CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Auckland UniServices Limited

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): PP-CII Coordination and Technical and Scientific Support for RNHP Projects

Implementation Partners for this Project: Various implementing agencies

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): October 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006

Date of Report (month/year): August 2006

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.
This project involved coordination and technical & scientific support for the development (selecting, assessing the feasibility and designing projects) and, in some cases, implementation (capacity building, operational planning & evaluation) of selected invasive species management projects funded by CEPF in the Polynesia – Micronesia Hotspot..

III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. Briefly describe the methods used in achieving the objectives of this project.
   - Developed and applied project selection process & criteria, and project development guidelines
   - Focused activities at selected Demonstration projects
   - Modeled best practice procedures
   - Assigned PP-CII Project Coordinators/mentors to advise and support project managers
   - Promoted research
   - Facilitated the engagement of appropriately skilled advisers
   - Facilitated training and skills-sharing
   - Coordinated technical reviews of plans and reports
   - Facilitated monitoring and evaluation of activities and outcomes
   - Facilitated access to specialist networks (eg ISSG, PILN)
   - Promoted invasive species management in various forums.

2. Describe what was achieved in terms of:

   a) capacity development;
   Capacity to manage invasive species was developed at all projects. Effort was directed at advising and supporting implementing agencies, community groups and other stakeholders in undertaking project development and implementation tasks. Training and skills-sharing exchanges were facilitated for selected people (for

example, Tokelau government officials were trained in myna eradication techniques).

b) developing partnerships;

The PP-CII involves 7 partners (the Invasive Species Specialist Group, BirdLife International, Conservation International, New Zealand's Agency for International Aid and Development, Secretariat for the Pacific Community, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme and The Nature Conservancy). Each partner provided support and inputs during the course of this project. Partnerships were also established and maintained based on individual projects. Typically these involved an implementing agency, one or more stakeholder groups, one or a few specialist advisers and a PP-CII coordinator. These project teams were very productive during the course of this project.

c) raising awareness of invasive species and generating community support for their management;

The main focus of PP-CII activities is Demonstration Projects. These projects were selected specifically for their potential to raise awareness of invasive species and generate community support for management, as well as to develop management capacity locally, nationally and regionally. Significant progress was made during this project in raising awareness and generating community support. The support and involvement of local people and government representatives at all of these projects indicates progress which has been made (for example, the residents of Kayangel Atoll, Palau have declared their support for eradication of invasive species from their island)

d) involving the local community and other stakeholders:

In consultation with stakeholders and implementing agencies, opportunities for involving local people were identified, and their inputs facilitated. For example, on Viwa Island in Fiji, over 30 local residents were trained in rodent eradication and monitoring techniques. Under the stewardship of USP staff they have recently undertaken the rodent eradication operation, with support and advice through the PP-CII.

e) providing benefits to the local community and other stakeholders.

In addition to new skills and capacity already acquired (see above), further significant benefits are expected to accrue. These are likely to include outcomes such as improved domestic water supplies, increased crop yields and new opportunities for eco-tourism– as well as predicted biodiversity conservation outcomes (for example, reduced seabird mortality on Vatu-I-Ra Island due to rat predation).

3. How has the project been promoted? (Please enclose/attach press clippings, brochures, publications, videos, websites, photos, etc). Please describe the products developed during the project and how and to whom these were disseminated.

Most Demonstration Projects are summarized on the Pacific Invasives Initiative website (***www.issg.org/cii/pii***). Implementing agencies and stakeholders will be encouraged to circulate project reports once they have been finalized.

The PP-CII and Demonstration Projects were promoted in a number of forums during the period including the first meeting of Pacific Invasives Learning Network teams in Palau, June 2006.
Implementing agencies and collaborators have taken a large number of photos of activities at most projects which are generally available for wider dissemination.

IV. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose**:* To reduce negative impacts of invasive alien species primarily by managing them at selected Demonstration Projects in the Polynesia – Micronesia Hotspot.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
Objectives to manage selected invasive alien species are being addressed at 10 Demonstration Projects in the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot by 30 June 2006.	Progress has been made as at 30 June 2006 in addressing invasive species at the following sites: 1 Vahanga Atoll, Tuamotu Archipelago, French Polynesia. As a result of work done through this CEPF grant an operational plan is being refined for the eradication of rats. 2. A study of the feasibility of eradicating mynas from Mangaia was undertaken in June 2006. A project plan is now being prepared. 3. Phoenix Islands, Kiribati. A survey of the main islands of the group was undertaken in May 2006 to determine the presence of seabirds and invasive rats, cats, and rabbits. Project plans are now being prepared to eradicate these invasives. 4. Tokelau. Awareness, educational, and training programs relating to the invasive Yellow crazy ant were delivered to specific audiences.

	5 Aleipata Islands, Samoa. As a result of further consultation and detailed investigations during this period a grant proposal has been prepared for consideration by the RNHP and other funders for the removal of rats and invasive ants from the Group. 6. Viwa Island, Fiji. Following extensive consultation with Viwa residents and prior research, a detailed operational plan has been prepared for the eradication of rats from Viwa. Local people have been trained in various activities and will undertake this operation in late July 2006. Further investigations continue in preparation for eradicating the invasive cane toads. 7 Vatu-I-Ra Island, Fiji. A feasibility study completed in May 2006 showed that rat eradication is feasible. Detailed plans were prepared and local staff trained. The rat eradication operation is planned for late July 2006. 8 Kayangel Atoll, Palau. A study of the feasibility of eradicating invasive rodents was undertaken in June 2006. 9. Invasive tramp ants – Pacific region. A coordinator for the program has been appointed and a coordinated program designed. Training courses for border control staff in the Pacific region have been initiated. 10. Mosquitoes as disease vectors in Tonga. A survey to assess the distribution and abundance of mosquitoes was undertaken in April 2006. This was a collaborative effort involving Tongan agencies and community groups. The report will be used to inform future decisions. 11 Ahnd Atoll, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia. A study of the feasibility of eradicating invasive rats from Ahnd Island was undertaken in June 2006.

	12. Tokelau mynas. A study of the feasibility of eradicating mynas was undertaken in May 2006. An operational plan was prepared, trapping trials were undertaken and local people trained in appropriate techniques. 13. Merremia peltata (review) - Pacific region. A review of possible biocontrol agents and methods targeting this weed was completed in June 2006. A recommended course of action has been proposed.

4. Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators at the local and/or the national/regional level.
This project was remarkably successful given the very tight timeframes involved. Thirteen projects were selected, stakeholders were consulted and peoples' inputs facilitated to a wide range of activities. Impacts have already been recorded at local and national levels in relation to raised awareness and support for invasive species management, and enhanced management capacity. At some sites where projects have been implemented invasive species impacts have already been reduced. More time will be required, however, to measure and interpret outcomes. At most other projects implementation has yet to proceed.

5. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?
All invasive species projects involve unexpected impacts – especially in the Pacific where there are few precedents for the kinds of activities involved in this program. Monitoring is being put in place to minimize the risks associated with unexpected negative impacts. In relation to this (coordination and support) project unexpected impacts have included:
Positive:

- further proposals from stakeholder groups for additional invasive species projects – even before initial ones are implemented!
- The strong links and management opportunities which are becoming apparent between ecological and socio-economic objectives and outcomes.
- Significant support from interested individuals and collaborating agencies – such as the Austral Foundation, the NZ Department of Conservation and Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research.
- expressions of acknowledgement and support from community groups and implementing agencies for PP-CII inputs and services.

Negative:
- Time and effort implications for the PP-CII Coordinating Team as a result of tight timeframes and sometimes unreasonably high expectations of (immediate) success.

6. Describe the key positive and negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.
Positive:
Community groups have become strong supporters of, and participants in, Demonstration Projects provided they have been properly consulted and their views appropriately acknowledged.
Negative:
There are inherent challenges and risks in endeavouring to facilitate the development and implementation of invasive species management projects in less than 6 months.

V. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs*: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Demonstration Projects identified, selected, developed and promoted in consultation with Pacific communities, management agencies and other stakeholders.	
1.1. Ten Demonstration Projects selected by 31 December 2005.	The following projects were selected by 31 March 2006. 1. Restoration of Vahanga Atoll, Tuamotu Archipelago, French Polynesia. 2. Protection of Tanga'eo, the endemic Mangaia kingfisher from the common myna. 3. Phoenix Islands conservation survey, Kiribati. 4. Challenging the Yellow crazy ant on Tokelau. 5. Restoration of the Aleipata Island Group, Samoa. 6. Viwa Island restoration, Fiji. 7. Protecting the internationally important seabird colonies of Vatu-I-Ra Island, Fiji. 8. Feasibility study for the management of invasive alien species on Kayangel Atoll, Palau. 9. Pacific Ant Prevention Programme. 10. Assessment of invasive pathogens in relation to the distribution of introduced mosquitoes: potential threats to biodiversity (Tonga). 11. Feasibility Study and Project Plan to eradicate rats from Ahnd Atoll, Federated States of Micronesia. 12. Protection of Tokelau Fakaofo from myna invasion.

	13. Prospects for biological control of *Merremia peltata* in the Pacific.
1.2 Project Plans prepared for at 10 Demonstration Projects by 30 June 2006.	As at the 31 June 2006 Project Plans have been prepared for the following projects: 1. Viwa Island restoration project – a plan was prepared and endorsed by the Resident Stakeholder and Viwa Stakeholder Committees and approved by the implementing agency (USP) by 24 November 2005. 2. Phoenix Islands conservation survey, Kiribati – a plan was prepared and approved by the implementing agency by 31 March 2006. 3. Restoration of Vahanga Atoll, Tuamotu Archipelago – a project/ operational plan was drafted by 30 June 2006. 4. Protecting the internationally important seabird colonies of Vatu-I-Ra Island, Fiji. A feasibility study was completed in May 2006 and a project plan prepared. 5. Protection of Tokelau Fakaofo from myna invasion. A plan was prepared as part of the feasibility study and management has been initiated. 6. Prospects for biological control of *Merremia peltata* in the Pacific. A plan with recommended actions has been prepared following the review.
Output 2. Capacity needs identified and capacity building facilitated for people and groups involved in Demonstration Projects.	
2.1. Training Needs Analyses completed for at least 4 Demonstration Projects by 30 June 2006.	An education and awareness program document has been produced for the Yellow crazy ant project on Tokelau. This document outlines education and training needs and identifies target audiences. Training needs for the Viwa rat eradication project have been identified and are being addressed.

	Training needs were identified and local practitioners trained during the feasibility study visit for the Tokelau myna project. Training needs for the Vatu-I-Ra project have been identified and are being addressed prior to eradication being initiated. Training needs have been identified in association with the SOP MANU project management team (Vahanga project).
2.2. The participation of at least 5 local practitioners (M/F) in training or skills-sharing initiatives is supported by 30 June 2006.	Two local practitioners (Craig Morley and Joape Kuruyawa) working on the Viwa Island restoration project participated in a review of the operational plan undertaken by the NZ Department of Conservation's Island Eradication Advisory Group. Visits to a number of NZ islands where successful eradications have been undertaken were arranged for these practitioners. The purpose of these visits was to demonstrate the practicalities of eradication operations and to discuss specific activities. The participation of seven MNRE (Samoa) staff members in a survey of the critically endangered friendly ground dove on the Aleipata Islands was facilitated. The purpose was to provide insights, knowledge and skills in bird surveys. The attendance of Philippe Raust (MANU SOP) and Ray Pierce (Pacific Conservation Action Trust) at a meeting of invited specialists in Auckland was arranged (March 2006). The purpose of this meeting was to refine the Operational Plan and to discuss associated technical details related to the restoration of Vahanga Atoll. Environment and quarantine officers on Fokelofa Atoll were trained in myna capture techniques during the feasibility study visit in May 2006. The participation of the Viwa rat

	eradication project assistant and a Viwa Island resident was facilitated in the feasibility study trip to Vatu-I-Ra Island to learn more about rat eradication and biosecurity methods.
Output 3. Pacific communities, management agencies and other stakeholders are cooperatively engaged in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating Demonstration Projects.	
3.1. Local community, management agency and other key stakeholder group representatives have contributed to the preparation of project plans and have declared their support for proposed activities at all ten Demonstration Projects by 30 June 2006.	The Resident Stakeholder Committee and the Viwa Stakeholder Committee have been consulted and have endorsed the project to eradicate the rats from Viwa. Further consultation has been undertaken to confirm stakeholder support for the Aleipata Islands rat eradication project. The Taupulega Fakaofo of Tokelau have endorsed the crazy ant project, after further consultation. As part of the preparation for the Vatu-I-Ra Island rat eradication four meetings with the local clan were held. Meetings were also held with other key stakeholders including the Ministry of Tourism, Native Lands Trust Board and the Fijian Affairs board. A meeting was held with stakeholders in Tahiti in June 2006 to discuss the Vahanga Island rat eradication project. The Minister of Environment has declared his support for the project. During the Tokelau myna feasibility study visit meetings were held with the Acting Director of the Environment, The Pulenuku (Mayor), and Faipule (lawmaker) of all three atolls on Tokelau. During the Mangaia myna feasibility study visit two meetings were held with representatives of the local community and the Mangaia Resource Council. The Resource Council declared its support for the project continuing.

Output 4. Research projects, field trials and other experimental approaches are incorporated in the design of Demonstration Projects, where appropriate.	
4.1. Research needs are identified for at least 6 Demonstration Projects by 30 June 2006.	Research topics have been identified and prioritised for the Viwa island restoration project. Topics include crab interactions with baits and rat, cane toad and Fijian ground frog interactions. PII staff arranged and facilitated a Centre for Biodiversity and Biosecurity (CBB) seminar at the University of Auckland to outline and discuss Demonstration Project research needs. Research needs have been identified in the Vahanga Restoration Plan. Research needs have been identified in the report on the 'Prospects for biological control of *Merremia peltata'* project. These include determining the centre of origin for this invasive plant in the Pacific. The Phoenix Islands conservation survey determined the distribution of seabirds and the status of invasive species, and identified priority sites for their management in the Phoenix Group. Field trials of myna traps and baits were incorporated into the Tokelau and Mangaia feasibility studies. A common research need emerging from PII rat eradication projects is determining optimal rodent baiting regimes in the presence of crabs and mice.
Output 5. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting commitments (for Demonstration Projects and associated PP-CII activities) are met.	
5.1. Monitoring and evaluation procedures are identified in each Demonstration Project plan.	A monitoring and evaluation document has been prepared for the Viwa Island restoration project. A monitoring and evaluation framework is included in the draft project plan for the

	Vahanga Island restoration project. A monitoring and evaluation framework was developed as part of the Tokelau Yellow crazy ant project. A monitoring and evaluation framework has been drafted for the Vatu-I-Ra restoration project. Nest trap boxes were erected in Tokelau as part of the monitoring of mynas on the atoll as part of the development of a monitoring and evaluation plan for the project. Monitoring and evaluation procedures are being documented as part of a rodent training program being developed as part of the Ahnd Atoll rat eradication project. Rodent monitoring procedures are being developed in consultation with the Department of Environment and Health, Palau as part of the Kayangel Atoll rodent eradication project.
5.2. Quarterly reports have been circulated to CEPF.	The final Quarterly report (April - June 2006) was submitted to CEPF on 28 June 2006.

7. Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.
This project was remarkably successful given the timeframes involved. Many projects initiated during this project are now poised to be implemented as soon as additional resources become available.

8. Were any outputs unrealized? If so, why and how did you address these?
Important progress was made in relation to all outputs.
All outputs were realized.

9. How did the lack of achievement of these outputs affect the overall impact of the project?
N/A

VI. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

N/A

VII. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.

Important lessons have included;

1. Risks associated with working within very tight timeframes (see above).
2. Difficulties in communicating affectively with implementing agencies and stakeholders across the Pacific.
3. Difficulties in travel (logistics, cost and time) in the Pacific region.
4. Difficulties in communicating and working with different cultures and languages (an inherent challenge in working in such a diverse region).

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

A critical success factor in this project was the availability of PP-CII guidelines and criteria for selecting, developing and implementing Demonstration Projects.

Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)

The presence of the PP-CII Coordinating Team itself – a small team of committed specialists with clear roles to facilitate inputs from others was also a critical success factor.

The input, often on a *pro-bono* basis, of collaborators to the PP-CII project overall, as well as to individual projects, was also an important success factor.

"Tapping into" specialist networks such as the Invasive Species Specialist Group and using existing tools such as the Global Invasive Species Database have also been major attributes of this project.

VIII. 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
New Zealand's Agency for International Aid and Development (NZAID)	A	$100000	NZAID support for the PP-CII has been critical in undertaking this CEPF funded project.

***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 *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF funded project)*

C *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.)*

D *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

It will be critical that the impetus created during this project in working with stakeholders, implementing agencies and others to develop projects is not lost through a lack of on-going funding and support. PP-CII partners will be encouraged to explore opportunities to acquire further funding to ensure the success of projects initiated during this CEPF project.

IX. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Please provide any additional information you think may assist CEPF in understanding any other aspects of your completed project.
The PP-CII would welcome any opportunity to expand on the experiences and lessons learned during this project – especially to CEPF decision-makers as they consider the initiation of the full CEPF for the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot.

Describe any follow-up activities you wish to implement and how you intend to do so (eg other invasive species management actions you wish to pursue, or how you plan to scale up the project to a broader area).

The main focus for activities during this project was in developing Demonstration Projects. These projects are now poised for implementation. Partners to the PP-CII are united in their support for the completion of these projects. Stakeholders – including local communities are also relying on these projects being implemented.

In addition to continuing its support for these projects the PP-CII Coordinating Team plans to also focus on further capacity building (based on these sites) and up-scaling (expanding management areas and regimes, replicating successful projects elsewhere, and developing new projects and approaches based on the lessons learned) – working through its partner networks.

X. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making

the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:
Name: Alan Saunders
Mailing address: SGES/Tamaki Campus, University of Auckland, PB92019, Auckland, New Zealand
Tel:+64 9 373 7599 Ext86805
Fax:373 7042
E-mail: a.saunders@auckland.ac.nz