

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Pacific Ant Prevention Program (PAPP)

Implementation Partners for this Project: ISSG, Biosecurity NZ

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): December 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006

Date of Report (month/year): 3/08/2006

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The SPC and its partners are grateful that the funding provided by the RNHP through the CEPF has been instrumental in the success of the initial PAPP outputs. Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) who have been approached during the life of this project have shown enthusiastic and sustained support for activities they were involved in, and expressed the desire to be involved with future activities. The long lead in time for the PAPP to have reached this point has been frustrating in one aspect but conversely has allowed the political support to be widely and firmly entrenched prior to activities commencing. This in turn has facilitated delivery of activities in the SPC region.

III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. Briefly describe the methods used in achieving the objectives of this project.

Using SPC, PII-ISSG and BNZ networks, the coordinator proceeded to work through objectives. The existing SPC and Biosecurity New Zealand (BNZ) biosecurity frameworks provided a good foundation on which to base the Programme design and logframe development. Additionally the technical and policy advice offered to PICTs requesting help was also formulated from BNZ's extensive experience with invasive ant management issues. The Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) has also played a key role and provided sound advice on Programme design and delivery expectations.

2. Describe what was achieved in terms of:

a) capacity development;

Through the Pacific Invasive Ant Surveillance (PIAS) work approximately 70 quarantine staff across 14 locations in 12 PICTs were trained in invasive ant awareness and ant surveillance techniques.

b) developing partnerships;

As a result of the PIAS training, closer relationships with PICT quarantine agencies are developing. Additionally, relationships with Heads of Quarantine were further strengthened through attendance, presentation and workshop participation at the Pacific Plant Protection Organisation meeting in Nadi.

The PAPP Project and its objectives were presented to the Pacific Invasives Learning Network (PILN) launching in the Republic of Palau where multi-sectoral invasive species teams from eight PICTs were present. Initial correspondence has also been made with regional health organisations representatives to gain support for the initiative and to explore any synergies between programmes.

c) raising awareness of invasive species and generating community support for their management;

The PIAS work contributed to greater awareness of invasive ant issues with the quarantine staff exposed to the training. Public awareness was also raised through the associated media coverage. The PPPO meeting also reinforced the invasive ant message with heads of quarantine.

d) involving the local community and other stakeholders:

Community involvement at this stage early in the Programme development is minimal and as such was not significant component of the project. Nevertheless close working relationships with quarantine officers in Papua New Guinea saw the unplanned mapping of a the Little Fire Ant *Wasmannia auropunctata* outbreak in Wewak. Community residents were enthusiastic about helping with mapping and any subsequent management of these high impact ants. This is currently subject to a RHNP project bid and if successful local community participation will be an integral component of the work.

Quarantine and other government agencies in those countries visited during the PIAS activities were involved in training and surveillance work.

e) providing benefits to the local community and other stakeholders.

The PIAS work delivered a reasonable degree of confidence regarding RIFA free status for those Pacific Island countries targeted during surveillance activities. Technical and practical knowledge gained during PIAS work was also beneficial to local quarantine agencies. The RIFA free status will be beneficial to island nations during their trade in agricultural products with other countries.

Technical advice provided to the countries requesting assistance with invasive ant issues was also beneficial in terms of future direction of their projects.

3. How has the project been promoted? (Please enclose/attach press clippings, brochures, publications, videos, websites, photos, etc). Please describe the products developed during the project and how and to whom these were disseminated.

A press release for the SPC-facilitated PPPO meeting made mention of the PAPP. The PAPP was actively promoted to Heads of Quarantine and other Pacific country plant protection personnel at the PPPO meeting in Nadi. (see link below).

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0606/S00032.htm>

There was some PIAS TV coverage for PNG and the Cook Islands. Additionally, extensive video footage was captured from PIAS activities in Fiji. This is to be utilized at a later date for the development of an awareness video.

IV. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: To prepare for the implementation of the Pacific Ant Prevention Programme.

This project will contribute to the PICTs' awareness of invasive ants impacts and preparedness to conduct surveillance and appropriate response activities.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
Phase I of the PAPP implementation is funded and ready to commence.	Programme bid for Phase I of the PAPP is prepared and ready for submission to funding agencies.

4. Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators at the local and/or the national/regional level.

Funding could never be guaranteed and wording for this Indicator is misleading. Nevertheless, the PAPP is ready to commence should the prepared funding proposal be successful with the various target donor organisations.

5. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

One unexpected positive outcome was the stated intention of one PICT to carry out its own surveillance work irrespective of donor funding or assistance.

One concerning outcome was the realization of the scope of impacts and distribution of Little Fire ant *Wasmannia auropunctata* in the Pacific region. The current distribution of this highly invasive ant puts those *Wasmannia* free islands at serious risk of invasion.

6. Describe the key positive and negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.

The long lead in time of the PAPP initiative and the extensive lobbying that was done prior to project implementation is highly recommended. Despite reasonable lead in times for PICT communications and adoption more time should be allowed to maximize probability of responses and to allow any issues to be resolved.

V. PROJECT OUTPUTS

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

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: A programme coordinator appointed whose role will be to ensure the delivery of outputs 2 to 5.	The appointed PAPP Coordinator worked on achieving outputs
1.1. A suitably qualified and experienced	

Programme Coordinator recruited and in place.	
Output 2. Coordination of the baseline RIFA surveillance at selected ports and airports. This application is for the coordination of the surveillance; actual surveillance work is funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.	Coordinator organised and coordinated RIFA baseline surveillance at 14 high risk Pacific Island ports; -organised the training of 70 Pacific Island border control personnel. -The Coordinator attended and assisted surveillance and training at Guam, Tahiti and Fiji
2.1. Contractual requirements are effectively managed.	Contractual requirements monitored and fulfilled.
Output 3. Funding for Phase 1 of the implementation of Pacific Ant Prevention Programme secured.	A dozen potential funding agencies led by agencies which SPC could easily approach were identified and will be approached
3.1. Appropriate funding secured (amount will be identified in output 5).	- Funding agencies have been identified; -Implementing agency is finalising full Project Plan for submission to these donor agencies.
Output 4. Technical and scientific advice on specific invasive ant issues provided on request.	
4.1. All requests responded to as appropriate.	-Responded to requests from Papua New Guinea; Tokelau, and French Polynesia. -This is an ongoing activity
Output 5. Project plan for Phase 1 of the implementation of Pacific Ant Prevention Programme prepared.	
5.1. Project plan completed.	- Nominations for Technical Advisory Group were received from selected agencies in the Pacific Islands, NZ, and the USA. Awaiting response from Australia. -Some parts in the full implementation plan are based on experience from the SPC's Pacific Fruitfly management programme. A technical staff involved on the fruitfly programme is also assisting the development and implementation for the PAPP as a contribution from SPC. - Project plan completed.

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

Highly successful surveillance programme covering 14 locations, anticipated to continue subject to funding. Large number of quarantine staff trained in ant surveillance methodology and general invasive ant awareness. A high degree of cooperation from PICTs during the implementation of this work.

Further enhanced communication networks and relationships in the region at all levels within biosecurity agencies.

Technical and policy advice

Programme funding bid developed and ready for distribution to identified international funding agencies.

8. Were any outputs unrealized? If so, why and how did you address these?

Output 3’s original wording about having secured funding was unrealistic given that no guarantee of funding was ever made. To that end, the logframe for the full 6-year Programme was developed along with funding bid for Phase 1 ready for submission to chosen potential donor agencies.

9. How did the lack of achievement of these outputs affect the overall impact of the project?

Given the original planning never had the conception of guaranteeing the securing of funding, it has not affected the over all objective of this preliminary work on the PAPP.

VI. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

VII. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

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

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

As referred to above the original wording of Output 3 misleading from the outset. More care should have been taken during Project design to ensure this wording was more realistic.

The inflexibility of the funding term combined with unpredicted time delays in Coordinator appointment placed time constraints on certain aspects of the project. In hindsight more time should have been attributed to this component of the project.

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

The underlying political and managerial support of the PICTs to adopt projects delivered on behalf of the PAPP meant that all on-site ant work was well facilitated by receiving countries. This should be further enhanced by recent promotion and the success of the surveillance work.

VIII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

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

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
USForestry &Wildlife Service	Complimentary funding	US \$10,000	For public awareness material
SPC	Project co-funding	US\$15,000	Supported travel of trainees to Guam for PIAS from Palau, Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of Marshall Islands;

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

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF funded project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

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

Subject to funding approval for Phase I, Programme objectives will continue to be realized. Full programme life span is six years, and built into that timeframe is transitioning of activities to PICTs.
 Programme proposal bid will be sent to three main donor organisations, and various projects within the 3 year programme could be funded by smaller donor organisations.

IX. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
--

Please provide any additional information you think may assist CEPF in understanding any other aspects of your completed project.

None

Describe any follow-up activities you wish to implement and how you intend to do so (eg other invasive species management actions you wish to pursue, or how you plan to scale up the project to a broader area).

Follow up activities are intended to carry forward for six years if funding is secured for Phases I & II of the Programme. In the event of RIFA outbreaks the SPC may expand prevention as well as RIFA management activities to the rest of the 22 PICTs

X. INFORMATION SHARING

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

Yes yes

No

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:

Name: Warea Orapa

Mailing address: SPC Land Resources Division, PMB Suva. Fiji Islands.

Tel: (679) 3379284

Fax: (679) 3370021, 3386326
E-mail: wareao@spc.int; warea.orapa@gmail.com