

CEPF Final Project Completion Report

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

Organization Legal Name	<i>BirdLife International</i>
Project Title	Investing for the Environment: Building Civil Society Capacity to Drive Conservation Success in the East Melanesian Islands
CEPF GEM No.	64259
Date of Report	16/3/2017

CEPF Hotspot: East Melanesia Highlands

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 4, Increase local, national and regional capacity to conserve biodiversity through catalyzing civil society partnerships.

Grant Amount: US\$164,255

Project Dates: 1st April, 2014 until 30th September, 2016

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

Vanuatu Environment Advocacy Network. BirdLife chose to work with VEAN as a potential partner in country, as VEAN are run by a well-established and locally-based group, of whom the lead person, Lai Sakita, had previously been involved in a bird control programme in Tanna. First contacts indicated a keen, and willing, group with little access to funds to help with development/establishment. BirdLife used a subgrant to fund VEAN over the course of the contract. During that time BirdLife provided support and guidance to enable VEAN to improve the institution capacity.

Solomon Islands Community Conservation Partnership. BirdLife was asked to provide support to SICCP by AMNH. SICCP received their own capacity grant from CEPF, and BirdLifes approach was to provide a roadmap, in the form of a Partner Development Plan, to help SICCP improve the institution capacity.

Conservation Impacts

2. Describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF investment strategy set out in the ecosystem profile

In terms of Investment Strategy 4, BirdLife has provided support to both national NGOs to identify their strengths and weaknesses, in terms of institutional capacity. We have worked closely with both NGOs to Prepare a Partner Development Plan, which addresses the weaknesses and identifies solutions, and then with the NGO to help them with the solutions. We updated the PDP for VEAN following a successful programme in Year 1.

At the same time we worked with both organizations to develop links with other CSOs that were based close to Priority KBAs in their country. We discussed ecotourism opportunities with contacts from Gaua, and communities in the foothills of Mt Tabwesawema on Santo. We discussed wild harvesting, particularly of globally-threatened bird species, on Tongoa and Mt Tukusmera, Tanna. We jointly liaised with a CSO on Makira to develop a survey plan to search for, and improve our understanding of, the Makira Moorhen and the associated KBA.

We organized a workshop in each of Solomon Islands and Vanuatu to provide training on the processes associated with developing an effective fund-raising grant. A number of these CSOs subsequently received small-grant funding through CEPF.

3. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

Each of our partners have shown a demonstrable improvement across most of the measures of institutional capacity during the course of the project. The improvements for VEAN can be directly attributed to the current project – while the improvements for SICCP are more difficult to attribute, as SICCP received input from a wide range of international organisations.

The improvements for VEAN included establishing an effective governance system, setting up a Management Committee to oversee the work of the employed staff (currently just the one person, but established in a manner that ensured that further staff could be incorporated seamlessly into the organization), confirming the Vision and Mission statements of the organization and generally ensuring that the organization was delivering products that provided benefits to biodiversity, both directly and through work with other, more locally-based, CSOs.

During the course of the project SICCP employed a Chief Executive and a finance officer, expanded their work programme into Makira, developed continued work plans in various projects in Western Province, and overhauled the organisations Strategic Plan, Mission and Vision Statements. It is difficult to determine what this project contributed directly – this project provided no funding, but worked together with SICCP to identify a Development Plan that helped to help form the questions that needed answering regarding the strategic plan ,the Mission and Vision statements etc.

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

List each long-term impact from Grant Writer proposal

1. Vanuatu Environment Advocacy Network (VEAN) and Solomon Islands Community Conservation Partnership (SICCP) will have the structure and capacity to deliver effective conservation action in country through a focused and targeted Action Plan and their extensive partnership with local Civil Society Organisations and Local, District and National Government representatives.
2. BirdLife will have identified future programmes of work in Vanuatu and the Solomons where it can combine with the National Partners to deliver outcomes common to the national partner, itself and Nationally agreed targets, in particular improving knowledge of, and conservation action at, Key Biodiversity Areas and/or for globally threatened species in the countries.

4. Actual progress toward long-term impacts at completion

Long-term Impacts 1.

Both organisations have developed the capacity to be able to support local Civil Society Organisations to deliver effective conservation action. Both organisations have consolidated their approach in their relative areas of expertise, and expanded beyond that to indicate willingness to operate in new areas.

For instance SICCP have traditionally worked most effectively on a range of projects in the Western Province, focusing on community delivery of conservation actions. SICCP have worked closely with a number of CSOs in investigating the opportunities for progressing these community conservation areas into legislative conservation sites. SICCP have also expanded to new Provinces, notably Makira and Temotu, where they have combined the expertise that they have accumulated in Western Province with locally-sensitive issues. SICCP have focused their attention in these areas, and not targeted further conservation action in Choiseul, Isabel, Guadalcanal or Rennell, as there was a feeling that they were in danger of spreading their expertise too thinly too quickly.

VEAN have developed from being a small Port Vila-based organization providing some expertise to a range locally-based CSOs, to a more out-going organization working with CSOs on outer islands, and to discuss conservation measures that might benefit both the community and biodiversity conservation indicates substantial progress. The current project in Tongoa, together with the Traditional Ecological Knowledge approach on Mt Tukumera, are the most obvious indicators of this development but the discussions with CSOs on Gaua and Mt Tabwesawema in Santo, potentiall forming a Northern Island subgroup of VEAN and the increasing liaison with CSO partners in Futuna and Aneityum also indicates a more focused and more confident NGO.

Both organisations took full part in, and organized the attendance at a fund-raising workshop, of a range of CSOs from within their respective countries (including CSOs from parts of the country where the organization does not, currently, have a strong work programme). These workshops provided additional opportunities for VEAN and SICCP to establish contacts with CSO communities associated with KBA sites around the country.

The long-term ambition, of establishing both organisations as a truly national biodiversity conservation organisation providing an umbrella for the individual CSOs (thus mimicking the Local to Global message that BirdLife International present) is still some way from reality. The partners have different areas in need of expertise in order to achieve this but, with sufficient funding and, in particular, appropriate support then they are both able to achieve this and, in the course of that, become fully established and effective BirdLife partners – which will help to provide them with further support and maintenance beyond the period of available CEPF funding in the region.

Long Term Impacts 2.

BirdLife International has identified that improving the knowledge of, and developing conservation actions at, Key Biodiversity Areas within each of the countries is a priority and have developed a funding proposal accordingly. Important areas here are to better understand the conditions at each site, identify the primary threats at each site, identify the main players at each of the sites and to what extent they operate together with SICCP and/or VEAN, and propose and report on the responses that the main players can undertake at each site. Once the species component of the conditions at each site has been confirmed we can then progress on to undertaking an effective Gap Analysis to ensure that we have conservation actions in place

for all priority species at an appropriate selection of sites. We collected information on the Pressures on 11 KBA sites across the East Melanesia Islands as part of a separate project, and see this as being an obvious first step toward developing a coherent national plan of conservation that the NGOs can coordinate.

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

List each short-term impact from Grant Writer proposal

1. By the end of year 2 VEAN and SICCP, and at least another 10 local CSOs will have recorded their strengths and weaknesses, identified a course of action and begun the process of addressing their organizational weaknesses.
2. Both VEAN and SICCP will have applied for funding to CEPF and/or other institutional, trusts and foundations.
3. Both VEAN and SICCP will have undertaken conservation-related work (such as surveys, monitoring, restoration, protection) in partnership with representatives of local Civil Society Organizations that are associated with conservation priority sites identified in the Ecosystem Profile.
4. Following the national workshops in both Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands civil society networks of NGOs and CSOs will develop to enable collective responses to priority and emerging threats to biodiversity.
5. At least 50% of the local CSOs will have applied for funding to deliver conservation action through CEPF or other suitable donors at a future round of applications and at least 30% of the local CSOs will have secured funding to deliver conservation action through CEPF or other suitable donors and will be undertaking activities that improve the conservation status of priority sites and/or priority species.
6. The Civil Society Tracking Tool will show clear improvements for at least 3 of the 5 summary criteria (Human Resources, Financial Resources, Management Systems, Strategic Planning and Delivery) for both VEAN and SICCP, and a plan to further improve the remaining criteria.

5. Actual progress toward short-term impacts at completion

Short-term Impact 1.

Both VEAN and SICCP completed a Civil Society Tracking Tool and the BirdLife Healthcheck at the onset of the project. Both used the findings from these checks to develop Partner Development Plans, VEAN established a second PDP in Nov 2015. Both partners registered on the Capacity for Conservation website, where a series of tools are available to facilitate an improvement in the capacity of organisations to deliver on various aspects. Eight Civil Society Partners in Solomons and 5 in Vanuatu completed the Civil Society Tracking Tool at the 2015 Fundraising Workshop. All the Vanuatu CSOs have also registered on the Capacity for Conservation website where they are monitored by VEAN. SICCP have subsequently developed a capacity training programme for CSOs in the Solomon Islands – where the use of the website was proposed by BirdLife. I am informed that this has been pursued.

Short-term Impact 2.

Both VEAN and SICCP have applied for funding to CEPF in both 2015 and 2016 – the latter successfully in 2015. SICCP have also received funding from other organisations during the

course of this programme. VEAN provide support to a number of CSOs who apply for funding to the GEF small grants programme. This has been the primary form of funding for VEAN prior to the current CEPF programme. VEAN charges a nominal annual subscription to each of the CSOs, and in return provides technical skills, knowledge, access to the internet, and office facilities.

Short-term Impact 3.

Both VEAN and SICCP have undertaken conservation action at sites, in concert with local CSOs. For example SICCP work with KIBCA, Arnavon Community and Tetepare Descendants Association to provide the information required to enable these CSOs to promote their sites as formally-recognised protected areas. SICCP work with Kahua Association and organisations in Temotu to monitor rare species through interviews with local communities and the establishment of camera traps (ie species that impact on Makira Moorhen) and dugong monitoring in Temotu. VEAN have worked with local community on Kurumambe to establish a Tabu, to organize a set of rangers to monitor the Tabu and to collect information on Scrubfowl use of burrows at the site. VEAN have also worked with Taule Taule to begin to collect information on the harvesting of a significant Collared Petrel colony at Mt Tucusmera, Tanna.

Short-term Impact 4.

Both the NGOs (VEAN and SICCP) have developed their skills and ability to respond to priority conservation issues – and have increasingly established links with local CSOs who can provide details at the site level. However, this has not yet been organized in a way that it has, to date, delivered effective responses. This is an area that would benefit significantly from having a national, co-ordinated approach to prioritizing actions, and monitoring those actions, at the Priority sites in each country. Developing an effective KBA network in the country, respected by NGOs, CSOs and government representatives alike would be an effective way of delivering this short-term impact.

Short-term Impact 5.

We know that 10 local Civil Society Organisations attended the Fundraising Workshop in Port Vila and 9 in Honiara in July/August 2015. Of these we understand that CEPF received funding applications from CSOs in Futuna, VESS, Kurumambe, Gaua and South Santo in Vanuatu and from SIRA, Kahua Association, Temotu and Arnavon. Of the above only Futuna, Kurumambe, South Santo were unsuccessful – and of these the Kurumambe project was recommended to be developed in conjunction with VEAN and with BirdLife International as a Case Study showcasing the development of sustainable harvesting of a wild crop as an example.

Short-term Impact 6.

Both VEAN and SICCP showed clear improvements in the status of 5 of the 6 summary criteria – SICCP showed improvements across all 6 in the view of 4 of the 5 contributors.

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

Both organisations have developed their organizational capacity significantly since the start of the project. This is due, in part, to this particular project but, certainly in the case of the SICCP in large part due to the availability of significant extra funding, both through CEPF, and also other external funding sources. Organisational capacity certainly becomes easier when there are

funds to facilitate it – and become much more of a challenge when funding is no longer available.

One of the challenges of the current project is that SICCP has received both funding and advice on capacity development from a number of organisations, including AMNH, UQ, WCS as well as CEPF and the RIT. These multiple sources of advice (many of which, unlike BirdLife, directly funded SICCP) and a new Chief Executive who had not been involved in the original proposals resulted in some confusion about how BirdLife planned to contribute. This was not effectively resolved throughout the project. At the conclusion BirdLife clearly helped with the fundraising workshop, with CSO NGO associations, with the Makira work programme, and with identifying some of the priorities for organisational development – much of which will have become embedded in the way that SICCP works.

The holding of an AGM and establishment of a Council/Steering Committee was a significant step forward in ensuring that VEAN is a viable NGO with considerable skills, expertise and advice for the CSOs working in the environment in Vanuatu. The partnership between VEAN and BirdLife took a while to develop but, by the end of the project, was robust and showing signs of an increasingly confident and mature NGO. The Tongoa megapode, CEPF-funded, project provides a useful next step while developing increased links with the SPREP Ecosystem-based Adaptation programme in both Efate and Tanna, in particular the establishment of effective communication with the communities involved provides further areas for optimism. VEAN have established an online presence with their facebook site that showcases videos and highlights the amount of community work in which the organization is involved.

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

Project Components and Products/Deliverables

Component 1 (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

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

Component 1. Institutional capacity needs of VEAN and SICCP identified.

1.1. Results of Baseline Civil Society Tracking Tool and BirdLife Healthcheck presented to each of the NGOs.
CSTT and BL Healthcheck undertaken in April 2015. Results fed back to both organisations.

1.2. National NGOs have a plan of action to address Institutional Capacity Needs.

Both VEAN and SICCP prepare Partner Development Plans, linked to the Capacity for Conservation website, where tools to help with self-development are available.

1.3. BirdLife provides report on a midterm review of progress, reporting topics of success and topics for improvement.

BirdLife discusses progress with VEAN, and the organisations develop a 'next steps' Development Plan, capturing progress to date and plans for development in the upcoming 12 months. Progress on the development plan with SICCP was delayed until the start of the Chief Executive Officer, with whom regular discussions were held – culminating in the workshop to identify strategy and next steps.

- 1.4. Results from a repeat survey of the Civil Society Tracking Tool and BirdLife NGO Healthcheck reported at the end of the project to indicate progress made and next steps for future development.

Repeat surveys for the CSTT were undertaken by both SICCP and VEAN toward the end of the project. These showed considerable progress under most, if not all, the capacity priority areas, and also once again highlighted areas for future development.

Component 2.

Institutional capacity requirements of VEAN and SICCP addressed.

- 2.1. Both NGOs identify an individual to lead the capacity development within their organisation.

The Chief Executive of both organisations undertook to coordinate the capacity development within their organisation.

- 2.2. Each of the NGOs and BirdLife agree on, and sign, a joint MoU that identifies respective roles and responsibilities, addresses codes of conduct between the 2 organisations, and identifies ownership, equity and accountability.

Discussions with both organisations determined that there was no need, or purpose, to developing an MoU between the organisation and BirdLife. There were no issues regarding ownership of information or equity. In hindsight it might have been better to further emphasise the accountability of the organisations in order to minimise the confusion that was initially present in SICCP board about what BirdLife were providing to the organisation.

- 2.3. National NGO establishes effective and transparent financial management with external audit undertaken of the VEAN and SICCP accounts undertaken and auditors report produced.

SICCP accounts are audited externally, and reported through their separate CEPF programme. VEAN finances were assessed in May 2016 – and then reviewed by staff from the BirdLife Pacific Suva office who provided training and advice to VEAN on how to best present this information. VEAN have, since, liaised with the finance team in the BirdLife Pacific office over further expenditure during the remaining part of the project. VEAN finances were overseen, in a voluntary capacity, by Vivian Obed – a founding member of VEAN. Vivian was employed by another organisation after 6 months of the current project and was unable to maintain her commitment. She is keen to return to VEAN at some stage in the future, when her current workload lessens. Meanwhile, Lai has taken on board the recommendations of the BirdLife finance team and is developing a basic financial management system.

Component 3. Local Civil Society Organisations in Gaua, Aneityum, Futuna, Green Hill on Tanna, Tongoa and around the Santo Mountain Chain (Vanuatu) and in East Makira, East Rennell, Guadalcanal, Western Province and Choiseul (Solomon Islands) have been identified and develop links with their national NGO.

- 3.1. National NGO develops a list of CSOs around each of the Priority Areas in their country who might be interested in developing a conservation programme to improve the status of the Priority Areas.

CSOs around Gaua, Aneityum, Futuna, Tongoa and South Santo in Vanuatu, and East Makira, Western Province and Temotu province were identified by the NGO partners and invited to the fundraising workshop in 2015. CSOs in Green Hill, Tanna were known to be working with NYBG – and contacts with the latter were undertaken by BirdLife to ensure that there was not too much duplication and confusion of purpose. Contacts with local CSOs in East Rennell, Guadalcanal and Choiseul were not developed in the immediate future by SICCP as there were concerns that the organization was extending its activities too quickly. CSO representatives from each of these groups attended the fundraising workshop so lowlevel contact has been established.

3.2. Key conservation actions identified at Priority Sites and representatives of CSOs at the site invited to workshop to identify ways to develop capacity to develop these conservation actions.

Nine separate project proposals were prepared at the fundraising workshop with a view to both developing partner capacity and undertaking conservation actions. Seven of these 9 proposals were funded in one form or another.

3.3. Baseline Civil Society Tracking Tools and 'NGO Healthchecks' undertaken at workshop and prepared for CSOs.

CSTT were undertaken at the Honiara workshop and completed by 8 of the CSOs. This option was not pursued in Port Vila.

3.4. MoUs between National and Local CSOs proposed that consider ownership, rights and responsibilities of the two organisations when undertaking joint Conservation programmes.

MoUs between SICCP and VEAN on the one hand and each of the various CSOs on the other was not considered to be a priority, until and unless there was a transfer of funds. VEAN liaise with CSOs through a membership programme, for which there is an application form and a set of rules for members to comply.

3.5. At least 5 of the CSOs put in funding applications to CEPF in order to initiate projects to develop conservation actions on their priority sites.

Nine separate project proposals were prepared at the fundraising workshop with a view to both developing partner capacity and undertaking conservation actions. Seven of these 9 proposals were funded in one form or another.

Component 4. National Conservation Action Plan in place with an, associated fundraising plan, for VEAN and SICCP.

4.1. Summary information relevant to Priority Sites from Ecosystem Profile is available in a format that is accessible for local CSOs.

Both NGOs have paper copies of the Priority Sites – as available through the World Biodiversity Database. This provides information, and templates, for the NGO to identify the important species at the site, the main threats at the site and the responses

that are, or have been, undertaken at the site. It rapidly became clear that the species component of the dataset was not complete.

4.2. A conservation Action Plan is in place for each NGO.

Both SICCP and VEAN have been closely involved in their respective governments updating of the NBSAPs – which provides them with opportunities not just to identify conservation actions of priority to the governments, but enables them to highlight the sites that should be of priority at the government/national level. The NGOs used the priority species and sites in the Ecosystem Profile as the basis for their recommendations. VEAN is attempting to improve its conservation delivery capacity before committing to a conservation action plan. Targetting community conservation actions, and in particular developing sustainable harvesting practices, in particular for terrestrial species that are globally threatened is the first step.

4.3. A fundraising plan, based on the conservation action plan, is in place for each NGO.

SICCP is raising funds through a variety of organisations – and ensuring that they deliver actions relevant to the proposals. VEAN are hoping to be able to employ a conservation specialist who can provide the skills to enable the organisation to target community-led

4.4. Both of the NGOs, with support from BirdLife, will develop a significant funding application in 2014 and/or 2015 for an in-country conservation programme that works in partnership with one, or a number of, local CSOs.

SICCP have worked closely, with support from BirdLife, with the Kahua Association in East Makira, initially to search for the Critically endangered Makira Moorhen – and subsequently to enable the Kahua Association to develop capacity to improve the organisations ability to influence the relevant communities. There has been a considerable volume of academic assessments of poverty, community conservation, and ecosystem services in the area – much of which has not been fed back to the communities. Identifying those aspects of benefit to the communities has been a significant challenge.

VEAN applied, with support from BirdLife, for a CEPF grant in 2016 to further the capacity development, focussing on project and financial management – and also to work closely with Taule Taule, a CSO in Tanna, on collecting information on the Collared Petrel colony (probably the largest colony in the world) on Mt Tukumera and determining the extent to which the continued harvesting of petrel chicks is sustainable.

Component 5. VEAN secures the subgrant to address capacity needs.

5.1. VEAN have a costed capacity development plan with training and development opportunities identified and preferred providers outlined.

Partner development plan agreed and enacted.

5.2. BirdLife and VEAN have a signed sub grant agreement (agreed by CEPF) in line with the capacity development plan, fully costed and quoted budget and grant monitoring criteria for mid term and full term subgrant reports and agreed deadlines.

Sub-grant agreements signed, and agreed by CEPF, in May 2014 and again in November 2015..

5.3. VEAN have mid term and full term monitoring reports that outline progress against the capacity development plan and subgrant budgets.

Mid-term and end of year monitoring reports completed.

5.4. BirdLife produce feedback for VEAN and CEPF on subgrant progress.

BirdLife provided information for VEAN and CEPF on progress with subgrant agreements, and how these have helped VEAN to establish organisational capacity, to contribute toward conservation actions in Vanuatu and to develop partnerships with CSOs from areas adjacent to the priority KBAs in the country.

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

We did not attempt to undertake a whole country conservation action plan, and associated fundraising plan, for either partner. Neither partner was ready for this kind of overview assessment. SICCP were focused on consolidating the work that they had already undertaken rather than expanding their remit, while VEAN were attempting to identify how best to develop the capacity to deliver effective conservation actions.

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

Both organisations are now well-versed in the use of the Capacity for Conservation website, <http://capacityforconservation.org/>, a site providing the resources for self-led, organizational development. The website has been developed by a number of organisations, including BirdLife International, provides a 'Healthcheck', a format for preparing a Partner Development Plan, an array of tools to help organisations of a range of sizes to improve their capacity, and a series of Indicators to facilitate measuring progress. Both NGOs have the ability to mentor other organisations through the website – I know that VEAN are currently working closely with several CSOs through this website.

Benefits to Communities

11. Please describe the communities that have benefited from CEPF support

*Please report on the size and characteristics of communities and the benefits that they have received, as a result of CEPF investment. Please provide information for all communities that have benefited **from project start to project completion**.*

Community Name	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit											
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Size of Community				Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services
								50-250 people	251-500 people	501-1,000 people	Over 1,001 people									

*If you marked "Other" to describe the community characteristic, please explain:

Lessons Learned

12. Describe any lessons learned related to organizational development and capacity building.

The offer of a roadmap, without any financial inducement, did not work as well for SICCP as anticipated. The fact that SICCP received advice from a range of organisations regarding development and capacity building meant that the BirdLife approach was seen as just one of many ways of progressing.

The use of the tools provided through the Capacity for Conservation website, and the expectation that these tools would enable self-led organizational development, was optimistic. The time required to focus on this self-led organizational development was not available, especially for SICCP, who were already working on a range of projects. In hindsight, combining a self-led organizational development process with a series of short workshops (similar to the approach used for the PICCC) may have been more effective. VEAN were more effective using this approach, as they had fewer commitments, and the sub-grant ensured that they had the funding to create the time required to commit to organizational development.

13. Describe any lessons learned related to project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)

14. Describe any lesson learned related to project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)

The speed of project implementation must be driven by the NGO, not by BirdLife and/or the donor. The process of decision-making involves considerable discussion between a range of stakeholders and can be frustrating from the outside. The occurrence of Cyclone Pam, in Vanuatu, during the project set back progress as the rather more serious issues of life death, eating and accommodation took precedence for the folk at VEAN.

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

Sustainability / Replication

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

Both organisations are now more resilient, and better able to cope with fluctuations in funding opportunities. The SICCP workshop to discuss strategy highlighted the need to address how to survive through a funding squeeze, at some time in the future while VEAN are expanding their partner membership programme to provide a basis of core funding to maintain the organization even without external funds.

Both organisations now have a robust Steering Committee/Council/Trustees that can provide a strong soundboard for the Chief Executive officers and their staff.

Both organisations have developed a strong relationship with the individual CSOs in their country and so increase their 'mandate' to argue for conservation and the environment

Both organisations have increased their interactions with government environment departments.

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

Safeguards

18. **If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social and environmental safeguards that your project may have triggered**

Additional Funding

19. 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

** 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)*

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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

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:

- 21. Name:** Mark O'Brien
22. Organization: BirdLife International
23. Mailing address: 10 McGregor Road, GPO Box 18332, Suva, Fiji
24. Telephone number: +679 331 3492, +679 879 4419
25. E-mail address: mark.obrien@birdlife.org