodiversity (13a) through the inclusion of this topic in education programmes?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
184. Does your country cooperate with other States and international organizations in developing relevant educational and public awareness programmes (13b)?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	

Decision IV/10. Measures for implementing the Convention [part]

185. Are public education and awareness needs covered in the national strategy and action plan?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
186. Has your country allocated appropriate resources for the strategic use of education and communication instruments at each phase of policy formulation, implementation and evaluation?	
a) limited resources	X
b) significant but not adequate resources	
c) adequate resources	
187. Does your country support initiatives by major groups that foster stakeholder participation and that integrate biological diversity conservation matters in their practice and education programmes?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
188. Has your country integrated biodiversity concerns into education strategies?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) yes	X

189. Has your country made available any case-studies on public education and awareness and public participation, or otherwise sought to share experiences?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
190. Has your country illustrated and translated the provisions of the Convention into any local languages to promote public education and awareness raising of relevant sectors?	
a) not relevant	
b) still to be done	X
c) under development	
d) yes	
191. Is your country supporting local, national, sub-regional and regional education and awareness programmes?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
<i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i>	
192. When requesting assistance through the GEF, has your country proposed projects that promote measures for implementing Article 13 of the Convention?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision V/17. Education and public awareness

193. Does your country support capacity-building for education and communication in biological diversity as part of the national biodiversity strategy and action plans?	
a) no	
b) limited support	
c) yes (please give details)	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The ASEAN Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation (ARCBC) conducted a "Biodiversity Training, Education and Awareness Seminar-Workshop for the Philippines" in August 1999. The objectives of the workshop are:

- a) to assess existing and potential activities of training institutions and experts on biodiversity conservation in the Philippines;
- b) to share experiences in the development and implementation of training and extension programs on biodiversity conservation; and,
- c) to identify gaps/weaknesses and recommend strategies for biodiversity conservation.

The three-day workshop came up with the following outputs:

- a) gaps and weaknesses in training and extension activities in biodiversity conservation and management;
- b) issues in biodiversity conservation and recommended strategies;
- c) identified problems of stakeholders on biodiversity conservation and some strategies.

These outputs, however, did not translate into a national strategy and action plan that would have been the basis of a comprehensive communication plan for biodiversity conservation.

Article 14 Impact assessment and minimizing adverse impacts

194. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?					
a) High		b) Medium	X	c) Low	
195. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X
				d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					
<p>The Philippine EIA System had been in place since 1978 with the issuance of Presidential Decree 1586. This was further updated in 1996 with the issuance of Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) Administrative Order No. 96-37 that streamlined the system. Central to the system is the consideration that projects to be located in environmentally critical areas are required to prepare Environmental Impact Assessment and secure an Environmental Compliance Certificate. Environmentally critical areas include biodiversity-rich areas and critical habitats.</p> <p>Other laws such as the Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998 (Republic Act 8550), have provision/s that also requires all government agencies, as well as the private firms and entities who intend to undertake activities or projects which will affect the habitats of the rare, threatened and endangered aquatic species to prepare a detailed EIA that shall be submitted to the DENR for review and evaluation.</p> <p>Although the country's EIA legislation is in place, the implementation of the system could still be improved. One area where it can be enhanced is to allow for full and meaningful public participation. It is observed that although there are many opportunities for public participation in the process, the current practice is that public participation is mainly focused for information purposes only, very rarely for decision-making. Thus, stakeholders are just informed that there will be this project, not whether they would like to have that project. Additionally, there is also a need to conduct further studies on impact assessment to establish indicators for monitoring change in biodiversity.</p> <p>In terms of resources for the implementation of the EIA System, the national government allocates limited funding for this purpose. This is augmented by counterpart from the private sector, i.e. the proponent pays for the professional fees of the EIA Review Committee.</p>					

196. Is legislation in place requiring an environmental impact assessment of proposed projects likely to have adverse effects on biological diversity (14 (1a))?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) legislation in place	X
e) review of implementation available	
197. Do such environmental impact assessment procedures allow for public participation (14(1a))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
198. Does your country have mechanisms in place to ensure that the environmental consequences of national programmes and policies that are likely to have significant adverse impacts on biological diversity are duly taken into account (14(1b))?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	X
d) fully compliant with current scientific knowledge	
199. Is your country involved in bilateral, regional and/or multilateral discussion on activities likely to significantly affect biological diversity outside your country's jurisdiction (14(1c))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
200. Is your country implementing bilateral, regional and/or multilateral agreements on activities likely to significantly affect biological diversity outside your country's jurisdiction (14(1c))?	
a) no	
b) no, assessment of options in progress	
c) some completed, others in progress	
b) yes	X
201. Has your country mechanisms in place to notify other States of cases of imminent or grave danger or damage to biological diversity originating in your country and potentially affecting those States (14(1d))?	
a) no	X
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) mechanisms in place	
e) no need identified	

202. Has your country mechanisms in place to prevent or minimize danger or damage originating in your State to biological diversity in other States or in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (14(1d))?	
a) no	X
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) fully compliant with current scientific knowledge	
e) no need identified	
203. Has your country national mechanisms in place for emergency response to activities or events which present a grave and imminent danger to biological diversity (14(1e))?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) mechanisms in place	
204. Has your country encouraged international cooperation to establish joint contingency plans for emergency responses to activities or events which present a grave and imminent danger to biological diversity (14(1e))?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
c) no need identified	

Decision IV/10. Measures for implementing the Convention [part]

205. Has your country exchanged with other Contracting Parties information and experience relating to environmental impact assessment and resulting mitigating measures and incentive schemes?	
a) no	X
b) information provided to the Secretariat	
c) information provided to other Parties	
d) information provided on the national CHM	
206. Has your country exchanged with other Contracting Parties information on measures and agreements on liability and redress applicable to damage to biological diversity?	
a) no	X
b) information provided to the Secretariat	
c) information provided to other Parties	
d) information provided on the national CHM	

Decision V/18. Impact assessment, liability and redress

207. Has your country integrated environmental impact assessment into programmes on thematic areas and on alien species and tourism?	
a) no	
b) partly integrated	X
c) fully integrated	X
208. When carrying out environmental impact assessments does your country address loss of biological diversity and the interrelated socio-economic, cultural and human-health aspects relevant to biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) partly	X
c) fully	
209. When developing new legislative and regulatory frameworks, does your country have in place mechanisms to ensure the consideration of biological diversity concerns from the early stages of the drafting process?	
a) no	
b) in some circumstances	X
c) in all circumstances	
210. Does your country ensure the involvement of all interested and affected stakeholders in a participatory approach to all stages of the assessment process?	
a) no	
b) yes - in certain circumstances	X
c) yes - in all cases	
211. Has your country organised expert meetings, workshops and seminars, and/or training, educational and public awareness programmes and exchange programmes in order to promote the development of local expertise in methodologies, techniques and procedures for impact assessment?	
a) no	
b) some programmes in place	
c) many programmes in place	X
d) integrated approach to building expertise	
212. <i>Has your country carried out pilot environmental impact assessment projects, in order to promote the development of local expertise in methodologies, techniques and procedures?</i>	
a) no	
b) yes (please provide further details)	X
213. Does your country use strategic environmental assessments to assess not only the impact of individual projects, but also their cumulative and global effects, and ensure the results are applied in the decision making and planning processes?	
a) no	
b) to a limited extent	X
c) to a significant extent	

214. Does your country require the inclusion of development of alternatives, mitigation measures and consideration of the elaboration of compensation measures in environmental impact assessment?	
a) no	
b) to a limited extent	X
c) to a significant extent	
215. Is national information available on the practices, systems, mechanisms and experiences in the area of strategic environmental assessment and impact assessment?	
a) no	
b) yes (please append or summarise)	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Philippines has had several initiatives relevant to the implementation of this Article. At the ASEAN level, the Philippines has continuing discussions on activities likely to affect biological resources outside the country although to a limited extent. Examples are cited below:

- The Philippines has an agreement with Malaysia for the joint management of the Turtle Islands Heritage Protected Areas (TIHPA). TIHPA is the world's first transfrontier PA for marine turtles and the only major rookery of green turtles in the ASEAN region. The TIHPA is composed of six islands from the Philippines (Baguan, Langaan, Taganak, Great Bakkungan, Lihiman, and Boan) and three islands from Malaysia (Selingan, Gulisaan, and Bakkungan Kenchil).
- There are workshops and discussions on forest fires and its overall impacts on national parks, conservation areas, and on biodiversity for each of the ASEAN countries.

Aside from the CITES, there is no known mechanism in place to prevent or minimize danger or damage originating in the country to biological diversity of other countries or in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

At the national level, the National Committee on Biosafety (NCBP) has issued an updated set of Biosafety Guidelines that cover all work involving genetic engineering and the importation, introduction, field release, and breeding of organisms that are potentially harmful to people and environment even though these are not genetically modified. The Philippines was one of the first countries in Asia to formulate biosafety guidelines.

The Philippines has already signed the Cartagena Protocol although ratification is still underway.

Article 15 Access to genetic resources

216. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium	X	c) Low			
217. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting		d) Severely limiting	X
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>Two landmark legislations were passed in the past few years to effectively implement this Article. These are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Executive Order 247 "Prescribing Guidelines and Establishing a Regulatory Framework for the Prospecting of Biological and Genetic Resources, their By-Products and Derivatives, for Scientific and Commercial Purposes and for Other Purposes"</i> <p>EO 247 states that it is "the policy of the State to regulate the prospecting of biological and genetic resources to the end that these resources are protected and conserved, are developed and put to the sustainable use and benefit of the national interest. Further, it shall promote the development of local capability in science and technology to achieve technological self-reliance in selected areas".</p> <p>"Bioprospecting" is defined in the law as "the research, collection and utilization of biological and genetic resources, for the purpose of applying the knowledge derived therefrom for scientific and/or commercial purposes." Pursuant to this provision, bioprospecting in the public domain, including natural growth in private lands, and even within protected areas, ancestral lands and domain, whether intended to be utilized by foreign or local prospectors, requires consent of the concerned communities and/or research agreement with the government. Traditional uses of the resources, however, are exempt from the coverage of this regulation.</p> <p>Access by other parties to Philippine biological and genetic resources is expected to be facilitated by the setting up of clear and uniform rules for the use of resource, as embodied in EO 247. Under the system established, no bioprospecting activity shall be allowed unless a research agreement may either be an Academic Research Agreement (ARA) or a Commercial Research Agreement (CRA). Both agreements require the prospector to satisfy certain requirements and to undergo an application process.</p>							

- *Indigenous Peoples Right Act (IPRA Law)*

In October 1997, the Philippine Congress enacted the IPRAW Law which is the embodiment of the logn struggle for the recognition of the rights of the IPs to their ancestral domain as well as their cultural identity. Under IPRA, "the State shall recognize, respect and protect the rights of the IPs to preserve and develop their culture, traditions, and institutions. It ashall consider these rights in the formulation of national laws and policies. The rights referred to include the right to claim ancestral domains which covers not only the physical emvironment but also the spiritual and cultural bonds associated with it (Section 4 of IPRA). In return, the IPs are charged with the responsibility of maintaining the ecological balance and restoring damaged areas (Section 9 of IPRA).

The Law also protects the right of the indigenous people to exclude others in exploiting natural resources within their ancestral domain. Before any person is allowed access to these resources, free and prior informed consent of the community obtained in accordance to the customary laws, is required. The regulations governing bioprospecting (EO 247) further require that benefits derived from the utilization of biological and genetic resources shall be shared fairly and equitably with the community.

The IPRA Law, however, has not been fully implemented. In 21 September 1998, the government issued Memorandum Order No. 21 that froze the budget funds for Programs and Projects of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) thus paralyzing the operations of the commission. This, coupled with the question on the constitutionality of the IPRA filed by former Justice Isagani Cruz have made the IPs a non-priority in the national programs of the previous administration.

The implementation of EO 247 had been challenged being a pioneering policy. To date, only one CRA and one ARA have been approved. With the enactment of the Wildlife Act into a law, the inconsistencies between this and EO 247 is now being rationalized in the preparation of its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR).

218. Has your country endeavoured to create conditions to facilitate access to genetic resources for environmentally sound uses by other Contracting Parties (15(2))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
219. Is there any mutual understanding or agreement in place between different interest groups and the State on access to genetic resources (15(4))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X

220. Has your country an open participation planning process, or any other process in place, to ensure that access to resources is subject to prior informed consent (15(5))?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	
d) processes in place	X
221. Has your country taken measures to ensure that any scientific research based on genetic resources provided by other Contracting Parties is developed and carried out with the full participation of such Contracting Parties (15(6))?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	
222. Has your country taken measures to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of the results of research and development and the benefits arising from the commercial and other use of genetic resources with any Contracting Party providing such resources (15(7))?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	
If so, are these measures	
a) Legislation	
b) Statutory policy or subsidiary legislation	
c) Policy and administrative measures	X

Decision II/11 and Decision III/15. Access to genetic resources

223. Has your country provided the secretariat with information on relevant legislation, administrative and policy measures, participatory processes and research programmes?	
a) no	
b) yes, within the previous national report	X
c) yes, through case-studies	
d) yes, through other means (please give details below)	
224. Has your country implemented capacity-building programmes to promote successful development and implementation of legislative, administrative and policy measures and guidelines on access, including scientific, technical, business, legal and management skills and capacities?	
a) no	
b) some programmes covering some needs	X
c) many programmes covering some needs	
d) programmes cover all perceived needs	
e) no perceived need	

225. Has your country analysed experiences of legislative, administrative and policy measures and guidelines on access, including regional efforts and initiatives, for use in further development and implementation of measures and guidelines?	
a) no	
b) analysis in progress	X
c) analysis completed	
226. Is your country collaborating with all relevant stakeholders to explore, develop and implement guidelines and practices that ensure mutual benefits to providers and users of access measures?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
227. Has your country identified national authorities responsible for granting access to genetic resources?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
228. Is your country taking an active role in negotiations associated with the adaptation of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision V/26. Access to genetic resources

229. Has your country designated a national focal point and one or more competent national authorities to be responsible for access and benefit-sharing arrangements or to provide information on such arrangements?	
a) no	
b) yes	
c) yes, and Executive Secretary notified	X
230. Do your country's national biodiversity strategy, and legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing, contribute to conservation and sustainable use objectives?	
a) no	
b) to a limited extent	X
c) to a significant extent	
Parties that are recipients of genetic resources	
231. Has your country adopted administrative or policy measures that are supportive of efforts made by provider countries to ensure that access to their genetic resources is subject to Articles 15, 16 and 19 of the Convention?	
a) no	
b) other arrangements made	X
c) yes	

232. Does your country co-operate with other Parties in order to find practical and equitable solutions supportive of efforts made by provider countries to ensure that access to their genetic resources is subject to Articles 15, 16 and 19 of the Convention, recognizing the complexity of the issue, with particular consideration of the multiplicity of prior informed consent considerations?	
a) no	X
b) yes (please provide details)	
233. In developing its legislation on access, has your country taken into account and allowed for the development of a multilateral system to facilitate access and benefit-sharing in the context of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources?	
a) no	X
b) legislation under development	
c) yes	
234. Is your country co-ordinating its positions in both the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources?	
a) no	
b) taking steps to do so	X
c) yes	
235. Has your country provided information to the Executive Secretary on user institutions, the market for genetic resources, non-monetary benefits, new and emerging mechanisms for benefit sharing, incentive measures, clarification of definitions, <i>sui generis</i> systems and "intermediaries"?	
a) no	X
b) some information provided	
c) substantial information provided	
236. Has your country submitted information on specific issues related to the role of intellectual property rights in the implementation of access and benefit-sharing arrangements to the Executive Secretary?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
237. Has your country provided capacity-building and technology development and transfer for the maintenance and utilization of <i>ex situ</i> collections?	
a) no	
b) yes to a limited extent	X
c) yes to a significant extent	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Although the policy environment had been laid down for the implementation of this Article, there had been bottlenecks in its implementation. The NCIP encountered tremendous difficulty in the implementation of the IPRA Law not just on the ground but even in the aspect of funding and the question on its constitutionality. Similarly, EO 247 has been perceived to be too stringent as evidenced by the conflicting provisions with the Wildlife Act and which is currently being ironed out in the formulation of the Implementing Rules and Regulations of the latter. Further, only one ARA and one CRA has been approved as of date.

Article 16 Access to and transfer of technology

238. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
239. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting		d) Severely limiting	X
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>The implementation of this Article had been given impetus through the issuance of Executive Order 247 <i>"Prescribing Guidelines and Establishing a Regulatory Framework for the Prospecting of Biological and Genetic Resources, their By-Products and Derivatives, for Scientific and Commercial Purposes and for Other Purposes"</i></p> <p>The Philippine access regulation treats both both foreign and local collectors equally in terms of requirements and opportunities for access, except for requirements that encourage technology transfer from foreign collectors to the local collaborators. The nature and degree of participation of local scientists are subject to negotiation between the parties. EO 247 also requires that collectors to engage the services of local universities and that some equipment used in the researches be donated to Philippine institutions or agencies.</p> <p>In the aspect of benefit sharing, EO 247 provides that all discoveries derived from Philippine materials be made available to the Philippine government and local communities concerned. When discoveries from Philippine endemic species are made, the prospector shall make available to the Philippine government the use of such discovery, commercially and locally without paying royalty to the inventor/discoverer; however, other agreements, where appropriate may be negotiated by parties. For inventions derived from Philippine material, a separate agreement shall be made for the transfer of royalty, benefits and technology. The parties to the agreement may also include a stipulation of profit sharing. This provision, however, has yet to be fully clarified. Also, a number of other benefit-sharing options are being explored.</p> <p>The CBD also recognizes that intellectual property rights (IPRs) affect the implementation of the Convention. At present, there are no clear rules yet on how IPR issues are to be treated in the country. The First National Report indicated that the emerging thought is that local counterparts only share in IPRs if they have actual participation in the innovations developed. While the benefit-sharing provisions of EO 247 mandates the payment of royalties, it does not require that IPRs have to be shared. In this sense, the regulation merely requires sharing a portion of the proceeds (e.g. licensing fees). For lack of time, this information was not updated in time for the submission of the Second National Report, but this will definitely be looked into by the concerned agencies.</p>							

The implementation of this Article had been difficult since availability of resources for implementing EO 247 had been severely limiting. For the past five years, most of the funds utilized in EO 247 implementation were shouldered by the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau of the DENR out of its annual budget. No funds were provided specifically for EO implementation.

240. Has your country taken measures to provide or facilitate access for and transfer to other Contracting Parties of technologies that are relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or make use of genetic resources and do not cause significant damage to the environment (16(1))?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	
241. Is your country aware of any initiatives under which relevant technology is transferred to your country on concessional or preferential terms (16(2))?	
a) no	
b) yes (please give brief details below)	X
242. Has your country taken measures so that Contracting Parties which provide genetic resources are provided access to and transfer of technology which make use of those resources, on mutually agreed terms (16(3))?	
a) not relevant	
b) relevant, but no measures	
c) some measures in place	X
d) potential measures under review	
e) comprehensive measures in place	
If so, are these measures	
a) Legislation	X
b) Statutory policy or subsidiary legislation	
c) Policy and administrative arrangements	
243. Has your country taken measures so that the private sector facilitates access to joint development and transfer of relevant technology for the benefit of government institutions and the private sector of developing countries (16(4))?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	

If so, are these measures	
a) Legislation?	
b) Statutory policy and subsidiary legislation?	
c) Policy and administrative arrangements?	X
244. Does your country have a national system for intellectual property right protection (16(5))?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

245. If yes, does it cover biological resources (for example, plant species) in any way?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	

Decision III/17. Intellectual property rights

246. Has your country conducted and provided to the secretariat case-studies of the impacts of intellectual property rights on the achievement of the Conventions objectives?	
a) no	X
b) some	
c) many	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

<p>Challenges in the Implementation of EO 247</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate resources • Lack of political will • Absence of the following which are needed for its effective implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - guidelines fo defined parameter or criteria to determine the amount of bioprospecting fee to be paid by researchers - quota/quantity fo specimens to be allowed for biopropecting - guidelines on the amount of performance, ecological, rehabilitation, bond to be posted by the researchers - guidelines on the monitoring scheme/system within the Inter-Agency Committee on Biological and Genetic Resources (IACBGR) member-agencies, involving the regional/field offices
--

Issues on EO 247

- Scope and Coverage
 - No reference as to whether gathering and use of traditional knowledge for commercial application is covered or not
 - Exemptions:
 - a) traditional users - who are / how are traditional users determined? How will their uses of biological resources be monitored?
 - b) pre-CBD collections and *ex-situ* resources (captive-bred and/or propagated materials) - gene/seed banks are now the major sources of specimens for research and technology development purposes (e.g., DNA technology)
- Prior Informed Consent Requirements
 - 60-day requirement before a PIC Certificate can be issued - this is viewed as too long for the researchers.
 - Long process before a PIC Certificate is obtained - scientists complain that the PIC process is too tedious, time consuming and costly to comply with
 - Expenses for public notification and consultations shall be borne by researchers - industry representatives opine that PIC requirement deprives them of their right to protect trade secrets and might invade on their IPR claims on a discovery or invention
- Requirements for a Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits

The EO requires researchers and/or collectors to comply with the following as part of the benefit-sharing

 - a) deposit the complete set of specimen collected at the Philippine National Museum or other designated repository in the country
 - b) provide Filipino citizens and government entities complete access to specimens collected and to data/information generated from these resources;
 - c) actively involve Filipino scientists in the collection, research and technology development and to avail of the services of Philippine universities and academic institutions
 - d) where applicable and appropriate, transfer/donate to a Philippine entity the equipment purchased through the research activity
 - e) in case of commercial application, pay royalties and/or other forms of compensation to the Philippine government, local communities (including IPs/ICCs), individual person, or protected areas where the resources were collected
 - f) in case a commercial product is discovered or a new technology is developed from the use of Philippine endemic species, make available such discovery/technology locally and commercially without paying royalty to the researcher, subject to negotiation

Several scientists view these requirements as too demanding and "asking too much and giving too little". They also fear that the involvement of local scientists may invade on the confidentiality of information and may jeopardize the chances to apply for IPR protection on commercially viable products.
- Process Before a Formal Research Agreement is Approved

Most scientists find the process (five months from filing of application to approval) too long to the detriment of the researchers and the development objectives as well.

In general, most local researchers find the bioprospecting policy a barrier to research growth and development. On the part of foreign researchers, they would instead consider other countries as venue for their research and collection activities.

Article 17 Exchange of information

247. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
248. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>Exchange of information could be treated in different levels. At the international arena, the rapid growth of the Internet and the Web contributed significantly to the exchange of publicly available information on biodiversity. In the Philippines, the passing of the e-commerce law facilitated this mode of exchange. However, the bottleneck is not just the infrastructure for exchange but also making available biodiversity content on the Net. There is a wealth of biodiversity knowledge in the country, however, they are not organized and easily accessible. At the national level, access to such information is dependent on availability of infrastructure. It should be noted that only cities and major towns have access to the Internet. At the provincial and local level, information exchange is more difficult where largely traditional means are still employed.</p> <p>Another point that has to be looked into in information exchange is that there is no established mechanism for researchers to communicate their research findings to the areas where the study was conducted.</p> <p>A recent development is the proposed establishment of a Philippine Biodiversity Information Network which is aimed at facilitating the delivery and exchange of information on biodiversity to support conservation efforts. The Memorandum of Agreement for the Network is scheduled for signing in April 2002 by more or less twenty stakeholders. This effort largely complements the Philippine Clearing House Mechanism for Biodiversity.</p>							

249. Has your country taken measures to facilitate the exchange of information from publicly available sources (17(1))?	
a) no measures	
b) restricted by lack of resources	X
c) some measures in place	X
d) potential measures under review	
e) comprehensive measures in place	

If a developed country Party -

250. Do these measures take into account the special needs of developing countries (17(1))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	
251. If so, do these measures include all the categories of information listed in Article 17(2), including technical, scientific and socio-economic research, training and surveying programmes, specialized knowledge, repatriation of information and so on?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	

Article 18 Technical and scientific cooperation

252. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?					
a) High		b) Medium	X	c) Low	
253. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting					
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					
<p>To date, there are already comprehensive measures in place at the national level to promote international technical and scientific cooperation in the field of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Institutions that contribute significantly to this technical and scientific cooperation include the ASEAN Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation, the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization - Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEAMEO SEARCA), Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, the University of the Philippines - Marine Sciences Institute, and several universities and academic institutions. However, there is still a need to expand participation in technical and scientific cooperation initiatives among Parties to fully benefit from the implementation of this Article.</p>					

254. Has your country taken measures to promote international technical and scientific cooperation in the field of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (18(1))?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	X
255. Do the measures taken to promote cooperation with other Contracting Parties in the implementation of the Convention pay special attention to the development and strengthening of national capabilities by means of human resources development and institution building (18(2))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
256. Has your country encouraged and developed methods of cooperation for the development and use of technologies, including indigenous and traditional technologies, in pursuance of the objectives of this Convention (18(4))?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) methods in place	

257. Does such cooperation include the training of personnel and exchange of experts (18(4))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
258. Has your country promoted the establishment of joint research programmes and joint ventures for the development of technologies relevant to the objectives of the Convention (18(5))?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	

Decision II/3, Decision III/4 and Decision IV/2. Clearing House Mechanism

259. Is your country cooperating in the development and operation of the Clearing House Mechanism?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
260. Is your country helping to develop national capabilities through exchanging and disseminating information on experiences and lessons learned in implementing the Convention?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
261. Has your country designated a national focal point for the Clearing-House Mechanism?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
262. Is your country providing resources for the development and implementation of the Clearing-House Mechanism?	
a) no	
b) yes, at the national level	
c) yes, at national and international levels	X
263. Is your country facilitating and participating in workshops and other expert meetings to further the development of the CHM at international levels?	
a) no	
b) participation only	X
c) supporting some meetings and participating	

264. Is your CHM operational	
a) no	
b) under development	
c) yes (please give details below)	X
265. Is your CHM linked to the Internet	
a) no	
b) yes	X
266. Has your country established a multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary CHM steering committee or working group at the national level?	
a) no	X
b) yes	

Decision V/14. Scientific and technical co-operation and the clearinghouse mechanisms (Article 18)

267. Has your country reviewed the priorities identified in Annex I to the decision, and sought to implement them?	
a) not reviewed	
b) reviewed but not implemented	X
c) reviewed and implemented as appropriate	

Further comments on implementation of these Articles

Capacity Building in support of technical and scientific cooperation

In order to support technical and scientific cooperation, there is a need to develop and strengthen national capabilities including human resources development and institutional building. For the period covered by this Report, there were a number of formal and training courses and exchange programs sponsored by other Parties that were participated in by Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau personnel and other concerned government agencies. However, there is no systematic mechanism in-place that would track similar activities in the non-government sector. Moreover, there is still no comprehensive capacity building strategy that would adequately address the country's need for implementing the Philippine National Strategy and Action Plan in general, and the CBD in particular. A National Capacity Building Strategy that would define needs at the systemic, institutional, and individual level would definitely benefit the country since it will provide baseline information, indicators, and progress of the program. It will rationalize all capacity building efforts saving precious resources and time.

Add-On Enabling Activity on Biodiversity

The most recent development is the implementation of the UNDP-GEF funded Add-on Enabling Activity Project on Biodiversity in January 2002. The project, among others, aims to come up with capacity building strategies for major aspects of biodiversity conservation namely protected area management, local and indigenous knowledge and technologies, and agrobiodiversity.

Joint Research Programs

In support of the implementation of this Article and in line with the strategies of the Philippine NBSAP, joint research programs with other Contracting Parties were implemented for the period covered by this Report. Examples are given below:

- *Biodiversity Research Programme for Development in Mindanao: Focus on Mt. Malindang and Environs (July 2000 to June 2005)*

This project is funded by the Ministry for Development Cooperation of the Netherlands. It aims to build the capacity for local communities, government, academe and other stakeholders to promote and undertake the sustainable use of biological resources and effective decision-making on biodiversity conservation.

- *Establishment of Turtle Island Heritage Protected Area*

The Philippines and Malaysia signed a Memorandum of Agreement for the joint management and protection of the Turtle Islands Heritage Protected Area as a green and hawksbill turtle sanctuary. Both parties shall endeavor to develop an integrated management program that shall highlight conservation, management, research and monitoring activities. Although the MOA was signed in 1996, its continued implementation serves as a model for transboundary management of protected areas.

The Philippine Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) on Biological Diversity

The Philippine CHM was developed in 1998 through the Enabling Activity Grant from the UNDP-GEF. It closely followed the guidelines set forth for the development of national CHMs. During the duration of the Project, it was regularly updated. After the project was completed, however, no updating was done although it remained available on the Internet.

The UNDP-GEF Add-On Enabling Activity provides additional funds to update the CHM, operationalize it and come up with a sustainability plan to optimize its utility as a mode for scientific and technical cooperation, among others.

Article 19 Handling of biotechnology and distribution of its benefits

268. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
269. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>The implementation of this Article by the country for the past four years had been assigned a medium priority. There is the landmark legislation in place, Executive Order 247 ("Prescribing Guidelines and Establishing a Regulatory Framework for the Prospecting of Biological and Genetic Resources, Their By-Products and Derivatives for Scientific and Commercial Purposes and For Other Purposes") which was issued in 1995. A year later, the implementing rules and regulations was issued by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. EO 247 provided, among others, a framework for regulating prospecting activities by requiring prior informed consent from the government, Protected Area Management Boards, local and indigenous communities, and private landowners. It also provided minimum terms for academic and commercial research agreements, benefit-sharing and an institutional structure that serves as a competent authority for regulating access.</p> <p>For the past four years, however, the number of Academic Research Agreements (ARA) and Commercial Research Agreements (CRA) approved under the provisions of EO 247 had been very low. Only two research agreements had been approved - one ARA was issued to the University of the Philippines System in collaboration with other research institutions, and one CRA to the Marine Science Institute of the University of the Philippines. There is a general belief that the provisions of EO 247 are too stringent to implement and thus hampers the implementation of this Article.</p> <p>In terms of resources, funds for implementing this Article from the Government side is limiting. Funds from the private sector is more accessible; however, there is the moral question of vested interest whenever private funds are used especially in areas as controversial as biotechnology.</p>							

270. Has your country taken measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities by those Contracting Parties which provide the genetic resources for such research (19(1))?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	

If so, are these measures:	
a) Legislation	
b) Statutory policy and subsidiary legislation	
c) Policy and administrative measures	X

271. Has your country taken all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis by Contracting Parties to the results and benefits arising from biotechnologies based upon genetic resources provided by those Contracting Parties (19(2))?	
a) no measures	
b) some measures in place	X
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive measures in place	

**Decision IV/3. Issues related to biosafety and Decision V/1. Work Plan
of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on
Biosafety**

272. Is your country a Contracting Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety?	
a) not a signatory	
b) signed, ratification in progress	X
c) instrument of ratification deposited	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Philippines signed the Biosafety Protocol in May 2000. The ratification process is being initiated by the PCSD Sub-Committee on Biodiversity under the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

In relation to this, the Department of Agriculture has completed the formulation of a draft Administrative Order (AO) entitled "Rules and Regulations on the importation and release into the Environment of Plant and Plant Products derived from the Use of Modern Biotechnology. Under the AO, GM plant and plant products, whether for field-testing, propagation and direct use for food, feed, or processing require safety tests. The AO is consistent with the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This AO underwent extensive consultations with all stakeholders. The AO is scheduled for release during the first half of 2002.

The Department of Agriculture of the Philippines participated as a member of the Philippine Delegation in ICCP and have forwarded official comments to the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau - Department of Environment and Natural Resources as focal points.

It is the position of the Department of Agriculture that Philippine government agencies should examine their respective roles in the implementation of Cartagena Protocol and start to formulate measures needed for the Protocol. Ideally, measures should be in place before the ratification process starts.

The Philippines will be formulating a National Biosafety Framework that will integrate and update the existing policies on biosafety, clarify and set specific role of all concerned agencies/institutions, and incorporate the provisions of Cartagena Protocol. The project is part of the 100 national Biosafety Framework Project of the UNDP-GEF. The Philippine project will start within the year 2002.

Article 20 Financial resources

273. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?					
a) High		b) Medium	X	c) Low	
274. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting					
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources					
<p>Financial resources for the implementation of this Article was limiting. At the national level, the budget given to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the primary agency responsible for biodiversity conservation is only Philippine Peso 5.1 billion for the year 2001.</p> <p>Biodiversity conservation cuts across many sectors. This implies that initiatives with their corresponding budgets spent by other relevant sectors (i.e. Department of Agriculture, Department of Science and Technology, Department of Health, Department of Tourism, Department of Trade and Industry, Department of National Defense) which are directly or indirectly benefitting biodiversity conservation should also be accounted for as investments towards this purpose. However, since there is still no standardized financial reporting for this purpose, it was very difficult to ascertain given the limited time period. Thus, it is recommended that efforts should be initiated towards standardizing reporting and monitoring financial resources given to biodiversity conservation initiatives.</p> <p>The country received new and additional funds from the financial mechanism but this was not enough to meet the agreed incremental costs of implementing measures which fulfill the obligations to the Convention. For the period under review, financial resources for biodiversity conservation were mainly for the continuing activities of the CPPAP and NIPAP. CPPAP is scheduled for completion this June 2002, while NIPAP was completed in March 2001. The only new significant financial support for the past four years are the UNDP-GEF project which commenced in 2001, the Samar Integrated Biodiversity Programme (US\$5.8 million) and Mount Malindang Project (US\$2.5 million).</p>					

275. Has your country provided financial support and incentives in respect of those national activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of the Convention (20(1))?	
a) no	
b) yes - incentives only	
c) yes - financial support only	X
d) yes - financial support and incentives	

<i>If a developed country Party -</i>	
276. Has your country provided new and additional financial resources to enable developing country Parties to meet the agreed incremental costs to them of implementing measures which fulfil the obligations of the Convention, as agreed between you and the interim financial mechanism (20(2))?	
a) no	
b) yes	
<i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i>	
277. Has your country received new and additional financial resources to enable you to meet the agreed full incremental costs of implementing measures which fulfil the obligations of the Convention (20(2))?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
<i>If a developed country Party -</i>	
278. Has your country provided financial resources related to implementation of the Convention through bilateral, regional and other multilateral channels (20(3))?	
<i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i>	
279. Has your country used financial resources related to implementation of the Convention from bilateral, regional and other multilateral channels (20(3))?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision III/6. Additional financial resources

280. Is your country working to ensure that all funding institutions (including bilateral assistance agencies) are striving to make their activities more supportive of the Convention?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
281. Is your country cooperating in any efforts to develop standardized information on financial support for the objectives of the Convention?	
a) no	X
b) yes (please attach information)	

Decision V/11. Additional financial resources

282. Has your country established a process to monitor financial support to biodiversity?	
a) no	
b) procedures being established	
c) yes (please provide details)	X
283. Are details available of your country's financial support to national biodiversity activities?	
a) no	
b) not in a standardized format	X
c) yes (please provide details)	
284. Are details available of your country's financial support to biodiversity activities in other countries?	
a) not applicable	X
b) no	
c) not in a standardized format	
d) yes (please provide details)	
Developed country Parties -	
285. Does your country promote support for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention in the funding policy of its bilateral funding institutions and those of regional and multilateral funding institutions?	
a) no	
b) yes	
Developing country Parties -	
286. Does your country discuss ways and means to support implementation of the objectives of the Convention in its dialogue with funding institutions?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
287. Has your country compiled information on the additional financial support provided by the private sector?	
a) no	X
b) yes (please provide details)	
288. Has your country considered tax exemptions in national taxation systems for biodiversity-related donations?	
a) no	
b) not appropriate to national conditions	
c) exemptions under development	X
d) exemptions in place	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Monitoring Financial Support to Biodiversity Conservation

To date, only financial support to government implemented projects can be monitored although not in a very systematic manner. This can be explained by the fact that biodiversity conservation cuts across many sectors. This implies that initiatives with their corresponding budgets spent by other relevant sectors (i.e. Department of Agriculture, Department of Science and Technology, Department of Health, Department of Tourism, Department of Trade and Industry, Department of National Defense) which are directly or indirectly benefitting biodiversity conservation should also be accounted for as investments towards this purpose. However, since there is still no standardized financial reporting for this purpose, it was very difficult to ascertain given the limited time period. Thus, it is recommended that efforts should be initiated towards standardizing reporting and monitoring financial resources given to biodiversity conservation initiatives both by the government and the private sector. It should be noted that both the government and the NGOs have been very aggressive in sourcing funds for biodiversity projects.

Article 21 Financial mechanism

289. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?							
a) High		b) Medium		X		c) Low	
290. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?							
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources							
<p>The Global Environment Facility (GEF)</p> <p>In the Philippines, the Global Environment Facility has played a vital role in biodiversity conservation activities promotive of the country's commitments to the Convention. The Philippines is one of the 25 global hotspots. On a per unit area basis, the Philippines is the top megadiversity country and the hottest of the hotspots. Considering these, the Philippines needs financial and technical assistance from developing countries in order to implement commitments to the Convention. The GEF had been providing financial support but is not adequate considering the magnitude and urgency of the problem.</p> <p>Financial Mechanisms at the National Level for the Conservation of Biodiversity</p> <p>Very little attention was given to strengthen local financial mechanisms for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Existing local financial institutions have to be strengthened to include biodiversity conservation aspects in their priorities. Likewise, local financial mechanisms have to be looked into to expand sources of support for biodiversity conservation.</p>							

291. Has your country worked to strengthen existing financial institutions to provide financial resources for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity?	
a) no	X
b) yes	

Decision III/7. Guidelines for the review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism

292. Has your country provided information on experiences gained through activities funded by the financial mechanism?	
a) no activities	
b) no, although there are activities	
c) yes, within the previous national report	
d) yes, through case-studies	X
e) yes, through other means (please give details below)	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Philippines was able to strengthen its capacity in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity through the financial and technical assistance from the GEF. The GEF funded the Conservation of Priority Protected Areas (CPPAP), the second phase of the Integrated Protected Areas System (IPAS) program that is pilot-testing the NIPAS Law (National Integrated Protected Areas System). The CPPAP has a budget of US\$20 million, financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through the World Bank. The CPPAP is due for completion this June 2002. The GEF also funded enabling activities for biodiversity conservation amounting to US\$457,000.00. GEF grants for the past four years for major projects on biodiversity conservation amount to approximately US\$10 million. These are however, not enough to cover the incremental costs of conservation efforts that has to be undertaken by the Philippines in order to maintain its biodiversity resources not just for its own for the benefit but for the world as well.

To make the GEF a more responsive financial mechanism, it should simplify application and approval procedures, shorten the duration of project application and enhance the efficiency of evaluation and approval. These measures would enable developing countries to access funding as quickly as possible and thus will be able to implement COP decisions effectively.

One difficulty in accessing the fund is the limited understanding at the national level of the concept of incremental cost. To a large extent, the preparation of project proposals has been hampered by this constraint. It would be of great help if national experts could have more opportunities to participate in the preliminary process of project application in order to familiarize them with the procedures.

In sum, GEF as the major funding mechanism for the CBD had played a vital role in the overall efforts for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. It had been instrumental in the progress the country has made in this area.

Article 23 Conference of the Parties

293. How many people from your country participated in each of the meetings of the Conference of the Parties?	
a) COP 1 (Nassau)	4
b) COP 2 (Jakarta)	4
c) COP 3 (Buenos Aires)	4
d) COP 4 (Bratislava)	4
e) COP 5 (Nairobi)	4

**Decision I/6, Decision II/10, Decision III/24 and Decision IV/17.
Finance and budget**

294. Has your country paid all of its contributions to the Trust Fund?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision IV/16 (part) Preparation for meetings of the Conference of the Parties

295. Has your country participated in regional meetings focused on discussing implementation of the Convention before any meetings of the Conference of the Parties?	
a) no	
b) yes (please specify which)	X
If a developed country Party -	
296. Has your country funded regional and sub-regional meetings to prepare for the COP, and facilitated the participation of developing countries in such meetings?	
a) no	
b) yes (please provide details below)	

Decision V/22. Budget for the programme of work for the biennium 2001-2002

297. Did your country pay its contribution to the core budget (BY Trust Fund) for 2001 by 1 st January 2001?	
a) yes in advance	
b) yes on time	X
c) no but subsequently paid	
d) not yet paid	

298. Has your country made additional voluntary contributions to the trust funds of the Convention?	
a) yes in the 1999-2000 biennium	
b) yes for the 2001-2002 biennium	
c) expect to do so for the 2001-2002 biennium	
d) no	X

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Philippines supports the activities of the Conference of the Parties. It was among the countries that participated in drafting the Convention and saw it through the signing at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. It was among the first 31 countries to ratify the Convention that put the Agreement to force in 1993. The country also participated actively in all the Conference of the Parties, the SBSSTA and the inter-sessional meetings and conferences organized by the CBD Secretariat.

As such, it shared experiences and other information relevant to the COP agenda and took part in the drafting of working documents for the meetings through government representatives in attendance. The Philippine delegation endeavored to bring to the COP discussion the country's position essential and technical issues. At the national level, positions to the issues discussed at the COP meetings are thoroughly discussed and studied by the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development Sub-Committee on Biodiversity. Thus, these positions reflect the national opinion regarding the issue. However, the country's participation to the COP meetings would be more meaningful and substantial if the number of delegates would be increased. Presently, the Philippines could only financially support at the maximum four persons to the COP meetings, thus, participation specially in simultaneous sessions are limited.

The Philippines, to the extent allowed by available resources, submits reports and responds to other initiatives of the COP. It submitted its First National Report in 1998 and is currently compiling information for the thematic reports.

The Philippines has paid all its contributions to the Trust Fund. However, it is not capable to provide additional contributions due to financial constraints.

Article 24 Secretariat

299. Has your country provided direct support to the Secretariat in terms of seconded staff, financial contribution for Secretariat activities, etc?	
a) no	X
b) yes	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Philippines supports the work of the CBD Secretariat. It was among the countries that participated in drafting the Convention and saw it through the signing at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. The country was among the first 31 countries to ratify the Convention which put the Agreement to force in 1993. The Philippines also participated actively in all the Conference of the Parties, the SBSSTA and the inter-sessional meetings and conferences organized by the CBD Secretariat.

To facilitate the work of the Secretariat, the Philippines promptly designated national focal points for the CBD, the Clearing House Mechanism, and the Inter-Governmental Commission for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The country has also designated a coordinator for the Global Taxonomy Initiative.

The Philippines, to the extent allowed by available resources, submits reports and responds to other initiatives of the Secretariat. It submitted its First National Report in 1998 and is currently compiling information for the thematic reports.

The Philippines has paid all its contribution to the Trust Fund. As A developing country, however, the Philippines is unable to provide financial support to the CBD Secretariat.

Article 25 Subsidiary body on scientific, technical and technological advice

300. How many people from your country participated in each of the meetings of SBSTTA?	
a) SBSTTA I (Paris)	2
b) SBSTTA II (Montreal)	2
c) SBSTTA III (Montreal)	2
d) SBSTTA IV (Montreal)	2
e) SBSTTA V (Montreal)	2

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Philippines is among the countries that actively participated in the activities of the SBSTTA. As such, it shared experiences and other information relevant to the SBSTTA meeting agenda and took part in the drafting of working documents for the meetings through government representatives attending the SBSTTA. The Philippine delegation endeavored to bring to the SBSTTA discussion the country's position essential and technical issues. At the national level, positions to the issues discussed at the SBSTTA meetings are thoroughly discussed and studied by the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development Sub-Committee on Biodiversity. Thus, these positions reflect the national opinion regarding the issue. However, the country's participation to the SBSTTA meetings would be more meaningful and substantial if the number of delegates would be increased. Presently, the Philippines could only financially support at the maximum two persons to the SBSTTA meetings, thus, participation specially in simultaneous sessions are limited.

Article 26 Reports

301. What is the status of your first national report?	
a) Not submitted	
b) Summary report submitted	
c) Interim/draft report submitted	
d) Final report submitted	X
If b), c) or d), was your report submitted:	
by the original deadline of 1.1.98 (Decision III/9)?	
by the extended deadline of 31.12.98 (Decision IV/14)?	X
Later (please specify date)	

Decision IV/14 National reports

302. Did all relevant stakeholders participate in the preparation of this national report, or in the compilation of information used in the report?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
303. Has your country taken steps to ensure that its first and/or second national report(s) is/are available for use by relevant stakeholders?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
If yes, was this by:	
a) informal distribution?	X
b) publishing the report?	X
c) making the report available on request?	X
d) posting the report on the Internet?	X

Decision V/19. National reporting

304. Has your country prepared voluntary detailed thematic reports on one or more of the items for in-depth consideration at an ordinary meeting of the parties, following the guidelines provided?	
a) no	X
b) yes - forest ecosystems	
c) yes - alien species	
d) yes - benefit sharing	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

The Philippines submitted its First National Report in 1998. Two versions were published: one was a book version while the other was a booklet of a popular version. Both versions were circulated widely through various means.

The Philippines is currently compiling information for the thematic reports requested by the Convention.

Decision V/6. Ecosystem approach

305. Is your country applying the ecosystem approach, taking into account the principles and guidance contained in the annex to decision V/6?	
a) no	
b) under consideration	
c) some aspects are being applied	
d) substantially implemented	X
306. Is your country developing practical expressions of the ecosystem approach for national policies and legislation and for implementation activities, with adaptation to local, national, and regional conditions, in particular in the context of activities developed within the thematic areas of the Convention?	
a) no	
b) under consideration	
c) some aspects are being applied	
d) substantially implemented	X
307. Is your country identifying case studies and implementing pilot projects that demonstrate the ecosystem approach, and using workshops and other mechanisms to enhance awareness and share experience?	
a) no	
b) case-studies identified	
c) pilot projects underway	X
d) workshops planned/held	
e) information available through CHM	
308. Is your country strengthening capacities for implementation of the ecosystem approach, and providing technical and financial support for capacity-building to implement the ecosystem approach?	
a) no	
b) yes within the country	X
c) yes including support to other Parties	
309. Has your country promoted regional co-operation in applying the ecosystem approach across national borders?	
a) no	
b) informal co-operation	
c) formal co-operation (please give details)	X

Inland water ecosystems

Decision IV/4. Status and trends of the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems and options for conservation and sustainable use

310. Has your country included information on biological diversity in wetlands when providing information and reports to the CSD, and considered including inland water biological diversity issues at meetings to further the recommendations of the CSD?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
311. Has your country included inland water biological diversity considerations in its work with organizations, institutions and conventions affecting or working with inland water?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
<i>If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -</i>	
312. When requesting support for projects relating to inland water ecosystems from the GEF, has your country given priority to identifying important areas for conservation, preparing and implementing integrated watershed, catchment and river basin management plans, and investigating processes contributing to biodiversity loss?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
313. Has your country reviewed the programme of work specified in annex 1 to the decision, and identified priorities for national action in implementing the programme?	
a) no	
b) under review	X
c) yes	

**Decision V/2. Progress report on the implementation of the programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems
(implementation of decision IV/4)**

314. Is your country supporting and/or participating in the River Basin Initiative?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
315. Is your country gathering information on the status of inland water biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) assessments ongoing	X
c) assessments completed	
316. Is this information available to other Parties?	
a) no	
b) yes - national report	X
c) yes - through the CHM	
d) yes - other means (please give details below)	X
317. Has your country developed national and/or sectoral plans for the conservation and sustainable use of inland water ecosystems?	

a) no	
b) yes - national plans only	
c) yes - national plans and major sectors	X
d) yes - national plans and all sectors	
318. Has your country implemented capacity-building measures for developing and implementing these plans?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision III/21. Relationship of the Convention with the CSD and biodiversity-related conventions

319. Is the conservation and sustainable use of wetlands, and of migratory species and their habitats, fully incorporated into your national strategies, plans and programmes for conserving biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Further comments on implementation of these decisions and the associated programme of work

Marine and coastal biological diversity

Decision II/10 and Decision IV/5. Conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biological diversity

320. Does your national strategy and action plan promote the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
321. Has your country established and/or strengthened institutional, administrative and legislative arrangements for the development of integrated management of marine and coastal ecosystems?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	
c) advanced stages of development	X
d) arrangements in place	
322. Has your country provided the Executive Secretary with advice and information on future options concerning the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
323. Has your country undertaken and/or exchanged information on demonstration projects as practical examples of integrated marine and coastal area management?	
a) no	
b) yes - previous national report	X
c) yes - case-studies	X
d) yes - other means (please give details below)	
324. Has your country programmes in place to enhance and improve knowledge on the genetic structure of local populations of marine species subjected to stock enhancement and/or sea-ranching activities?	
a) no	
b) programmes are being developed	
c) programmes are being implemented for some species	X
d) programmes are being implemented for many species	
e) not a perceived problem	
325. Has your country reviewed the programme of work specified in an annex to the decision, and identified priorities for national action in implementing the programme?	
a) no	
b) under review	X
c) yes	

Decision V/3. Progress report on the implementation of the programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (implementation of decision IV/5)

326. Is your country contributing to the implementation of the work plan on coral bleaching?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
c) not relevant	
327. Is your country implementing other measures in response to coral bleaching?	
a) no	
b) yes (please provide details below)	X
c) not relevant	
328. Has your country submitted case-studies on the coral bleaching phenomenon to the Executive Secretary?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
c) not relevant	

Further comments on implementation of these decisions and the associated programme of work

Agricultural biological diversity

Decision III/11 and Decision IV/6. Conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biological diversity

329. Has your country identified and assessed relevant ongoing activities and existing instruments at the national level?	
a) no	
b) early stages of review and assessment	X
c) advanced stages of review and assessment	
d) assessment completed	
330. Has your country identified issues and priorities that need to be addressed at the national level?	
a) no	
b) in progress	X
c) yes	
331. Is your country using any methods and indicators to monitor the impacts of agricultural development projects, including the intensification and extensification of production systems, on biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) mechanisms in place	
332. Is your country taking steps to share experiences addressing the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes - case-studies	X
c) yes - other mechanisms (please specify)	
333. Has your country conducted case-studies on the issues identified by SBSTTA: i) pollinators, ii) soil biota, and iii) integrated landscape management and farming systems?	
a) no	
b) yes - pollinators	X
c) yes - soil biota	
d) yes - integrated landscape management and farming systems	X
334. Is your country establishing or enhancing mechanisms for increasing public awareness and understanding of the importance of the sustainable use of agrobiodiversity components?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) mechanisms in place	

335. Does your country have national strategies, programmes and plans which ensure the development and successful implementation of policies and actions that lead to sustainable use of agrobiodiversity components?	
a) no	
b) early stages of development	X
c) advanced stages of development	
d) mechanisms in place	
336. Is your country promoting the transformation of unsustainable agricultural practices into sustainable production practices adapted to local biotic and abiotic conditions?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
337. Is your country promoting the use of farming practices that not only increase productivity, but also arrest degradation as well as reclaim, rehabilitate, restore and enhance biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
338. Is your country promoting mobilization of farming communities for the development, maintenance and use of their knowledge and practices in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	X
c) yes - significant extent	
339. Is your country helping to implement the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
340. Is your country collaborating with other Contracting Parties to identify and promote sustainable agricultural practices and integrated landscape management?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision V/5. Agricultural biological diversity: review of phase I of the programme of work and adoption of a multi-year work programme

341. Has your country reviewed the programme of work annexed to the decision and identified how you can collaborate in its implementation?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
342. Is your country promoting regional and thematic co-operation within this framework of the programme of work on agricultural biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) some co-operation	X
c) widespread co-operation	
d) full co-operation in all areas	
343. Has your country provided financial support for implementation of the programme of work on agricultural biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) limited additional funds	X
c) significant additional funds	
<i>If a developed country Party -</i>	
344. Has your country provided financial support for implementation of the programme of work on agricultural biological diversity, in particular for capacity building and case-studies, in developing countries and countries with economies in transition?	
a) no	
b) yes within existing cooperation programme(s)	
b) yes, including limited additional funds	
c) yes, with significant additional funds	
345. Has your country supported actions to raise public awareness in support of sustainable farming and food production systems that maintain agricultural biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes, to a limited extent	
c) yes, to a significant extent	X
346. Is your country co-ordinating its position in both the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources?	
a) no	
b) taking steps to do so	
c) yes	X
347. Is your country a Contracting Party to the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade?	
a) not a signatory	
b) signed - ratification in process	X
c) instrument of ratification deposited	
348. Is your country supporting the application of the Executive Secretary for	

observer status in the Committee on Agriculture of the World Trade Organisation?	
a) no	
b) yes	
349. Is your country collaborating with other Parties on the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators?	
a) no	X
b) yes	
350. Is your country compiling case-studies and implementing pilot projects relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators?	
a) no	X
b) yes (please provide details)	
351. Has information on scientific assessments relevant to genetic use restriction technologies been supplied to other Contracting Parties through media such as the Clearing-House Mechanism?	
a) not applicable	X
b) no	
c) yes - national report	
d) yes - through the CHM	
e) yes - other means (please give details below)	
352. Has your country considered how to address generic concerns regarding such technologies as genetic use restriction technologies under international and national approaches to the safe and sustainable use of germplasm?	
a) no	X
b) yes - under consideration	
c) yes - measures under development	
353. Has your country carried out scientific assessments on <u>inter alia</u> ecological, social and economic effects of genetic use restriction technologies?	
a) no	X
b) some assessments	
c) major programme of assessments	
354. Has your country disseminated the results of scientific assessments on <u>inter alia</u> ecological, social and economic effects of genetic use restriction technologies?	
a) no	X
b) yes - through the CHM	
c) yes - other means (please give details below)	
355. Has your country identified the ways and means to address the potential impacts of genetic use restriction technologies on the <u>in situ</u> and <u>ex situ</u> conservation and sustainable use, including food security, of agricultural biological diversity?	
a) no	X
b) some measures identified	
c) potential measures under review	
d) comprehensive review completed	

356. Has your country assessed whether there is a need for effective regulations at the national level with respect to genetic use restriction technologies to ensure the safety of human health, the environment, food security and the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity?	
a) no	X
b) yes - regulation needed	
c) yes - regulation not needed (please give more details)	
357. Has your country developed and applied such regulations taking into account, <i>inter alia</i> , the specific nature of variety-specific and trait-specific genetic use restriction technologies?	
a) no	X
b) yes - developed but not yet applied	
c) yes - developed and applied	
358. Has information about these regulations been made available to other Contracting Parties?	
a) no	X
b) yes - through the CHM	
c) yes - other means (please give details below)	

Further comments on implementation of these decisions and the associated programme of work

The Philippines signed as a Contracting Party to the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade. However, the Philippine Congress has not yet ratified the Convention agreements.

The Philippines has no particular program on the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators. However, some basic information about this subject are focused on insects, and inserted or integrated in various conservation projects for agriculture.

Forest biological diversity

Decision II/9 and Decision IV/7. Forest biological diversity

359. Has your country included expertise on forest biodiversity in its delegations to the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
c) not relevant	
360. Has your country reviewed the programme of work annexed to the decision and identified how you can collaborate in its implementation?	
a) no	
b) under review	X
c) yes	
361. Has your country integrated forest biological diversity considerations in its participation and collaboration with organizations, institutions and conventions affecting or working with forest biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
362. Does your country give high priority to allocation of resources to activities that advance the objectives of the Convention in respect of forest biological diversity?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
For developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition -	
363. When requesting assistance through the GEF, Is your country proposing projects which promote the implementation of the programme of work?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision V/4. Progress report on the implementation of the programme of work for forest biological diversity

364. Do the actions that your country is taking to address the conservation and sustainable use of forest biological diversity conform with the ecosystem approach?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
365. Do the actions that your country is taking to address the conservation and sustainable use of forest biological diversity take into consideration the outcome of the fourth session of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests?	
a) no	
b) yes	X

366. Will your country contribute to the future work of the UN Forum on Forests?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
367. Has your country provided relevant information on the implementation of this work programme?	
a) no	
b) yes - submission of case-studies	X
c) yes - thematic national report submitted	
d) yes - other means (please give details below)	
368. Has your country integrated national forest programmes into its national biodiversity strategies and action plans applying the ecosystem approach and sustainable forest management?	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent	
c) yes - significant extent	X
369. Has your country undertaken measures to ensure participation by the forest sector, private sector, indigenous and local communities and non-governmental organisations in the implementation of the programme of work?	
a) no	
b) yes - some stakeholders	
c) yes - all stakeholders	X
370. Has your country taken measures to strengthen national capacities including local capacities, to enhance the effectiveness and functions of forest protected area networks, as well as national and local capacities for implementation of sustainable forest management, including restoration?	
a) no	
b) some programmes covering some needs	
c) many programmes covering some needs	X
d) programmes cover all perceived needs	
e) no perceived need	
371. Has your country taken measures to implement the proposals for action of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests and the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests on valuation of forest goods and services?	
a) no	
b) under consideration	
c) measures taken	X

Biological diversity of dry and sub-humid lands

Decision V/23. Consideration of options for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in dryland, Mediterranean, arid, semi-arid, grassland and savannah ecosystems

372. Has your country reviewed the programme of work annexed to the decision and identified how you will implement it?	
a) no	X
b) under review	
c) yes	
373. Is your country supporting scientifically, technically and financially, at the national and regional levels, the activities identified in the programme of work?	
a) no	X
b) to a limited extent	
c) to a significant extent	
374. Is your country fostering cooperation for the regional or subregional implementation of the programme among countries sharing similar biomes?	
a) no	X
b) to a limited extent	
c) to a significant extent	

Further comments on implementation of these Decisions and the associated programme of work

--

Decision V/20. Operations of the Convention

375. Does your country take into consideration gender balance, involvement of indigenous people and members of local communities, and the range of relevant disciplines and expertise, when nominating experts for inclusion in the roster?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
376. Has your country actively participated in subregional and regional activities in order to prepare for Convention meetings and enhance implementation of the Convention?	
a) no	
b) to a limited extent	X
c) to a significant extent	
377. Has your country undertaken a review of national programmes and needs related to the implementation of the Convention and, if appropriate, informed the Executive Secretary?	
a) no	
b) under way	X
c) yes	

Please use this box to identify what specific activities your country has carried out as a DIRECT RESULT of becoming a Contracting Party to the Convention, referring back to previous questions as appropriate:

Major Activities that the Philippines has carried out as a DIRECT RESULT of becoming a Contracting Party to the Convention:

- Conduct of a Country Study on Biodiversity and Preparation of a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan

The Philippines conducted an assessment of its biodiversity resources in fulfilment of its obligations to the Convention. The initiative was made possible through a grant from the United Nations Environment Programme to the implementing agency, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). Based on this comprehensive assessment, the problems, threats, issues, and gaps were identified and formed the basis for a national strategy and action plan (NBSAP). The goals of the NBSAP are the conservation, sustainable utilization, and equitable sharing of benefits by all Filipinos, present and future. (NBSAP, 1997)

- Formulation of policies and enactment of legislations

Policies were formulated and legislations enacted to ensure implementation of CBD commitments. Among the major policies/legislations are the following:

- Republic Act 7586, otherwise known as the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) Law, which provides for the establishment and management of a comprehensive system which encompasses outstandingly remarkable areas and biologically important public lands that are habitats of various species of plants and animals. The specific provisions of the NIPAS Law are: a) identification of protected area categories; b) establishment of a standard planning process; c) NIPAS administration by the DENR; d) recognition of ancestral rights; and, e) institutionalization of environmental impact assessment. The Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau is mandated to implement this Law.

Although the enactment of this Law preceded the signing of the CBD by the Philippines by four days, its provisions are clearly promotive of the implementation of commitments to the Convention.

- Executive Order 247, Prescribing Guidelines and Establishing a Regulatory Framework for the Prospecting of Biological and Genetic Resources, their By-Products and Derivatives, for Scientific and Commercial Purposes and for other Purposes
- Republic Act 8371, otherwise known as the Indigenous People's Rights Act, is the embodiment of the long struggle for the recognition of the rights of the IPs to their ancestral domain as well as their cultural identity. Under IPRA, "the State shall recognize, respect and protect the rights of the IPs to preserve and develop their culture, traditions, and institutions.
- Republic Act 9147, the Wildlife Resources Conservation and Protection Act, was enacted into law to conserve the country's wildlife resources and their habitats for sustainability. Towards this end, the following objectives shall be pursued: a) conserve and protect wildlife species and their habitats to promote ecological balance and enhance biological diversity; b) regulate the collection and trade of wildlife; c) pursue, with due regard to the national

interest, the Philippine commitment to international conventions, protection of wildlife and their habitats; and e) initiate or support scientific studies on the conservation of biological diversity.

- Republic Act 8550, the Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998, requires all government agencies, as well as the private firms and entities who intend to undertake activities or projects which will affect the habitats of the rare, threatened and endangered aquatic species to prepare a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment that shall be submitted to the DENR for review and evaluation.
- Republic Act 9072, the National Caves and Cave Resources Management Protection Act, is the declaration of policy of the country to conserve, protect and manage caves and cave resources as part of the country's natural wealth.

- Accessing the financial mechanism to support biodiversity conservation projects

The Philippines was able to access the financial mechanism to support the implementation of biodiversity conservation activities in the country. Most of the support to this effort coming from developed countries come via the GEF, either through UNDP/UNEP or World Bank and through regional channels. (First National Report, 1998)

- Implementation of major projects on biodiversity conservation

Major biodiversity conservation projects were implemented since 1992 including the Conservation of Priority Protected Areas in the Philippines and the National Integrated Protected Areas Project, to name some. New initiatives include the Samar Island Biodiversity Programme and the Biodiversity Research Program in Mt. Malindang, Mindanao. Projects being funded by the Foundation for the Philippine Environment and the GEF Small Grants Programme are also noteworthy contribution to the overall effort on biodiversity conservation in the country.

- Creation of a Sub-Committee on Biodiversity under the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD Sub-Com on Biodiversity)

The creation of the PCSD Sub-Committee on Biodiversity ensured the participation of civil society in the dialogue and decision-making concerning biodiversity conservation in the country. Being a multi-sectoral group, it is the venue for discussing various issues confronting biodiversity conservation in the country. Chaired by the Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and Co-Chaired by the Southeast Asia Regional Institute for Community Education (SEARICE), the Sub-Committee on Biodiversity is composed of 10 government agencies (DENR, Dept. of Foreign Affairs, Dept. of Agriculture, Dept. of Science and Technology, Dept. of Trade and Industry, Dept. of Health, Dept. of Tourism, Dept. of Interior and Local Government, National Economic and Development Authority, Philippine National Museum) and 8 non-government organizations (SEARICE, Philippine Sustainable Development Network Foundation, Ecological Society of the Philippines, Earth Savers Movement, Foundation for Sustainable Development, Haribon Foundation for the Conservation of Natural Resources, Philippine Association for Inter-Cultural Development, Upland NGO Assistance Center).

- Establishment of the ASEAN Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation

The ASEAN Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation was established to coordinate all initiatives and enhance the capacity of the ASEAN on biodiversity conservation. It will assist ASEAN-member countries in developing improved technical and institutional approaches for managing biodiversity conservation.

- Observance of the International Biodiversity Day

The country regularly observes International Biodiversity Day by holding symposia, fora and other activities relevant to the year's theme.

- Carried out various public information, education, and communication activities

To promote biodiversity conservation, the NBSAP, and the CBD, the Philippines carried out various IEC activities through multi-media (broadcast, print, Internet, among others).

Please use this box to identify joint initiatives with other Parties, referring back to previous questions as appropriate:

The Philippines carried out and/or currently undertaking joint initiatives relevant to biodiversity with other parties. Some of the major undertakings are described below:

- ASEAN Regional Center for Biodiversity Conservation (ARCBC) was established to coordinate all initiatives and enhance the capacity of the ASEAN on biodiversity conservation. It will assist ASEAN-member countries in developing improved technical and institutional approaches for managing biodiversity conservation.
- Biodiversity Research Programme for Development in Mindanao: Focus on Mt. Malindang and Environs, funded by the Ministry for Development Cooperation of the Netherlands, aims to build the capacity for local communities, government, academe, and other stakeholders to promote and undertake the sustainable use of biological resources and effective decision-making on biodiversity conservation.
- New Zealand Development Assistance to the Philippines National Ecotourism Strategy Project is based on a three-year programme of technical assistance to the Government of the Philippines between January 2001 to December 2003. The Philippines National Ecotourism Project stems from the Philippine Government Executive Order 111 issued in 1999 which calls for the preparation of a National Ecotourism Strategy. The EO also established the framework for the preparation and implementation of the National Ecotourism strategy. This included a formal Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Tourism and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. It also established a National Ecotourism Development Council, a National Ecotourism Steering Committee, an Ecotourism Technical Working Group and Regional Ecotourism Committees.

The New Zealand programme of assistance is focused on four key areas:

- 5) assistance with the preparation of the National Ecotourism Strategy
- 6) assistance with building capacity of the Ecotourism Technical Working Group

- 7) Identification of a network of key ecotourism sites in the Philippines
 - 8) Assistance with the provision of technical assistance to selected ecotourism projects.
- o An agreement between the Philippines and Malaysia for the management and conservation of the Turtle Islands Heritage Protected Area (TIHPA) which is the world's first transfrontier PA for marine turtles and the only major rookery of green turtles in the ASEAN region. TIHPA is composed of six islands from the Philippines (Baguan, Langaan, Taganak, Great Nakkungan, Lihiman, and Boan) and three islands from Malaysia (Selingan, Gulisaan, and Bakkungan Kenchil).

Please use this box to provide any further comments on matters related to national implementation of the Convention:

The wording of these questions is based on the Articles of the Convention and the decisions of the Conference of the Parties. Please provide information on any difficulties that you have encountered in interpreting the wording of these questions

The new format will make it easier for the Secretariat to process information from the numerous National Reports. However, the wordings were too lengthy, hard to interpret, and redundant. The choices are too structured for some questions thus limiting the answers.

If your country has completed its national biodiversity strategy and action plan (NBSAP), please give the following information:

Date of completion:	1996		
If the NBSAP has been adopted by the Government			
By which authority?	<i>President of the Republic of the Philippines</i>		
On what date?	<i>04 June 1997</i>		
If the NBSAP has been published please give			
Title:	<i>Philippine Biodiversity: An Assessment and Action Plan</i>		
Name and address of publisher:	<i>Bookmark, Inc. 264-A Pablo Ocampo Sr. Avenue Makati City, Philippines</i>		
ISBN:	<i>971-569-251-6</i>		
Price (if applicable):	<i>P1,000.00 (US 20.00)</i>		
Other information on ordering:	<i>Email to bookmark@mnl.sequel.net</i>		
If the NBSAP has not been published			
Please give full details of how copies can be obtained:			
If the NBSAP has been posted on a national website			
Please give full URL:	<i>http://www.psdn.org.ph/nbsap/main.html</i>		
If the NBSAP has been lodged with an Implementing Agency of the GEF			
Please indicate which agency:			
Has a copy of the NBSAP been lodged with the Convention Secretariat?			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide similar details if you have completed a Biodiversity Country Study or another report or action plan relevant to the objectives of this Convention

The Philippine Biodiversity Country Study became the basis for the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. These are both contained in the book entitled "Philippine Biodiversity: An Assessment and Action Plan". The book was published in 1997 and has the same details mentioned in the preceding form.

Please provide details of any national body (e.g. national audit office) that has or will review the implementation of the Convention in your country

The Philippine Council for Sustainable Development through its Sub-Committee on Biodiversity reviews the implementation of the Convention in the country. This Sub-Committee is composed of the following:

Chair : Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau - Department of Environment and Natural Resources (Government)

Co - Chair : Southeast Asia Regional Institute for Community Education (SEARICE)

Members :

- Government agencies

- Department of Foreign Affairs
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Science and Technology
- Department of Trade and Industry
- Department of Health
- Department of Tourism
- Department of Interior and Local Government
- National Economic and Development Authority
- Philippine National Museum

- Non-government organizations:

- Earth Savers Movement
- Ecological Society of the Philippines
- Foundation for Sustainable Development, Inc.
- Haribon Foundation for the Conservation of Natural Resources
- Philippine Association for Inter-Cultural Development
- Philippine Sustainable Development Network Foundation, Inc.
- Upland NGO Assistance Center

REFERENCES:

Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. 2000 Statistics on Philippine Protected Areas and Wildlife Resources. Quezon City, Philippines

United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. Earth Summit Agenda 21: Programme of Action for Sustainable Development (Rio Declaration on Environment and Development). United Nations Department of Public Information

Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. 1997. First Philippine National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Philippines

UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. 20 September 2000. Framework for National Assessment of Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. www.unep-wcmc.org/cbd/assessment/framework_2.1.doc

Convention on Biological Diversity. 2000. Guidelines for National Reports. www.biodiv.org

Conservation International - Philippines, Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau, University of the Philippines BCP-CIDS, United States Agency for International Development. December 2000. Highlights of the National Biodiversity Conservation Priority-Setting Workshop. Subic, Zambales, Philippines

National Economic and Development Authority. September 1999. Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan 1999-2004. Philippines

Philippine Council for Sustainable Development. 1997. Philippine Agenda 21: A National Agenda for Sustainable Development. Manila, Philippines

Department of Environment and Natural Resources, United Nations Environment Programme. 1997. Philippine Biodiversity: An Assessment and Action Plan. Bookmark, Inc. Makati City, Philippines

Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau, Ecosystems Research and Development Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. March 2002. Proceedings of the Seminar-Workshop for the Philippine R & D Agenda on Biodiversity Conservation. Laguna, Philippines