#### CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Organisation (SPREP)
Project Title:	Raising Awareness of Environmental Laws
Date of Report:	March 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Clark Peteru, Legal Adviser, SPREP, Ph: 66262 Email: clarkp@sprep.org

**CEPF Region:** Polynesia-Micronesia

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

**Grant Amount: USD 20,000** 

Project Dates: 30 April – 16 September 2012

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

MNRE was closely involved in all aspects of the project. This included drawing up of the terms of reference, the selection of the consultant, discussions with the consultants regarding work methodology, quality control, stakeholder consultations and final signoff.

#### **Conservation Impacts**

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

An increase in community knowledge of environmental laws

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

The expected result will be an increased awareness of key environmental legislation (which is hoped to have a positive impact on the species conservation efforts) and a more aware and better informed population, including decision makers. Accordingly we can expect better decisions to be made and better compliance.

The impact can be measured by setting a baseline and undertaking a study over a period of time (months). This will allow us to gauge if there has been any change in patterns of behaviour.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: n/a Species Conserved: n/a Corridors Created: n/a Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

The main short term challenge was delays at the outset due mainly to new tendering requirements within SPREP. Once the consultancy began the project ran only slightly over time.

A longer term challenge relates to periodic updating of the Guidebook so that it continues to have relevance.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

There was a delay due to illness of one of the implementing team at MNRE.

#### **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.

SPREP's tendering process has been streamlined.

There was an issue of number of days calculated by the consultants which implicitly excluded leave days but we weren't made aware of this till later

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

The concept of the Guidebook and the methodology used to develop it were geared towards presenting environmental laws in a clear way. A poll of readers would be able to provide feedback as to its success or otherwise.

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

See previous

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community: N/A

#### **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
SPREP	A	USD 500+	Costs for hosting (i) tender selection panel (ii) stakeholder workshop on first draft of the Guidebook

<sup>\*</sup>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.

Replicability depends on finding funding. Fortunately we managed to secure funding and a similar exercise is currently underway in RMI with a different project team.

**Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.** See previous

#### **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

#### **Additional Comments/Recommendations**

There is a possibility of further proposals to the donor for the RMI project.

#### 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: Clark Peteru

Organization name: Secretariat of the Pacific Environment Programme

Mailing address: PO Box

Tel: +685 Fax: +685

E-mail: clarkp@sprep.org

\*\*\*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)
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.	No			
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.

	(	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit											
Name of Community				es			he		Increased Income due to:			e to:	ue able	ater	other g,	6		ou,	l 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 matural resources management practices Ecotourism revenues Park management activities Park management activities Park management for environmental services Increased food security due	Urban communities Communities falling below the poverty rate Other	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										
																					<u> </u>
																					-
																					<u> </u>
																					<u> </u>
							_														
Total											<u> </u>							1		<u> </u>	<del></del>

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