CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Institute of Applied Sciences, University of the South Pacific
Project Title:	Increasing public awareness of Fijian dragonflies – A pocket guide to species on the main island of Viti Levu.
Date of Report:	17th June, 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Hilda Waqa-Sakiti Email: sakitiwaqa_h@usp.ac.fj.

CEPF Region: **Polynesia- Micronesia**

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 3: Build awareness and participation of local leaders and community members in the implementation of protection and recovery plans for threatened species.

Grant Amount: $14690.00USD

Project Dates: 1st August, 2012- 31 March, 2013.

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

Dr. Milen Marinov, University of Canterbury, NZ. He has completed his PhD on the taxonomy, ecology and chorology of Bulgarian Odonata and participated in various projects for mapping dragonfly distribution in Europe (Mediterranean in particular) and SE Asia. Dr. Marinov has experience with the Pacific Odonata as he has completed studies in New Zealand, Fiji, New Caledonia, Solomon Islands and the Kingdom of Tonga.

Conservation Impacts

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

The identification guide will help local communities and visitors to the Fijian archipelago get informed with the dragonfly species diversity on the islands. This information is valuable for addressing threatened and endangered species issues and the conservation, planning, and management of freshwater aquatic ecosystems and forest health consequently.

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

The approved proposal outlined that the following be achieved as major outcomes of the project:

1. Capacity building and Awareness:
   Dr. Marinov and Mrs. Waqa-Sakiti will compile a field guide to the odonates of Viti Levu.

2. Mapping odonate distribution within Viti Levu:
   Using GIS to create distribution maps representing sampling locations for each species from field data and also literature.

Towards the completion of this project, both the outcomes have been achieved in which a field guide has been complied and is currently with USP Press preparing for publications. This also required mapping of sample locations for each species where distribution maps have been generated and included in the species profile of each species.

Please provide the following information where relevant: N/A

Hectares Protected:
Species Conserved:
Corridors Created:

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.
The project was able to successfully achieve its short-term objectives.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?
We had expected the field guide to published before the time this final report be delivered but the publication process is not that easy so it is still with the publishers at the USP Press.

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.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)
The design of the project was simple as there was only one deliverable to achieve i.e. the Fieldguide to the Odonates of Viti Levu, Fiji. Therefore, meeting the outputs of this project was easily and successfully achieved. We also devised a time schedule in which different phases of the project be achieved and we strictly kept to the dates and continued to follow-up with the consultants hired on this project.

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)
This was a six months project so implementation-wise; this was not a major challenge.

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
MacArthur Foundation Conservation Trust Fund		$20,000.00USD	

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 *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.

The project upon completion should provide local communities and visitors of Fijian islands with an easy to use guide that will facilitate dragonfly species identification. As mentioned earlier, dragonflies could well fulfill the role of manageable monitoring tool for stream health, aquatic-terrestrial diversity and stability. Therefore a future stream monitoring based on dragonfly communities could easily be developed and maintained by local farmers and conservation practitioners who care about the advances of natural processes occurring in cross habitats zones, such as aquatic-terrestrial areas. The guide will provide easy-to-use tools for environmental protection and for planning conservation activities especially in the selection of key protected areas for ecosystem integrity in Fiji. This approach can also be replicated in other USP member countries included in CEPF's Polynesia- Micronesia hotspots e.g. Samoa and the Cook Islands and hopefully within the EMI region e.g. Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Members of this research team who are also vital members of the FNBSAP will be able to highlight the significance of this tool and its implementation for the selection of such sites in Fiji and possibly the region.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

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: Hilda Waqa-Sakiti
Organization name: University of the South Pacific
Mailing address: Private MailBag, Suva, Fiji.
Tel:679- 3231982

Fax:
E-mail:sakitiwaqa_h@usp.ac.fj.

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

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)
1. 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?	N/A			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.	N/A			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	N/A			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1below.	N/A			

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	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit													
									Increased Income due to:													
	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																						

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit: