CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Eco Oceania Pty Ltd.
Project Title:	Action Plan for Tokelau Islands Biosecurity and Restoration
Date of Report:	30 July 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Dr Ray Pierce, EcoOceania Pty Ltd, 165 Stoney Creek Road, Speewah, Queensland 4881, Australia raypierce@bigpond.com

CEPF Region: Polynesia-Micronesia

Strategic Direction: 1. Invasive species prevention

Grant Amount: $31,000

Project Dates: Jul 1, 2012-Jun 30, 2013

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):
Dr Monica Gruber – covered advice on invasive ant surveillance and management; site visits to islands, especially Atafu
Mr Mika Perez, Director, EDNRE, Tokelau – covered logistical aspects of action plan, coordinated community liaison and translations

Conservation Impacts

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

This project has prepared an action plan to help guide the implementation of biosecurity, invasive species management and protected species management at Tokelau. The Tokelau Islands provide important linkages between CEPF ecosystem hotspots at Samoa and Phoenix Islands. The project identified opportunities and tasks to restore atoll biota, including seabird populations, via combinations of pest eradication, strengthening of biosecurity and by local implementation of codes of conduct (village rules).

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

The project has had short term and anticipated long term impacts as described below.

Project Approach (500 words)

The approach followed the recommendations of the CEPF-funded conservation survey of indigenous biota and invasives at Tokelau (Pierce et al 2012). The approach was six-fold:

1. Discuss and agree with Tokelau management staff the broad priorities and action plans and the associated tasks, monitoring and surveillance that would be needed for biosecurity and island action plans
2. Draft a Biosecurity action plan with key components comprising defining source or risk ports, risk mechanisms, risk species and tasks needed to minimize risks. This all involved working with stakeholders on each of the islands and technical stakeholders regionally, including Samoa Quarantine, SPC and CI.
3. Draft a Tokelau invasives action plan for IAS already present. This used the Conservation survey results to identify Key Biodiversity Areas and the IAS present. A key approach

was to work with technical experts (ants, agricultural pests) to identify approaches to manage IAS present. This was then discussed with Tokelau staff and councils to adapt to local needs and community monitoring.
4. Draft an indigenous species protection plan involving tapu or no-take compliance enforced by Taupulega. This was discussed with Taupalega and adapted accordingly.
5. Meet with relevant Tokelau staff and work through and modify as needed the details of above draft plans (2-4 above)
6. Provide final reports

Link to CEPF Investment Strategy

The project addressed prevention, control, and eradication of invasive species in key biodiversity areas. Prevention of IAS invasion is a key focus of the project given that Tokelau has received relatively few invasive species to date, but there are significant risks that can be addressed pre-border and at the border relatively cheaply and effectively.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):

This project aims to have a multiple impact of restoring island ecosystems and species via the following processes:
- support passive mechanisms for protecting sensitive indigenous bird populations (particularly via cessation of harvesting)
- minimize the risk of further invasive species from arriving via good biosecurity and awareness
- identify methods for Tokelau to address existing invasives and where appropriate undertake targeted removal of invasive species already present at Tokelau.

Actual Progress Towards Long-term Impacts at Completion:

Awareness raising has resulted in improved biosecurity awareness and some IAS work on all of the atolls, all of which will have benefits to biodiversity beyond 3 years.
In particular this includes improved liaison between Tokelau's Environment division and some key regional agencies including Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC), Samoa Port Authority and Samoa Quarantine.
Our discussions along with those of SPC have identified methods for Tokelau to address existing invasives at the atolls including Wedelia (Singapore daisy), rats, and potentially yellow crazy ants.
Our discussions and recommendations on protection measures for key indigenous species provide a framework for long-term protection of key indigenous species both as conservation measures per se for threatened and sensitive species, and investment in food security.

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

Identify a process to achieve the long-term impacts described above. The short-term impacts are as follows:
- Taupulega support protection measures of key sensitive species
- Process identified to improve biosecurity and Tokelau implements at least the simplest and most urgent tasks..
- Process identified to address key invasives at Tokelau including implementation of at least the simplest and most urgent tasks, e.g. planned approach to myna removal
- Significantly improved awareness of invasive issues including impacts, surveillance and quarantine needs, plus Tokelau will begin to implement the highest priority biosecurity needs during this action planning work
- target areas will be prioritised - they will be partly site led (Key Biodiversity Areas, KBAs) and species led. The site led areas are mainly small motu that offer best chances in the short-term for Tokelau to recover sensitive species of birds and other biota and potentially involve their agreeing to remove invasive species (e.g. rats, cats, pigs) and/or minimising the deliberate introduction of species such as feral pigs for food. The total area benefitting would be less than 200 ha for the Group. However the biosecurity work and some other invasive work (e.g. mynas) are species-led

and involve the group as a whole (c.1200 ha); similarly success at small scale eradication will undoubtedly lead Tokelau to consider island wide invasives eradications in the future.

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:
Tokelau have just increased the number of biosecurity staff to meet the newly identified needs, and they are planning to have them trained in 2013.
Awareness raising has already prompted discussion amongst Taupalega (Council) and local action including:
- no confirmed sightings of mynas in recent months
- some action against yellow crazy ants is currently underway at Atafu in the form of a feasibility study and local management
- our work has prompted SPC staff to visit Fakaofo where they identified means of combating existing agricultural pests at that atoll
- our work has prompted Tokelau to strengthen relations with port authorities at Apia, Samoa, to improve biosecurity
- surveillance and improved biosecurity was already being addressed on at least one atoll and at Apia, and the appointment of additional staff indicates it will soon be addressed at the other two atolls
- awareness of invasive species issues has been raised in the community and amongst staff

Please provide the following information where relevant:

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 improved biosecurity (especially staff appointments) is a notable successful outcome of this project.
Challenges include the usual ones in relation to isolated islands, including here the potential rivalry (rather than cooperation) between islands. Impacts of IAS on human comfort (yellow crazy ant) may to some extent contribute to the course of general environmental management.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?
None

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:
Discuss and agree with Tokelau management staff the broad action plans and the associated tasks, monitoring and surveillance that would be needed for biosecurity and island action plans

Component 1 Actual at Completion:
Discussion and agreement achieved with Tokelau Environment staff (several meetings), Taupalega (2 of the 3 atolls) and general managers (all 3 atolls)

Component 2 Planned:
Draft a Biosecurity action plan with key components:
- define risk source ports e.g. Apia, New Zealand, aircraft sources in future
- define risk mechanism - specific ships from Apia, New Zealand, others etc
- define risk species - rodents; other vertebrates (e.g. mynas, bulbuls, lizards, amphibia), invertebrates including ants and snails; weeds; diseases, etc
- define tasks to minimize risks - quarantine at source ports, quarantine and surveillance en route, quarantine at islands (plus ongoing surveillance and response)

Liaise with technical stakeholders

Component 2 Actual at Completion:
Plan drafted covering following
- Risk source ports and mechanisms identified with shipping and Customs staff
- Risk species identified with Tokelau staff, Samoa Quarantine
- Tasks identified with cooperation of Tokelau staff, Taupalega and Samoa Quarantine

Component 3 Planned:
Draft an island invasives action plan with key components:
- confirm target KBAs (islets/motu) for management
- confirm target invasive species for future eradications and/or means of keeping invasives from reinvading
- assess potential methods of eradication and motu biosecurity - this will involve detailed discussion with technical specialists involved in management of invasives and also Tokelau staff.
- plan for ongoing management and monitoring by the local communities

Component 3 Actual at Completion:
Plan drafted covering the following:
- opportunities identified for to manage existing invasives and integrate economic and environmental benefits
- suitable IAS for targeting identified
- methods of invasive management identified
- ongoing management and monitoring methods outlined

Component 4 Planned:
Draft an indigenous species protection plan involving tapu or no-take compliance enforced by Taupulega. Much of the potential for biodiversity recovery at Tokelau is via cessation of harvesting and this could be refined to give better protection to key sensitive species.

Component 4 Actual at Completion:
Draft plan completed spanning seabirds, turtles and coconut crabs

Component 5 Planned:
Meet with relevant Tokelau staff and work through details of above draft plans (2-4 above)

Component 5 Actual at Completion:
Meeting with minister and Director of Environment, Taupalega to listen to comment and revise draft as needed. The components 2-4 were combined for one overall action plan.

Component 6 Planned:
Provide final report with final action plans for biosecurity, invasives management and species protection. Include sections on sustainability including costings and funding sources

Component 6 Actual at Completion:
Completed.

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?
No

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.
Tokelau Invasive Species Action Plan submitted

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.

No new lessons but previous experiences of slow process of getting feedback was reinforced during this period

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

By following an initial conservation survey project, the action plan already had a framework available for working with Tokelau staff and community, and this was a big help.

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

Nothing significant

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

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	Notes
Eco Oceania Pty Ltd.	A	2000	Additional tome spent on project
Tokelau Government	A	10,000	Estimated costs of accommodation and travel
SPC	C	3000	Estimated staff time spent on agricultural pests at Tokelau

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.

The involvement of other agencies, especially SPC, SQ and independent ant researchers will help to sustain biosecurity at Tokelau.

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.

Action plan recommendations followed the guidelines of the CEPF PMP and additional guidelines, e.g. aiming for rat eradication rather than ongoing control, the latter of which would see repeated use of pesticides.

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 Ray Pierce
Organization name: EcoOceania Pty Ltd
Mailing address: 165 Stoney Creek Road, Speewah, Queensland 4881, Australia
Tel: +61 740930784
Fax:
E-mail: raypierce@bigpond.com

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.				
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?				
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.				
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1below.				

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: