

CEPF Final Project Completion Report

Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions, below.

Organization Legal Name	Windsor Research Centre Limited
Project Title	An Action Plan to Save Threatened Biodiversity in Catadupa
CEPF GEM No.	62337
Date of Report	26 December 2015
Report Author	Michael Schwartz
Author Contact Information	Windsor@cwjamaica.com

CEPF Region: Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot

Strategic Direction: 1.1 Prepare and implement management plans in the 17 highest--priority key biodiversity areas

Grant Amount: \$210,619.31

Project Dates: 2013/5/1 to 2015/10/31

1. Implementation Partners for this Project (*list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project*)

- Dr. Robert Fleischer, Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, Center for Conservation and Evolutionary Genetics, National Zoological Park, Washington, DC. oversaw analyses of chytrid samples collected in Catadupa and provided advice and guidance on associated issues including protocols.
- Dr. S. Blair Hedges, (Dir) Center for Biodiversity, Temple University, USA, identified an “unknown” species of frog that was found in Catadupa as *Osteopileus marianae*, (NB, *O. marianae* had not been detected in a previous island-wide survey 2010-11, so confirmation in Catadupa is extremely important for this species.)
- Members of Cockpit Country Local Forest Management Committee (SW branch), including Chairman Shirley, participated in 9 Catadupa community meetings and in both Stakeholder Workshops to develop the Catadupa Conservation Action Plan (C-CAP).
- Forestry Department participated in our Experts Workshop (to define the C-CAP biological targets) and in the second Stakeholder Workshop to develop C-CAP strategies and actions and in the final workshop presenting the C-CAP to Government entities.
- National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) participated in our Experts Workshop (to define the C-CAP biological targets) and in the second Stakeholder Workshop to develop C-CAP strategies and actions and in the final workshop presenting the C-CAP to Government entities.
- Jamaica Environment Trust (JET) held a workshop for Catadupa communities on “Land Rights and Mining in Cockpit Country” (attendance 60+) and participated in the second Stakeholder Workshop, making a presentation on engaging with the media, national and international stakeholders to call for better environmental governance.
JET worked with WRC to define a joint strategy to mobilize the Media and to communicate with

Ministry of Mining and GoJ in general and co-signed a letter to Minister of Mining requesting a meeting.
JET also participated in our Media Visit to LM-MR KBA and in our Town Hall meeting in Kingston.

Conservation Impacts

2. Describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile

This project has contributed to Improving Protection and Management (Strategic Direction 1.1) of the high priority, Catadupa KBA by developing with community and Government stakeholders a Conservation Action Plan (C-CAP) which will, when successfully implemented, lead to conservation of Catadupa's biodiversity. The C-CAP will also be a basis for an eventual formal Management Plan for Catadupa.

The project has also started to raise awareness of biodiversity in the Litchfield Mtn – Matheson's Run (LM-MR) KBA, which has created a foundation upon which future conservation actions may be built.

This project has also contributed to Strategic Directions 2.1, because Catadupa and LM-MR are part of the North Coast Forest – Cockpit Country – Black River Conservation Corridor. Both KBAs provide essential ecosystem services, including water, and both are threatened by unsustainable, open-cast mining of bauxite.

3. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

The overall impact of this project has been to improve the chances that two, high-priority KBAs will be conserved and, in particular, to improve the probability that they will not be mined for bauxite which otherwise would certainly take place in the short to medium term under a "business as usual" scenario.

- For Catadupa KBA:
 - we have raised awareness of the area and its biodiversity in all of the 18 communities and in relevant Government Agencies;
 - we have collaboratively prepared a Conservation Action Plan;
 - the communities have come together to create a vehicle (Cockpit Communities For Conservation) to express their concerns and have had some initial success and experience during a live radio broadcast, a live TV broadcast and during public meetings;
 - a new set of informed, public "faces" has emerged to defend Catadupa's environment when media needs information and quotes.
- For the Litchfield Mtn – Matheson's Run KBA,
 - we have raised awareness of biodiversity and the imminent threat of bauxite mining in three "Front Line" Communities;
 - the project has brought these three communities together to resist a bauxite mining incursion into their communities and, for the first time in Jamaica, they have been able to express their opinions in public fora, including the press and on live TV, in a timeframe which may permit them to actually influence government policy;
 - a new set of public faces has emerged with whom the media can talk when related topics emerge.

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

Catadupa Key Biodiversity Area conserved and locally and globally important biodiversity protected / maintained. The threat of bauxite mining in Catadupa eliminated.

4. Actual progress toward long-term impacts at completion

The first steps towards conserving the Catadupa KBA and its important biodiversity have been taken. We have a stakeholder-developed Conservation Action Plan and have implemented those Actions necessary to be able to present the case for eliminating the threat of bauxite mining in Catadupa. Specifically:

- A Conservation Action Plan for Catadupa KBA (C-CAP) has been developed in collaboration with local community and government stakeholders (see <http://cockpitcountry.com/CCAP.html>).
- Communities in Catadupa have formed a group (Cockpit Communities For Conservation) with seventeen members designated from different communities and with an elected executive in order to further their goals and to help share information in each community.
- Baseline data on the Amphibian Chytrid threat has been researched and fed into the C-CAP (see <http://cockpitcountry.com/ChytridCatadupa.html>)
- Strategies and actions have been developed and implemented to have Special Exclusive Prospecting Licence #541 (bauxite mining in Catadupa) suspended, but we have not yet been able to meet with the Minister of Mining.
- [Letters](#) requesting meetings to discuss the issue were written and delivered to the Minister of Mining by Catadupa communities and a [joint letter](#) from WRC and JET was sent on 20th October 2015. No reply to any of these has been received.
- However, the target date (December 2015) will probably not be achieved because Government of Jamaica (and Ministry of Mining) are in “election mode” and are not responsive to our requests for a meeting. Elections are anticipated at end of January or beginning of February, 2016.

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

- 1) Catadupa Conservation Action Plan (C-CAP) prepared and approved by stakeholders by March 2015
- 2) Implementation of at least five top-ranked Actions from C-CAP initiated by December 2015.
- 3) Increased awareness and improved support for biodiversity conservation amongst 18 local communities (Ipswich, Chesterfield, Catadupa, Cambridge, Mount Horeb, Kensington, Maldon, Garlands, Mocho, Horse Guards, Niagara, Elderslie, Mulgrave, Breadnut Hill, Jointwood, White Hill, Accompong, Maroon Town).
- 4) Special Exclusive Prospecting Licence #541 (bauxite mining in Catadupa) suspended by December 2015
- 5) Increased awareness and improved support for biodiversity conservation amongst 4 local communities associated with the Litchfield Mtn - Matheson's Run KBA (LM-MR)

- 6) Increased awareness for 20 Media workers of the bauxite mining and its effects on biodiversity and on communities and more-informed coverage of the issue, reaching an estimated 50% of Jamaica's adult population (800,000 persons)
- 7) Increased awareness of at least 800 Catadupa and LM-MR stakeholders concerning KBAs in general and particularly of the three KBA's which constitute Cockpit Country.

5. Actual progress toward short-term impacts at completion

- 1) The C-CAP has been prepared and was approved by local stakeholders and GoJ representatives on [8th April](#) 2015.
- 2) Seven top-ranked C-CAP Actions [C-CAP Actions](#) have been initiated as follows:
 - Call for Cockpit Country Boundary to be declared;
 - Preparation and distribution of 200 [Bumper Stickers](#) to Catadupa drivers;
 - Use of Social Media (YouTube) to share information;
 - One community demonstration has been organised;
 - Catadupa communities have formed a “Cockpit Communities for Conservation” which meets regularly;
 - Presentation has been made to Ministry of Transport to sensitise them to the issue of Forest Connectivity and the threat of road re-alignment and/or new road construction.
 - Permit for DNA analysis for Giant Swallowtail Butterfly has been issued by NEPA
- 3) Awareness increased and support for biodiversity conservation improved at 21 community outreach meetings held at Cambridge (x2), Catadupa, Chesterfield/Stonehenge, Elderslie (x2), Garlands, Ginger Hill / Breadnut Walk, Horseguards, Ipswich, Maggotty (x2), Maldon / Point, Maroon Town, Merrywood; Mocho, Mount Horeb, Mulgrave, Niagara, Sweetwater, White Hill, for a total of 696 persons.
- 4) Strategies and Actions to have SEPL 541 suspended have been implemented; awareness has been raised both locally and nationally; letters requesting meetings to discuss the issue have been written and delivered to the Minister of Mining by the Communities (see <http://cockpitcountry.com/letters.html> and by WRC <<http://cockpitcountry.com/Letter to Minister Paulwell re CC Oct 2015.pdf>>).
- 5) Awareness increased and support for biodiversity conservation improved at six community outreach meetings held in three LM-MR communities (Gibraltar, Madras and Barnstaple) for a total of 131 persons (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/CCAPSensitisationMeetings.html> >).
- 6) Media personnel from Nationwide Radio (2), CVMTV (2), The Gleaner (1), The Observer (1), PANOS (1), Independent columnists (2) have been sensitised to the effects of bauxite mining on biodiversity and communities. That coverage of the issue is more-informed can be seen by listening to CVMTV's Live@7 for 26 September 2015 as well as reviewing articles in the Press (see <http://cockpitcountry.com/mediaReports.html>).
- 7) Approximately 700 Catadupa stakeholders are particularly aware of the Catadupa KBA and of the three KBAs that constitute Cockpit Country and about 130 LM-MR stakeholders are somewhat aware of the three KBAs that constitute Cockpit Country.

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

The project has achieved its short term goals within the constraints set by Government of Jamaica by ignoring letters from ourselves and from communities. We have demonstrated to GoJ that the public does not support mining within the outer boundary of Cockpit Country, which includes Catadupa and LM-MR KBAs.

7. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

This project had an unexpected positive impact on another KBA (Litchfield Mtn – Matheson’s Run), for which a bauxite prospecting licence has unexpectedly been issued. We were able to leverage the Catadupa project to join with local participants from LM-MR so that more media attention as generated and more and *different* faces were able to speak out against GoJ’s presumption that bauxite mining was still “business as usual”.

Project Components and Products/Deliverables

Component 1 (as stated in the approved proposal)

Stakeholders in Catadupa determined

8. Describe the results from Component 1 and each product/deliverable

A number of stakeholders from western Catadupa participated in Cockpit Country Boundary Public Consultation in 2013 (just as this CEPF-funded project was starting) and this fulfilled the goal of this component, telling us that these western communities did indeed feel part of Cockpit Country and therefore were stakeholders in the Catadupa KBA. Existing socio-economic profiles for these communities were also obtained.

Component 2 (as stated in the approved proposal)

Conservation Action Plan for Catadupa developed with participation of all stakeholders, including local communities, mining interests, Forestry Department, NEPA.

9. Describe the results from Component 2 and each product/deliverable

2.1 The C-CAP was finalized in a Final Workshop in April 2015 (see <http://cockpitcountry.com/WShopReport080415_Springfield.html>)

2.2 Although two Stakeholder Workshops were planned in February and March (for eastern Catadupa and western Catadupa communities), these were constrained by a) having to complete community sensitization meetings prior to this workshop, b) having to finalise the schedule of the Final Workshop with sufficient notice that GoJ staff could attend. One Workshop (eastern Catadupa) was held in February (see <http://cockpitcountry.com/WShopReport180215_Elderslie.html>) but Logistics problems in western Catadupa meant that there was insufficient time for the second Stakeholder Workshop. We compensated for this by obtaining inputs for the C-CAP during the Sensitisation Meetings.

2.3 Results of “Frog Assemblages” Research were not available in time for the C-CAP Final Workshop but were incorporated in the C-CAP analysis during August 2015. This analysis did not materially affect the main strategies which emerged from C-CAP workshops except for minor changes in their Ranking. Chytrid fungus (which had been a major concern before the field research) was identified as a Medium threat to frogs and has a Low overall ranking, and we

do not therefore believe the stakeholder consultation process was significantly affected by the late delivery of these results.

2.4 A distribution map of the prevalence and individual loading of amphibian chytrid fungus has been prepared: see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/ChytridCatadupa.html>>. As noted in 2.3., the field research revealed that chytrid does not appear to be a major threat to the overall community of frogs. However, the failure to detect one species, the endemic Jamaican Bromeliad Frog (*Eleutherodactylus jamaicensis*) raises renewed grave concern, first articulated by Holmes *et al.* (2012), that this species was highly vulnerable to chytrid and may be on the verge of extinction. Further search effort is urgently required.

2.5

- One proposal has been submitted to Forest Conservation Fund for \$20,500 to continue working with communities in LM-MR against the threat of bauxite mining and to carry out a pilot analysis of Frog presence and “calling vigour” in LM-MR.
- a commitment of US\$10,000 per year for Catadupa KBA conservation has been received from International Association of Butterfly Exhibitors and Suppliers.
- There are currently no other “calls for proposals” of which we are aware. We have contacted the Embassy of Japan (one of CEPF’s partners) and expect to submit a proposal in April 2016, which is their next funding cycle.

Component 3 (as stated in the approved proposal)

All levels of society sensitised to the value of Catadupa's biodiversity

10. Describe the results from Component 3 and each product/deliverable

3.1 Community sensitization meetings were held in eighteen communities around Catadupa and typically started an hour late and then lasted for 2 ½ to 3 hours, such was the interest. These meetings are documented by photos: (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/CCAPSensitisationMeetings.html>>); formal minutes were found to be impractical in the somewhat chaotic interactions and similarly, pre- and post- questionnaires were impossible to administer when community members arrive at varying times and when literacy is an issue (i.e., many community members would not have been able to “self-complete” a written questionnaire and questionnaires couldn’t be administered verbally throughout a meeting to each new arrival).

3.2 A Policy Brief Policy Brief has been prepared (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/CCAPPolicyBrief.html>>)

3.3 One thousand copies of our Catadupa Newsletter, “Towards a Conservation Action Plan” were printed and distributed. (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/CCAPNews.html>>)

3.4 1,000 copies each of two Newsletters (Catadupa CAP, Catadupa Frogs) were printed: see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/newsletters.html>>. These newsletters will be distributed with 1,000 copies of an existing, easy-to-read pamphlet “Environmental Benefits of Current Land Use Practices in Cockpit Country” and, together, will fulfill all the intent of the planned pamphlet while not prejudicing the still-unresolved Cockpit Country boundary issue by implying that Catadupa is distinct from Cockpit Country.

3.5 Web pages are on line: see “Conservation” pull-down menu on <<http://cockpitcountry.com>>; see also the “Biodiversity>Animals>Amphibians>Frogs-of-Catadupa-KBA” pull-down menu, as well as <<http://cockpitcountry.com/newsletters.html>>.

3.6 An article on the results of Frog surveys is being prepared and will be submitted to “FrogLog”, the publication of the IUCN SSC Amphibian Specialist Group.

3.7 A one-day workshop was held in Kingston to inform a broader selection of Government Agencies staff of C-CAP progress : 21 attendees including Forestry Dept, NEPA, Water Resources Authority and a Senior Director of Ministry of Mining.

3.8 The originally-planned case study was not presented at the National Minerals Week Conference but a broadly similar result was achieved by a Case study "Implications of Mining in Cockpit Country" (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/bauxitePresentation.html>>) which was presented at the governing party (PNP) Policy Review Committee Symposium on 6th September, 2015.

3.9 Presentations on the local biodiversity were made at 12 schools in Catadupa KBA (Catadupa All-Age, Catadupa High, Chatsworth, Flamstead Basic, Maldon High, Maldon Primary, Merrywood, Mt Horeb, Mulgrave, Vaughansfield SDA, Vaughansfield Primary, Johnson Basic, Garlands Primary).

3.10 Catadupa communities came together to form a group, “Cockpit Communities For Conservation” and have held five meetings to date.

Component 4 (as stated in the approved proposal)

Strategies and actions developed to have Special Exclusive Prospecting Licence #541 (bauxite mining in Catadupa) suspended by December 2015

11. Describe the results from Component 4 and each product/deliverable

The overall result of Component 4 is that, while we have successfully prepared or implemented all the supporting activities, documents and arguments required to Influence decision-makers, we have not actually been able to meet with the Minister of Mining and therefore we shall not be able to meet the goal of having the SEPL#541 suspended by December 2015. We expect that we will be able to achieve this goal sometime during the first half of 2016, depending on which party wins the forthcoming elections and whether a new Minister of Mining is appointed.

4.1 Members of Jamaica Environmental Advocacy Network (JEAN) were invited to visit the bauxite mining area near LM-MR KBA but attendance was poor and, indeed, those members of JEAN who are active are probably concentrating on their own issues. Recognising this, we held a meeting with Jamaica Environment Trust (JET) and independent activist / videographer, Esther Figueroa (who implemented our “Cockpit Country Is Our Home” radio, web and Facebook campaign in 2014), to develop a common strategy for our Catadupa radio and press campaign. This campaign was integrated with the LM-MR campaign (see below).

As a note on developing a common strategy, we did discuss a common strategy with our Cockpit neighbour, Southern Trelawny Environmental Agency, which is also a member of JEAN. CEO Hugh Dixon was adamant that, while he supported our actions, he was against the idea of a common strategy because GoJ would then perceive one voice only. His position, which seems

to have some merit, was that multiple voices, even if somewhat different, would have more effect in changing GoJ behaviour.

4.2 This component integrated with Component 5 (below).

Following WRC's discovery that Noranda Bauxite Co had breached their bauxite prospecting licence in May 2015, our press release and a site visit for The Observer newspaper resulted in substantial media attention during the second half of May, including front-page coverage (twice) in The Observer plus other less-prominent articles; also an article in The Gleaner. (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/mediaReports.html>>)

Thirty Catadupa community members (including 10 members of the Accompong Maroons) traveled to our Town Hall / Press Briefing meeting in Kingston (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/CCAPSensitisationMeetings.html#townhall>>) and delivered letters to Ministers of Mining, Minister of Agriculture, National Environment & Planning Agency, Mines and Geology Division (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/letters230915.html>>).

Component 5 (as stated in the approved proposal)

AMENDMENT June 2015 Build local and broad-based national support to address the threat of mining in the wider Cockpit Country as a strategy to safeguard each of the three CEPF KBAs located therein.

12. Describe the results from Component 5 and each product/deliverable

5.1 Six public meetings were held in three LM-MR KBA communities (Gibraltar, Madras, Barnstaple) to build local support to address the threat of bauxite mining in LM-MR and the wider Cockpit Country.

These communities then came together on 21 July 2015 for an open-air Public Meeting on the site of Noranda Bauxite Company's breach of their licence and then spontaneously organized a public demonstration on the nearby, active Haul Road. This generated substantial media coverage, including both national newspapers and most of a 1-hour programme ("Mining Showdown" on "Live@7 with Simon Crosskill) on 23rd July. (see <<http://cockpitcountry.com/mediaReports.html>>).

13. If you did not complete any component or deliverable, how did this affect the overall impact of the project?

All components were completed, even though this has not had the desired result of meeting the December target for having Special Exclusive Prospecting Licence #541 (bauxite mining in Catadupa) suspended, due to GoJ inaction. We shall continue to press for suspension of SEPL #541.

14. Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results

We used The Nature Conservancy's Conservation Action Planning Workbook (Version CAP_v6b) tool to develop the Catadupa Action Plan. This tool is available for download at <<http://https://www.conservationgateway.org/Files/Pages/conservation-action-plannasp122.aspx>>

CEPF Global Monitoring Data

Respond to the questions and complete the tables below. If a question is not relevant to your project, please make an entry of 0 (zero) or n/a (not applicable).

15. Did your organization complete the CEPF Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT) at the beginning and end of your project? (Please be sure to submit the final CSTT tool to CEPF if you haven't already done so.)

	Date	Composite Score
Baseline CSTT	n/a	
Final CSTT	n/a	

16. List any vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered species conserved due to your project

The following species in Catadupa KBA were historically recorded; with potentially the exception of *Eleutherodactylus jamaicensis*, which we failed to detect and for which we have grave concern about its vulnerability to chytrid, all others have improved conservation chances due to our project:

Columbidae	Patagioenas caribaea	RING-TAILED PIGEON	VU
ELEUTHERODACTYLIDAE	Eleutherodactylus fuscus	JAMAICAN EARSPOT FROG	CR
ELEUTHERODACTYLIDAE	Eleutherodactylus griphus	COCKPIT FROG	CR
ELEUTHERODACTYLIDAE	Eleutherodactylus jamaicensis	JAMAICAN BROMELIAD FROG	EN
ELEUTHERODACTYLIDAE	Eleutherodactylus grabhami	JAMAICAN PALLID FROG	EN
ELEUTHERODACTYLIDAE	Eleutherodactylus luteolus	JAMAICAN MASKED FROG	EN
ELEUTHERODACTYLIDAE	Eleutherodactylus cundalli	JAMAICAN ROCK FROG	VU
EUPHORBIACEAE	Phyllanthus cauliflorus		VU
HYLIDAE	Osteopilus wilderi	GREEN BROMELIAD FROG	EN
HYLIDAE	Osteopilus crucialis	JAMAICAN SNORING FROG	EN
HYLIDAE	Osteopilus marianae	YELLOW BROMELIAD FROG	EN
MALPIGHIACEAE	Malpighia obtusifolia		VU
MELIACEAE	Guarea jamaicensis		VU
MYRTACEAE	Pimenta obscura	WILD PIMENTO	VU
MYRTACEAE	Pimenta obscura	WILD PIMENTO	VU
OCHNACEAE	Ouratea elegans		CR
PALMAE	Bactris jamaicana	PRICKLY POLE	VU
Psittacidae	Amazona collaria	YELLOW-BILLED AMAZON	VU
Psittacidae	Amazona agilis	BLACK-BILLED AMAZON	VU
RUBIACEAE	Guettarda longiflora		CR
THEACEAE	Ternstroemia glomerata		CR
Papilionidae	Papilio homerus	JAMAICAN GIANT SWALLOWTAIL BUTTERFLY	

The following species in Litchfield Mtn – Matheson’s Run KBA have improved conservation chances due to our project. * NEW SURVEY URGENTLY REQUIRED.

ARALIACEAE	<i>Dendropanax grandiflorus</i>		CR
ARALIACEAE	<i>Dendropanax filipes</i>		CR
ARALIACEAE	<i>Schefflera troyana</i>		VU
BORAGINACEAE	<i>Cordia clarendonensis</i>		VU
CAPROMYIDAE	<i>Geocapromys brownii</i>	JAMAICAN HUTIA	VU
CARICACEAE	<i>Carica jamaicensis</i>		VU
Columbidae	<i>Patagioenas caribaea</i>	RING-TAILED PIGEON	VU
	<i>Eleutherodactylus jamaicensis*</i>	JAMAICAN BROMELIAD FROG*	EN
ELEUTHERODACTYLIDAE	<i>Eleutherodactylus grabhami</i>	JAMAICAN PALLID FROG	EN
ELEUTHERODACTYLIDAE	<i>Eleutherodactylus cundalli</i>	JAMAICAN ROCK FROG	VU
ERYTHROXYLACEAE	<i>Erythroxylum jamaicense</i>		VU
EUPHORBIACEAE	<i>Sebastiania spicata</i>		EN
EUPHORBIACEAE	<i>Acidocroton verrucosus</i>		VU
EUPHORBIACEAE	<i>Lasiocroton harrisii</i>		VU
FLACOURTIACEAE	<i>Samyda glabrata</i>		VU
GUTTIFERAE	<i>Clusia clarendonensis</i>		VU
HYLIDAE	<i>Osteopilus wilderi</i>	GREEN BROMELIAD FROG JAMAICAN SNORING FROG YELLOW BROMELIAD FROG	EN
HYLIDAE	<i>Osteopilus crucialis</i>		EN
HYLIDAE	<i>Osteopilus marianae</i>		EN
Icteridae	<i>Nesopsar nigerrimus</i>	JAMAICAN BLACKBIRD	EN
LAURACEAE	<i>Ocotea staminoides</i>		EN
MALPIGHIACEAE	<i>Malpighia harrisii</i>		VU
MELIACEAE	<i>Guarea jamaicensis</i>		VU
MYRSINACEAE	<i>Ardisia byrsonimae</i>		CR
MYRTACEAE	<i>Eugenia aboukirensis</i>		CR
MYRTACEAE	<i>Mitranthes nivea</i>		EN
MYRTACEAE	<i>Eugenia eperforata</i>		EN
MYRTACEAE	<i>Eugenia lamprophylla</i>		VU
MYRTACEAE	<i>Calyptranthes capitata</i>		VU
MYRTACEAE	<i>Eugenia schulziana</i>		VU
MYRTACEAE	<i>Eugenia heterochroa</i>		VU
OLACACEAE	<i>Schoepfia harrisii</i>		VU
POLYGONACEAE	<i>Coccoloba troyana</i>		VU
Psittacidae	<i>Amazona collaria</i>	YELLOW-BILLED AMAZON	VU
Psittacidae	<i>Amazona agilis</i>	BLACK-BILLED AMAZON	VU
RHAMNACEAE	<i>Colubrina obscura</i>		VU
RUBIACEAE	<i>Psychotria clarendonensis</i>		EN
RUBIACEAE	<i>Rondeletia clarendonensis</i>		EN
RUBIACEAE	<i>Portlandia harrisii</i>		VU
RUBIACEAE	<i>Erithalis quadrangularis</i>		VU
RUBIACEAE	<i>Rondeletia adamsii</i>		VU
RUBIACEAE	<i>Palicourea wilesii</i>		VU
THEACEAE	<i>Ternstroemia bullata</i>		CR

Hectares Under Improved Management

Project Results	Hectares*	Comments
17. Did your project strengthen the management of an existing protected area?	100	Belfont Forest Reserve
	931	Ffyfe & Rankine a Forest Reserve
	148	Ffyfe & Rankine b Forest Reserve
	152	Garlands Forest Reserve
	96	HorseGuards Forest Reserve
	170	Jericho Forest Reserve
	230	Mocho Forest Reserve
	504	Shuna Forest Reserve
	20	Tangle River Forest Reserve
	31	Belmont Forest Reserve
	150	Discovery Forest Reserve
	233	Brislington Forest Reserve
	662	Hyde Hall Mtn Forest Reserve
	129	Llandaff
85	Richmond Pen Forest Reserve Blocks A, B, C, D, E, F, H	
4,649	Litchfield Mtn – Matheson’s Run Forest Reserve	
18. Did your project create a new protected area or expand an existing protected area?		<i>List the name of each protected area, the date of proclamation, and the type of proclamation (e.g., legal declaration, community agreement, stewardship agreement)</i>
19. Did your project strengthen the management of a key biodiversity area named in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile (hectares may be the same as questions above)	15,736	Catadupa KBA
	15,714	Litchfield Mtn – Matheson’s Run KBA
20. Did your project improve the management of a production landscape for biodiversity conservation		<i>List the name or describe the location of the production landscape</i>

* Include total hectares from project inception to completion

21. In relation to the two questions above on protected areas, did your project complete a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), or facilitate the completion of a METT

by protected area authorities? If so, complete the table below. (Note that there will often be more than one METT for an individual protected area.)

Protected area	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score
	n/a					
	n/a					
	n/a					
	n/a					

22. List the name of any corridor (named in the Ecosystem Profile) in which you worked and how you contributed to its improved management, if applicable.

Direct Beneficiaries: Training and Education

Did your project provide training or education for . . .	Male	Female	Total	Brief Description
23. Adults for community leadership or resource management positions			n/a	(Outreach & awareness only)
24. Adults for livelihoods or increased income			n/a	(Outreach & awareness only)
25. School-aged children			n/a	(Outreach & awareness only)
26. Other	1		1	WRC technician Antoney Carson learned how to use software to acoustically identify frogs and how to safely handle frogs for chytrid sampling; he subsequently used these skills to assist Dr. Ann Sutton (CCAM) in additional frog surveys.

27. List the name and approximate population size of any “community” that benefited from the project.

Community name, surrounding district, surrounding province, country	Population size
Cambridge, St James Jamaica	4067
Catadupa, St James Jamaica	1824
Chesterfield, Stonehenge St James Jamaica	819
Elderslie St Elizabeth Jamaica	901
Garlands, St James Jamaica	837
Ginger Hill St Elizabeth Jamaica	652
Horseguards St James Jamaica	490
Maggotty St Elizabeth Jamaica	2976
Maldon/Point St James Jamaica	1326

Maroon Town		St James	Jamaica	1202
Breadnut Walk)				
Ipswich)	Merrywood	St Elizabeth	Jamaica	995
Merrywood)				
Mocho		St James	Jamaica	356
Mount Horeb		St James	Jamaica	847
Mulgrave,		St Elizabeth	Jamaica	1427
Niagara		St James	Jamaica	817
Sweetwater		St James	Jamaica	50
White Hill		St Elizabeth	Jamaica	593
				20,179

28. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Based on the list of communities above, write the name of the communities in the left column below. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes.

Community Name	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty line	Other	Increased income due to:				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
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
Cambridge,						X												X	X		
Catadupa,	X																	X	X		
Chesterfield, Stonehenge	X																	X	X		
Elderslie						X												X	X		
Garlands,						X												X	X		
Ginger Hill	X																	X	X		
Horseguards	X																	X	X		
Maggotty						X												X	X		

Maldon/Point	X																		X	X	
Maroon Town	X																		X	X	
Merrywood						X													X	X	
Mocho						X													X	X	
Mount Horeb						X													X	X	
Mulgrave,						X													X	X	
Niagara	X																		X	X	
Sweetwater						X													X	X	
White Hill	X																		X	X	

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

Lessons Learned

29. 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

We learned that having a common strategy does not mean having a common voice: that Government may perceive a common voice as one voice only.

It is not *one* very eloquent statement that gets things done, but, rather, “very many” statements. So repetition is important, particularly if there are different “angles”.

We learned to set a “release date” on press releases.

Discussion with our Jamaican-born Principal Investigator (PI) showed that there is a cultural difference in the meaning of the word “protocol”. Whereas foreign-born Jamaicans (Schwartz and Koenig) interpret it as being a rigid definition, not to be modified without approval, the PI interpreted the word as being a guideline, to be modified as required by circumstances.

We learned that possession of a PhD does not imply competence and that, when we have remote field sites (i.e. don't have direct day-to-day supervision of field work), we need even more risk-management, which has a cost and which needs to be factored into the project budget.

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

The interactive Project Design Process (between CEPF and WRC) certainly led to a precise and well-targeted project document.

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

Project Implementation was, as expected, fairly arduous because of distance involved (an average of 2 ½ hours' drive each way from WRC to the site). Our associated mitigation strategy was to base the Principle Investigator on site, but this had the consequence that he was largely unsupervised. Unfortunately, this person turned out to be less competent than would be indicated by having a PhD and he abandoned the project rather than try to face up to his deficiencies. WRC's Dr. Koenig was, however, able to salvage the work.

32. Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

Sustainability / Replication

33. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated

The main challenge to project sustainability is logistics: Catadupa KBA is “long and thin” (25 km x 7 km); roads are bad and public transport outside of the working day is difficult: this means that people will not travel to a meeting unless they are sure of a return “ride”. For the sustained implementation of the C-CAP, transport will need to be subsidized in order to maintain momentum.

Communication is also an issue because only two 'active' community members have email. None use Facebook, Twitter etc..

34. Summarize any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability

The unplanned action of Catadupa communities forming a "Cockpit Communities For Conservation" shows a level of interest and commitment that is likely to result in increased sustainability, provided that logistics can be subsidized (see para. 33 above)

Safeguards

35. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social, environmental, or pest management safeguards

"Chytrid" Sampling Protocols were imperfectly implemented up to June 2014: certain aspects of the protocol were not followed, which led to:

- bleach was not used to sterilise foot gear,
- both observers capturing frogs (with associated risk of data recording equipment being contaminated by the person responsible for "scribing"),
- the use of a hand in a ziplock bag turned inside out during the capture process.

This seems to have arisen from a cultural difference in the meaning of the word "protocol". Whereas the project manager and the research supervisor interpret it as being a rigid definition, not to be modified without approval, the Principle Investigator (and other local persons) interpret the word as being a guideline, to be modified as required by circumstances.

The original protocols were reviewed and either revised or reinstated and were subsequently implemented as rigid definitions, not to be modified.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

36. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF

Additional Funding

37. 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 CEPF investment

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
International Association of Butterfly Exhibitors & Suppliers (IABES)	Co-finance	26,544.50	
IABES	Grantee Funding	10,000	To implement Catadupa CAP in 2016
Forest Conservation Fund	Grantee Funding	20,480	To conserve LM-MR KBA (reallocation of unused funds from existing project)

* Categorize the type of funding as:

- 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)*

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:

- 38. Name:** Michael Schwartz
39. Organization: Windsor Research Centre
40. Mailing address: Sherwood Content, Trelawny, Jamaica W.I.
41. Telephone number: (876) 997 3832
42. E-mail address: Windsor@cwjamaica.com