CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	BirdLife International
Project Title:	Petrels, Communities and Conservation
Date of Report:	7th March 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Dr Mark O'Brien (mark.obrien@birdlife.org)

CEPF Region: Polynesia-Micronesia

Strategic Direction: 3. Safeguard and restore threatened species

Grant Amount: $89,777

Project Dates: July 1, 2010 - December 31, 2012

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

Conservation Impacts

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

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

Project Approach (500 words)

This project will work in close collaboration with the local SSG established at Nabukelevu/Mt Washington KBA, and also with the national NGO NatureFiji-MareqetiViti (NFMV) to foster knowledge transfer and learning between BirdLife Fiji Programme staff, NFMV staff, members of Nabukelevu/Mt Washington SSG and members of communities on both the island of Gau and around Nabukelevu/Mt Washington KBA on Kadavu.

A considerable amount of time and effort has been expended on Gau searching for the Fiji Petrel. This work, currently co-ordinated by NFMV (who are applying to become the BirdLife national Partner for Fiji in June 2013) has identified ways of collecting information on nocturnal petrels in order to monitor populations. It is also currently assessing methods of finding nesting burrows using radio-tagged birds and/or using dogs to search for petrel burrows (under a separate CEPF project). While this project has not, to date, been successful in its ultimate aim of locating the nesting site(s) of Fiji Petrel (an IUCN Critically Endangered species) it has generated substantial information on the presence/numbers of Collared Petrel (an IUCN Vulnerable species) on the site. Expanding the dataset, and search area, for breeding petrels to Kadavu – where historically birds have been present - is a logical next step.

Fieldwork will yield information on the status, ecology and threats to a poorly known and threatened group of seabirds: the burrow-nesting petrels. This will be used to develop appropriate conservation actions and prioritize next-steps for petrel conservation within the framework of a regional seabird conservation strategy. The information will contribute directly to national and international policy-related processes such as Fiji's National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (intended to be updated in the next 12 months) and the IUCN Red List. Staff within the BirdLife Pacific Regional Secretariat and NFMV will actively encourage the development of a Masters project in this study area, with a locally-based person - from Kadavu if a suitable person can be identified, otherwise it will be offered to a Fijian national - using this to develop their capacity as a

regional expert on petrel breeding biology. Finally the project will raise awareness of seabird conservation, including the threat to seabirds from alien invasive species. It will build local capacity to support seabird monitoring and research.

The continued BirdLife presence provided by this project will help to maintain progress made by the SSG in halting forest incursion and land degradation (in the CEPF funded Fijian Forests for Fijians project) by continuing KBA monitoring and emphasizing the implementation of measures already in use locally that improve land quality and food production of existing agricultural land.

Case studies, highlighting the methods used to establish local Community Conservation groups will be undertaken using information collected from a minimum of six sites. These sites will be selected from the Site Support Groups, established by BirdLife International and its partners in the Pacific region.

Link to CEPF Investment Strategy

This project links strongly to: CEPF SD 3 “Build awareness and participation of local leaders and community members in the implementation of protection and recovery plans for threatened species.” It takes place in Nabukelevu/Mt Washington KBA which has been identified as a priority site for CEPF investment within Fiji – a target country within the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot.

Specifically, it will address CEPF Priorities:

3.1 - Develop and implement species recovery plans for highly threatened species requiring species-focused action, especially those that have received little effort to date.
3.2 - Strengthen leadership and effectiveness of local conservation organizations by developing peer-learning networks and promoting exchanges and study tours.
3.3 - Raise the environmental awareness of communities about species and sites of global conservation concern through social marketing and participatory planning and management approaches.

The project also focusses on Investment Priority 2.1 Develop and manage conservation areas that conserve currently unprotected priority sites, especially critical refugia such as large forest blocks and alien-free habitats.

We aim to improve knowledge of the distribution and conservation status of a number of Globally Threatened species including the Critically Endangered Fiji Petrel - a species identified as a priority in the CEPF ecosystem profile.

It involves significant co-ordination with NFMV and the Fijian Government which recognizes Nabukelevu/Mt Washington KBA as a Site of National Significance. Endorsement from the Provincial Office and the Fiji Government Environment Department has been sought. The project builds capacity for longer term involvement of local communities in petrel conservation and through the training of a Masters student to act as a regional hub for future research and conservation activities.

By engaging with the Nabukelevu/Mt Washington SSG this project supports indigenous and local communities in community-based activities for biodiversity conservation and actions that will enhance local communities’ tenure and resource rights. We plan to implement threatened species conservation through engagement in/contribution to the species recovery planning process and through environmental awareness work on the ground.

The project addresses some major constraints in the CEPF Polynesia-Micronesia hotspot: a paucity of technical infrastructure and expertise, a lack of information on the state of natural resources and biodiversity, and a poor understanding of environmental issues among the general

population, which currently hampers conservation actions.

Through the project we aim to catalyze action by civil society within the Polynesia-Micronesia hotspot.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):
The long-term objective of this project is the survival and perpetual conservation of Globally Threatened petrels in Fiji and the Pacific, and the protection of Nabukelevu/Mt Washington Important Bird Area/Key Biodiversity Area (CEPF priority site 71) as a known breeding site for petrels in Fiji. In this way, this project contributes to the strategic objectives of the CEPF Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot Ecosystem Profile/CEPF investment; to the implementation of the Fiji Government National Environment Strategy and NBSAP; and to the implementation of the BirdLife International Regional Pacific Programme 2009-2012, and the MoU between BirdLife and the Government of Fiji.

Actual Progress Towards Long-term Impacts at Completion:

The field survey work confirmed that Collared Petrels were still present in the area, that burrows were few and far between and that, compared with a previous account from the same site in 1876 numbers appeared reduced. Kleinschmidt (1879) reported 'Late in the night, the Çollared Petrel visiting their nests encircled the mountain peak as though wishing to express their astonishment at our fires'. Our surveys involved a fluorescent tube, rather than a fire, but otherwise a similar response from very few birds was apparent. Comparison of numbers with sightings on Gau, using exactly the same method, indicated that records were 2 orders of magnitude lower on Kadavu. This is unlikely to reflect the true variation in numbers, however, as detectability of individuals is strongly influenced by the presence of other, calling birds. Our trial survey in 2011 included the use of tape lures and 'war whooping' resulted in numbers reported at rates that were about 50 times those reported in 2012. Clearly the áctive' method of surveying generates more observations, but at the risk of not understanding what area the observations come from. This survey approach, for the first time, provides a rapid assessment method for locating the approximate breeding sites for Collared Petrels, that is likely to be equally applicable for other burrow-nesting, nocturnal, seabirds. We would recommend that, in future, where the presence of nesting petrels on an island is unclear, to use the active method of survey. If this generates evidence that birds are present, and if there is time to undertake more surveys, then the passive approach used in the current study provides more comparable data with other sites. There is still a need to calibrate the findings using this kind of survey with the number and density of breeding petrels on a site.

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):

The short-term impacts of this project include the identification of burrow-nesting petrels, and development of targeted conservation actions to benefit them, at Nabukelevu/Mt Washington Important Bird Area/ CEPF priority site 71, through training of staff and local people in advanced survey techniques. The project will engage and empower local people living in and around the project sites, involved in local conservation groups, and build their capacity for conservation.

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

We collected information on the number of calling Collared Petrel as well as the number of birds sighted. We heard 112 calls, and saw birds on 66 occasions. This during a total observation period of 309 hours – dusk to dawn for up to 6 days per month from February to July. We also heard a single Tahiti Petrel (NT) in March but did not hear any Polynesian Storm-petrels (a species last recorded as breeding in Kadavu in 1876 – the only breeding record for the species in Fiji). We caught a single Collared Petrel in a mistnet – despite over 50 hours of attempts. 3-4 members of the local SSG assisted in surveys on each visit, with in total 8 members taking part on at least one occasion, and 2 on all occasions. By the end of the survey the SSG were independently undertaking the census methods, proving adept at both locating birds and

recording birds, and effort required to collect the data, in a standard way. The SSG also undertake a ground-based survey searching for nesting burrows. 3 burrows were located, all considered to be of Collared Petrel, but all considered to be old/inactive burrows. The fieldtrip to Gau at the end of the season provided further information for the SSG to fine tune their survey approach in future years. The benefits of using a dog for finding burrows was noted. A representative from the Vatu-i-Ra SSG was also able to attend, providing a useful means of transferring information on recording petrels and other seabirds.
Next steps, for Collared Petrel on Mt Nabukelevu, are to continue to attract potential breeding birds to the artificial nest box colony near the summit using the sound system in place. The artificial nest boxes will be monitored for any activity from petrels. One potential development, should funds become available, would be to erect a remote camera at the site to monitor any petrels that are attracted to the calling. This has proved of great interest at colonies in New Zealand where sightings of a range of petrel species 'grounded' adjacent to speakers have preceded nesting attempts by those species.
Future censuses, to establish a baseline monitoring programme for other priority species in the area will be high on the agenda. The SSG have proved to be adept at keeping a record of observations of birds as well as a measure of the effort required to record these observations.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 1404 ha (this is the Community-protected Area established under CEPF contract 55084).

Species Conserved: Collared Petrel. Considerable discussions over major requirements should/when we find burrows. The need for retaining native forest understood and accepted by the SSG, while the impact of invasives is likely also to be a major factor in decline in numbers. We discussed controlling Polynesian Rats (lots of evidence of their presence on the peak), but decided that it wasn't necessary. If Black Rats reach the peak then that decision will be reviewed. We know that, in other populations, Collared Petrel and similarl species nest at low altitudes in forest. The Nabukelevu site has both lost its low altitude forest and also has Black Rats at densities around the villages. This combination of factors is likely to have reduced Petrel numbers at the site in the last 100 years or so. It is encouraging that there appear to be no black rats near the summit – so the artificial burrows put in place around here may successfully attract birds to nest in this relatively predator free area. Also we found no signs of cats – another major predator of petrels, but will continue to look for and report any evidence found on the peak in the future.

Corridors Created: None.

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

The Collared Petrel recovery plan, currently being reviewed, will provide a useful summary of the current situation for the species, and the next steps required for effective conservation. The identification of a substantial colony on Gau provides plenty of opportunities to improve our understanding of the biology of the species. A recent paper on Collared Petrels in Vanuatu suggests that large colonies are still present there – and that these sites also need to be assessed.
The involvement, and empowerment, of the local SSG in the data collection has proved to be a great success and provides an excellent opportunity to further develop a comprehensive monitoring programme for the site.
Development issues (the proposed erection of a phone transmitter mast on the hill used for monitoring petrels) occurred during the year. The community discussed, in detail, with BirdLife/NFMV representatives the implications of this, and went, themselves, to the developers

to request an EIA or some other form of assessment to consider the impacts of erection at this site.
Discussions were held with the community regarding agricultural and reforestation issues. The local school assisted in the planting of native trees along the edge of the current forest to assist expansion into areas that had recently been felled to create more agricultural land. The general view in the community is that the various alternative livelihoods, established under a previous CEPF grant, have been a success and that, while the programmes will not make a lot of money, they are realistic.
The official transfer of co-ordinating body from BirdLife Fiji Programme to NatureFiji-MareqetiViti was undertaken at the village in December. This was made easier by the fact that the main point of contact in recent times, Mere Valu, has herself moved to NFMV.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Project Components

Project Components*: Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

Component 1 Planned:
Conservation capacity built amongst local staff and local communities around Nabukelevu/Mt Washington KBA, and awareness of globally threatened petrels increased in Fiji

Component 1 Actual at Completion:
Eight members of the local community assisted in survey methods on the peak. 2 members visited Gau to compare Collared Petrel sites there with Kadavu.
A video, in English and Fijian, was prepared and shown in Lomati, and on Gau. This is available on the internet.
Ongoing liaison with the Provincial Council offices on Kadavu resulted in a report of Collared Petrels at Nadara, Central Kadavu. SSG members from Nabukelevu and Dr O'Brien from BirdLife visited the village, discussed seabird populations, found out more about historical records from the area and talked about conservation. The community used to harvest birds, but, since the forest has receded further from the village, fewer burrows were located and the tradition has now ceased. This is the first time that Nadara has been identified as a Collared Petrel breeding area, although it is not far from the known site at Nakasaleka, in East Kadavu.

Component 2 Planned:
Conservation status of burrow-nesting petrels at Nabukelevu/Mt Washington KBA better understood with appropriate conservation interventions maintained and developed.

Component 2 Actual at Completion:
Collared petrel numbers on Nabukelevu are not high. The numbers have clearly declined since the only previous report (in 1876) which indicated that birds were regularly seen, after dark, around a fire lit on top of the peak. Whether they exceed the minimum number of pairs (10) required for them to act as a qualifying species for the Important Bird Area/Key Biodiversity Area is a point of discussion. It seems likely that this is the case, based on the number of sightings on Gau. Why are numbers not high? The extent of forest has declined both in the Nabukeleu KBA and the surrounding land – with little/no native forest present outside the current KBA boundary at the Western end of Kadavu. In addition, while there are no black rats on the summit in Nabukelevu, they have been reported lower down around the villages. A combination of reduced extent of forest, particularly in the lowlands, and increased incidence of predation, particularly in

the lowlands is likely to have reduced the breeding success of this species which, in the absence of mammalian predators, tends to nest at lower altitudes

The SSG visit to Gau provided considerable insight into conservation issues for the species at burrows – and will consider how to address these on Kadavu with renewed searches for nesting burrows in future years.

Some conservation problems on Kadavu, Black Rats and Cats, appear not to be an issue, at the moment, on the peak at Kadavu. If the artificial burrows on the peak do become occupied by petrels then there may not be a need to instigate a trapping programme – although careful monitored would be required to ensure that this remained the case..

The use of a sound system to attract breeding seabirds has proved successful elsewhere, but this is the first time that it has been trialled away from New Zealand in the Pacific. The SSG are interested to record whether it successfully attracts birds to the local area.

Component 3 Planned:
Results of surveys and conservation actions disseminated as best practice, incorporated into species recovery plans for Globally Threatened petrels, and contributing to national and international policy levers.

Component 3 Actual at Completion:
A draft species recovery plan for Collared Petrel is currently being reviewed and finalised, while a paper on monitoring methods developed as part of this project, has been drafted and is currently being reviewed with a plan to publish in Notornis.
The rapid assessment survey method should be transferable, with modifications, to other nocturnal, burrow nesting, seabirds and will enable surveyors to much more rapidly judge whether areas are likely to hold breeding populations of the seabirds.

Component 4 Planned:
Series of case studies of community conservation approaches within the Pacific region developed and disseminated

Component 4 Actual at Completion:
This has not been completed as quickly as hoped. Six case studies have been drafted, to date, and are currently awaiting revision. Once that has happened then they will be made widely available through various media, and will be presented on at regional conservation meetings during the year. It is anticipated that the findings from these case studies, and the Community engagement plan, will help to direct future community liaison by NatureFiji-MareqetiViti and other local NGOs.

A poster on community conservation benefits was presented, by Milly Ravuso, at the Cambridge Conservation Science Conference in April 2012 and was well received. Thiswill form part of a package of reports related to this subject.

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?
No. We had hoped to provide the opportunity for a Fijian, ideally from Kadavu, to undertake survey and analysis as part of a further education qualification. We had identified the individual, but were unable to negotiate the USP registration process in time to get the project formally

recognized. We are still discussing with the potential candidate alternative opportunities to undertake an MSc, maybe registering at Auckland University.

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.
I can send draft versions of these items now, or final versions once they get approved. I would prefer the latter, as I would not want to see draft versions publicly available.

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)

An initial concern was that the field surveys were focused on a narrow time period around the new moon. This often didn't coincide with the weekly ferry crossing. However, the SSG rapidly appreciated the need for surveys at that time and, once they'd learned the field methods, were able to work to the new moon schedule independent of any input from BirdLife.
We had hoped to get SSG representatives to Gau to learn field techniques, methods, etc, before the start of the field season. However, Gau was cutoff from all forms of public transport at the beginning of the year (the ferry was in for repair and the runway was closed for safety reasons until mid February). So this was not feasible. Visiting Gau at the end of the season turned out to be a very useful exercise, and the SSG came back enthused with ideas about how they could attempt to deliver the next steps for conservation of Collared Petrel.
We had hoped to undertake Case Studies for a range of sites that had undergone different types of initiation, and had been underway for differing lengths of time. Unfortunately one or our own SSGs, at Vatu-i-Ra underwent considerable upheaval during the year and is currently not active. We hope to be able to present this objectively in the Case Studies report as it should provide some useful lessons learned.

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

Relying on the SSG to co-ordinate field survey work proved to be a real success. The focus on surveying around new moon ensured that there was no opportunity to delay. SSG took this on board and established a camp at the peak, and initiated monitoring work, even when no BirdLife staff were able to be present.

As with all community projects in Fiji, BirdLife occurrence in the village is associated either with a welcome ceremony or a leaving ceremony – often both. This appears, at times, to be an onerous task. However, representatives from BirdLife and NFMV visited the community in December, 2012 to thank the community for their support, present the findings from the survey work during the year and to formalize the transfer of the SSG from BirdLife Fiji to NFMV. The village headman made a statement about BirdLife and its links with Nabukelevu that said 'BirdLife don't promise a lot, but they work very hard to deliver what they promise, they follow tradition – which is well-respected within the community, they maintain regular contact and they work closely with the community to deliver more benefits.'

The Case Study sites were selected to provide a comparison with the successful sites that BirdLife have been involved in at Natewa/Tunuloa and Nabukelevu. These included a marine IBA SSG that BirdLife have co-ordinated, the community work that NFMV have been working on in Gau, Kubulau community work co-ordinated by WCS and the long-running Bouma Natural Heritage Park co-ordinated by National Trust for Fiji. During the course of the year the marine IBA Site Support Group disbanded and the landowning community transferred their focus to an independent Eco-tourism consultant. This was, clearly, disappointing for the local staff – but will hopefully provide more useful lessons learned, in particular about the need for identifying realistic goals.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Nothing

Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount (US$)	Notes
Aage V. Jensen Charity Foundation (Marine)	A	4,576	
BirdLife International	A	4,459	
Birdlife International Global Seabird Programme	A	3,200	
Crowder-Messersmith	A	2,000	
Mohammed Bin Zayed Fund	A	10,000	
Pacific Seabird Group	A	2,000	
BirdLife International Community Conservation Fund	B	18,842	Increase the alternative livelihood opportunities in each of the villages in Nabukelevu
Aage V. Jensen Charity Foundation. Local Empowerment Programme	C	416,315	A regional programme to establish and develop Site Support Groups in 5 countries within the Pacific.
Marisla Foundation (Global Greengrants Fund)	B	48,574	
GEF-SGP-COMDEKS	B	25,476	Baseline assessment of the community development and knowledge management for COMDEKS – Fiji trial site at Natewa Tunuloa. This is likely to result in further funding for organisations to encourage sustainable development with the communities.
UNDP Equator Prize	B	4,496	Awarded to the Sisi Initiative in Natewa/Tunuloa.

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

A *Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this 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 funded 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.

Details of the monitoring methods and observation reports have been recorded onto file and kept in a safe location. Survey methods are understood by a range of members of the local community who would now be able to repeat the surveys at a future date.
There is no need for annual surveying on Kadavu. Further work on Gau will ascertain the extent to which the survey method is consistent from year to year.
The local livelihood programme has been operational for several years with regular income being generated by the community for a Trust Fund as a consequence. The projects appear sustainable at the current time – although regular discussions with BirdLife (now NFMV) representatives will help to maintain the current level of interest.
This project has helped toward the merger between BirdLife Internationals Fiji Programme and Nature Fiji MareqetiViti. This ensures that work on the island of Kadavu has an in-country, national, partner as its champion. The benefits, to the community, to the staff who have themselves transferred to NFMV and to NFMV itself as it expands its work area

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.

Not applicable

Additional Comments/Recommendations

This project has involved contributions from a number of staff. I felt it would be useful to indicate how each of the staff has contributed to the project, and what they are doing now - following the cessation of the project.

Milly Ravuso – attended a workshop in Cambridge where she presented a poster on Community Conservation in Fiji. Completed 2 Case Studies. Provided advice and support on the community conservation aspects of the project. Currently working as EU Programme Manager for BirdLife International Pacific Partnership Secretariat.

Tuverea Tuamoto – provided advice and knowledge regarding the Mt Nabukelevu Site Support Group and facilitated the agreement between the SSG and BirdLlife to undertake the Petrel project. Currently working for NatureFiji MareqetiViti as the Fiji Programme Biosecurity Officer on the EU project.

Mere Tabudravu – organized the monthly fieldtrips to Lomati, sorting the supplies etc. Undertook and drafted the 4 additional Case Studies, and the Community Engagement Plan. Became a mother for the first time, herself, during the project. Currently working for NatureFiji MareqetiViti on childrens education, ecosystem services and other community awareness programmes.

Jeremy Bird – took part in the 2nd fieldtrip to continue training for the SSG in monitoring techniques. Drafted the paper on monitoring. Developed Marine IBAs across the Pacific. Currently working for an environmental consultants in the UK.

Sialesi Rasalato – took part in 3 of the fieldtrips, co-ordinated on-the ground activities and hand-over ceremonies at Lomati, and the visit to Gau. Spent 3 months in Maine, with National Audubon on a seabird training course. Currently technical officer on IAS for BirdLife International Pacific Partnership Secretariat.

Chris Thompson – volunteer. Took part in 5th and 6th fieldtrip to Mt Nabukelevu. Co-ordinated motion and still photographs and prepared short video showcasing Community conservation work on Kadavu. Currently completing degree back in the UK.

Mark O'Brien – took part in first and fifth field visit, initially to provide training for the community in monitoring, second to introduce Chris Thompson to the community, co-ordinated project, analysed monitoring data, editing reports.

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:	Mark O'Brien
Organization name:	BirdLife International
Mailing address:	GPO Box 18332, 10 McGregor Road, Suva, Fiji
Tel:	(+679) 331 3492
Fax:	(+679) 331 9658
E-mail:	mark.obrien@birdlife.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)**
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Yes	1500	1500	The management plan was developed prior to this project under another CEPF grant. This project helped to consolidate the plan, by providing regular contact between BirdLife and the community and being available to answer questions that arose.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?		None	None	
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.		1800	1800	This is the total extent of the KBA in Appendix 1 of the Ecosystem Profile– is that what you meant? The current extent of the KBA is 2,900 hectares. The area that we actually influenced is rather less than this – as we focused on 1 village (ie 1/5th of the total area.
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				This depends on what you mean by protected areas? If you mean legally protected areas then yes, because none of the land is covered by legally protected areas. If you include community managed protected areas then all of the work occurred within this.
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1below.		1	1	During the course of this project alone we focused on one of the villages. So, that village has developed a number of activities over the years, and this project has helped to encourage them and provide answers if issues should occur. We now have funding to further

				extend these issues to other villages within the KBA.

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	sustainable natural resources management	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services	due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural	More secure access to water resources	or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of	disasters (fires, landslides, flooding,	More secure sources of energy	public services, such as education, health, or	traditional knowledge for environmental	decision-making due to strengthened civil society and	Other
Lomati Village, Kadavu, Fiji		X	X				X						X	X					X	x	
Total																					

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