

# Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Name:** THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO/ INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR ECOSYSTEM HEALTH (ISEH)

**Project Title:** HEALTHY ECOSYSTEMS, HEALTHY PEOPLE

## II. OPENING REMARKS

*Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this Report.*

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** To increase the awareness and critical understanding of the importance of the linkages between biodiversity, ecosystem health, and human health. To encourage integration of these concepts in research agendas and to identify priority areas and areas of capacity building. To produce documents including the publication of plenary talks, contributed papers, working group consensus documents, and an overall conference synthesis.

### Planned vs. Actual Performance

| Indicator  | Actual at Completion   |
|--|--|
| <b>Purpose-level:</b>  |  |
| <i>1.1 Participation of between 750-1000 delegates at the conference, with broad international participation</i>                         | Actual participation was just over 600 delegates. 20% of the delegates were from outside North America, which is a good representation for a US conference.  |
| <i>1.2 Collection and preparation of manuscripts from the conference for publication in books and in the journal "Ecosystem Health".</i> | Manuscripts from the conference are still being collected – many have already entered the review stage. Two supplemental issues of the Journal are being planned from the conference working groups. Expected publication in mid-2003. |

***Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.***

The Healthy Ecosystems, Healthy People conference brought together over 600 scientists, managers and policy makers from across North American and around the world. Through plenary presentations, contributed paper and poster presentations, and working groups, the conference effectively brought together information from many different disciplines and provided participants with an integrated and transdisciplinary approach to understanding the critical issues at hand.

Many of these presentations are now being prepared for publication, which will increase the awareness of these issues by reaching a whole new audience.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

no

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| <b>IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS</b> |
|----------------------------|

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

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

| Indicator  | Actual at Completion |
|--|----------------------|
| <b>Output 1: Attendance by at least two participants from the Atlantic Forest Hotspot</b>    |                      |
| <i>1. Junior or less well know participants are selected to attend the conference</i>        | Done                 |
| <i>2. Selected participants provide CV's to ISEH and CEPF</i>                                | Done                 |
| <i>3. Participants attend the conference, scheduled for June 6-11, 2002</i>                  | Done                 |
| <i>4. Participants to provide a brief written report to ISEH detailing their experiences</i> | In progress          |
| <b>Output 2: Attendance by at least two participants from the Tropical Andes hotspot</b>     |                      |
| <i>1. Junior or less well know participants are selected to attend the conference</i>        | Done                 |
| <i>2. Selected participants provide CV's to ISEH and CEPF</i>                                | Done                 |
| <i>3. Participants attend the conference, scheduled for June 6-11, 2002</i>                  | Done                 |
| <i>4. Participants to provide a brief written report to ISEH detailing their experiences</i> | In progress          |
| <b>Output 3: Attendance by at least two participants from the Choco-Darien Hotspot</b>       |                      |
| <i>1. Junior or less well know participants are selected to attend the conference</i>        | Done                 |
| <i>2. Selected participants provide CV's to ISEH and CEPF</i>                                | Done                 |
| <i>3. Participants attend the conference, scheduled for June 6-11, 2002</i>                  | Done                 |
| <i>4. Participants to provide a brief written report to ISEH detailing their experiences</i> | In progress          |
| <b>Output 4: Attendance by at least one participant from the Madagascar Hotspot</b>          |                      |

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Junior or less well know participants are selected to attend the conference        | Done        |
| 2. Selected participants provide CV's to ISEH and CEPF                                | Done        |
| 3. Participants attend the conference, scheduled for June 6-11, 2002                  | Done        |
| 4. Participants to provide a brief written report to ISEH detailing their experiences | In progress |
| <b>Output 5: Attendance by at least one participant from the Upper Guinea Hotspot</b> |             |
| 1. Junior or less well know participants are selected to attend the conference        | Done        |
| 2. Selected participants provide CV's to ISEH and CEPF                                | Done        |
| 3. Participants attend the conference, scheduled for June 6-11, 2002                  | Done        |
| 4. Participants to provide a brief written report to ISEH detailing their experiences | In progress |
| <b>Output 6: Attendance by at least one participant from the Philippines Hotspot</b>  |             |
| 1. Junior or less well know participants are selected to attend the conference        | Done        |
| 2. Selected participants provide CV's to ISEH and CEPF                                | Done        |
| 3. Participants attend the conference, scheduled for June 6-11, 2002                  | Done        |
| 4. Participants to provide a brief written report to ISEH detailing their experiences | In progress |

***Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.***

The conference was successful in increasing the representation of participants from developing countries – particularly those in designated “hotspot” areas, through the CEPF project funding.

***Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?***

Originally, the outputs included the attendance of more participants from the hotspot areas, however, timing of the project required that we scale back to the outputs listed above. This did not decrease the overall impact of the project, but would have added to the diversity of the conference participants.

**V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

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

None.

**VI. 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.***

The one lesson with this project was with regards to timing – we simply did not have enough time to adequately recruit and arrange travel for participants from the hotspot areas. Thus we were only able to bring in participants from some of the hotspots.

## **VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

One major problem we had with our project was trying to interpret which areas the hotspots covered. For example, determining whether or not a potential participant was within the “boundaries” of a hotspot area was difficult and we received very little guidance from CEPF. Some of these hotspot areas were also different from the hotspot areas understood by other CI groups (e.g. CEPF hotspots covered limited areas) and that again, made it difficult when trying to select candidates.

We understand that our project was different than most of the CEPF projects and do appreciate the opportunity to participate in the CEPF process. However, if CEPF will continue to fund projects such as ours in the future it should establish more detailed guidelines for the hotspot areas (e.g. specific maps of the hotspot region).