

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd
Project Title:	Towards establishing the economic value of invasive species impacts in the Pacific
Date of Report:	May 9, 2012
Report Author and Contact Information	Suzie Greenhalgh, greenhalghs@landcareresearch.co.nz

CEPF Region: Polynesia-Micronesia

Strategic Direction: 1. Prevent, control and eradicate invasive species in key biodiversity areas

Grant Amount: USD20,000

Project Dates: 01/01/11 – 31/01/12

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

Pacific Invasives Initiative: Undertook the review of economic valuation literature for invasive species with Landcare Research and reviewed technical report

IUCN: reviewed technical report

University of South Pacific: provided expert advice on the key invasive species to consider and review, provided key contacts to liaise with on various invasive species, provided research reports etc on various invasive species.

Conservation Impacts

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

This project scoped the extent of economic cost assessment for invasive species management. Frequently the decision to manage or not manage an invasive species will be based on the cost of undertaking management and the benefits from that management. The review of existing studies showed that there were few studies in the region that could be used to justify invasive species management. The subsequent project that has been based on the findings from this project will address the lack of capacity in the region and undertake an assessment of a suite of invasive species in Fiji.

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

This project was a scoping exercise for what was required to further the economic impact of invasive species in the Pacific. We expected to find that there were few actual valuation studies in the Pacific. This was the case. The majority of existing studies were focused in Hawaii with significantly fewer studies in other areas in the Pacific. This highlighted that the capacity to undertake valuation studies in the region was limited, especially in the area of invasive species.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: N/A

Species Conserved: N/A

Corridors Created: N/A

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

The biggest challenge with increasing the use of economic assessments to assist and support decisions around invasive species management is the lack of capacity in the region to undertake valuation studies. This will be addressed in a follow-up project (currently funded through CEPF also).

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

No, this was a scoping project.

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)

There is little capacity to undertake economic assessments for invasive species management in the Pacific and little is known about the impacts of many invasive species. This was expected and confirmed by this project.

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

Setting up meetings can be challenging as many local organizations and people don't respond to requests for a meeting until just prior to arrival in the region. Most meetings tend to be set up after you arrive in the region. This should be factored in when you are working in the region.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Despite there being many projects related to invasive species management, there appears to be little economic data collected during the project or baseline data about the impact of species in an area. This makes it difficult to make post-project assessments of the economic impact of invasive species. If additional data collection was made during these projects it would make any economic impact assessment more robust.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

--	--	--	--

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

- A** Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)
- B** Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)
- C** Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

There was limited capacity developed through this project with USP. This was primarily due to the lack of any real information and the cost and logistical challenges involved in the collecting primary data (project timeframe ended up being 6 months). We also realized that greater success would be achieved through training professionals in the field in economic valuation rather than just students. This project allowed us to clarify what the true state of economic valuation is and how to increase the capacity to undertake these assessments in the region. The data collated in the invasive species database will be of value to any practitioners undertaking valuation studies in the future.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

None

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

This was largely a desktop scoping study with an in-country visit to meet with the relevant agencies, researchers and collaborators to confirm assessment findings and what should be contained in follow-on research. Therefore no actions were required.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

The findings from this project have been used to design a new project that will meet the needs of the region for economic assessment of invasive species. This has been funded by CEPF for the 2012 calendar year.

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: Suzie Greenhalgh

Organization name: Landcare Research

Mailing address: Private Bag 92170, Auckland Mail Centre, Auckland, 1142, New Zealand

Tel: +64-9-574 4132

Fax: +64-9-574 4101

E-mail: greenhalghs@landcareresearch.co.nz

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

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	No			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	No			

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table.

