CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Isle Botanica
Project Title:	Rare Plants of Samoa
Date of Report:	September 2010
Report Author and Contact Information	Dr. Art Whistler 2814 Kalawao St. Honolulu, HI 96822 (808) 988 1771 whistler@hawaii.edu

CEPF Region: Pacific

Strategic Direction: Threatened and endangered plant species.

Grant Amount: \$19,550

Project Dates: 1 September 2009 to 31 July 2010

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):

Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Samoa. They organized the two-week workshop and supplied the participants.

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

The project identified and profiled 108 plant species that are rare in Samoa. From these, 37 were recommended for inclusion on the Red List of Samoan plants. Previous to that there were only five plant species on the Red List prior to the study.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.

The report provides a profile on each of the 108 rare or hard to find species. These can be identified from photographs (for most species) as well as botanical descriptions. Prior to this, there was virtually no information on which plants are rare, threatened, or endangered in Samoa. This report is suitable for inclusion on a website where it can easily be accessed by anyone. All known location of collections are included, so that scientists know where to look for the species. From the location data, areas with high concentrations of rare species can be identified, and possibly protected..

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 0 Species Conserved: 0 Corridors Created: 0

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

The short term goal was achieved. The plants were identified. The long term goal is to protect the species, which is the next step.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

There were no negative impacts from the work, but the implementation of the workshop shows the difficulties of organizing events in the country. Part of the problem is that other workshops were apparently taking place at the same time. There needs to be more organization for projects like this in the future.

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

The probably the major thing learned is to secure transportation. The project was always having to share the truck with other elements in the MNRE. Also, one person should have been put in charge from the beginning, but for reasons that are not entirely clear, several people had their hand in the organization, which led to confusion. Perhaps more pressure on my part for the MNRE to organize earlier would have helped, as they didn't even advertise the first workshop until the Friday evening before the first Monday session.

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

Transportation should have been a part of the budget, and a local organizer from MNRE should have been appointed earlier. Perhaps there are too many workshops going on in Samoa, and someone in the department (MNRE) should try to space them out.

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

Some of the problems that cropped up were handled well by Talie Foliga. But he was taken off the project at times, and he would have been the person best suited to benefit from the workshop (since he probably knows the plants better than anyone else at MNRE, and is very reliable. No one participant did all the field trips, as they were pulled off for various reasons. If more participants had been included, one of them might have taken a real interest in carrying on the work on the flora and rare plants of Samoa.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

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
MNRE	Transportation, salaries, lunches	?	

^{*}Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:

- **B** Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)
- C Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

It is difficult to find suitable personnel to run conservation projects like this. There is no natural interest in this kind of science in Samoa, and some of the best personnel in the MNRE are hired by NGOs in Samoa, leaving the government department understaffed.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved. N.A.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

N.A.

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.

Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	No			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Whole country			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1below.	No			

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table.

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	C	om	mun	ity (Chai	acte	eristic	s	Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
				Se			he		Increased Income due to:			able	ıter	other ig, c.	,		on,	ll ntal	n- ed ce.		
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services	Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision- making due to strengthened civil society and governance	Other
Total		<u> </u>																			

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Dr. Art Whistler

Organization name: Isle Botanica

Mailing address: 2814 Kalawao St., Honolulu, HI 96822

Tel: (808) 988 1771 Fax: (808) 988 1771

E-mail: whistler@hawaii.edu