

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd
Project Title:	Training in Cost-Benefit Analysis for Managing Invasive Alien Species
Date of Report:	July 15, 2016
Report Author and Contact Information	Suzie Greenhalgh (greenhalghs@landcareresearch.co.nz)

Background Information

CEPF Region: East Melanesian Islands

Strategic Direction: 1. Invasive species prevention

Grant Amount: \$20,000 USD

Project Dates: July 2015 – June 2016

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

Pacific Invasives Initiative:

- Coordinated the short-course advertising and managed applicant pool
- Provided materials for CBA training on IAS management in Pacific

Live and Learn Vanuatu:

- Provided advice and helped with logistics for CBA training
- Staff participated in the CBA training

University of the South Pacific:

- Provided advice and helped with logistics for CBA training

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of CEPF's Ecosystem Profile for the East Melanesian Islands. For example, you may refer to the Strategic Directions that your project has contributed to.

This project is a strategic fit with Investment Priority 4.3, specifically strengthening civil society's capacity in conservation management science and leadership through short-term training courses at domestic academic institutions. The funding supported a three-day course on cost-benefit analysis of invasive alien species (IAS) management in Vanuatu. Furthermore, the project supported Strategic Direction 4 for the East Melanesia Islands Biodiversity Hotspot through catalyzing civil society partnerships and Directions 2 and 3 through capacity building.

This project provided training and tools (i.e., cost benefit analysis (CBA) guidance and an excel-based tool) to enable local civil and government decision makers to consider conservation values in a socio-economic framework as opposed to the traditional view of conservation as the 'environment' and therefore a lower-priority issue. The project contributed

to CEPF's stated opportunity of building upon the co-management of conservation areas involving both government and civil society with training being provided to help support the development of cost-effective control/management options for invasive species in East Melanesia, particularly in Vanuatu, where most of the course participants were actively involved in managing IAS.

The training helps to fill an information gap identified in recent stakeholder meetings around the necessity to evaluate the economic impact of invasive species to better inform resource management in the region. The short course builds capacity in the region to undertake more formal cost-benefit analyses and to improve the efficient allocation of resources to manage IAS.

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

The three-day, intensive course provided training to 15 professionals working on IAS management in the region. The course was fully subscribed. It focused on CBA analysis with these professionals having the knowledge to undertake assessments of invasive species of their choice. We also provided training and access to an excel-based CBA tool tailored specifically for IAS management. This tool was initially developed in an earlier CEPF-funded project (Polynesia Hot Spot 2011/12), and subsequently updated and improved to facilitate use for participants in the Vanuatu training course. At the end of the three-day training, all 15 participants demonstrated proficiency in the basics of economics of managing IAS and competence that they could complete a formal CBA on their own, provided that data and time were available.

The project also provided telephone and email support for course participants who also voluntarily wanted to undertake CBAs for managing IAS of their choosing in the region. While we did provide several email reminders and adequate opportunities for participants to engage with the instructors, only a few respondents responded to these calls.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: Not relevant

Species Conserved: Not relevant

Corridors Created: Not relevant

If you provided information here, please also complete Annex 1, Performance Tracking Report Addendum at the end of this document to provide details.

Not applicable

Please describe the success and/or challenges of the project towards achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

While the capacity has been increased in the region around the use of CBA to make management decisions, there has not been sufficient time since project completion to assess how people in the region are using the tools and information developed during the project. Usage over time will depend on the needs of governments and NGOs to rationalize expenditure for controlling or eradicating IAS. However, the course provided an easy to use Excel tool to assist with undertaking CBA as well as step by step guidance. This means that even if participants have not undertaken a CBA during the grant period, they have the necessary material to undertake CBAs in the future. The material provided can also be used for other conservation purposes as well.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

We are not aware of any unexpected impacts as a result of this project.

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

Lessons Learned

Please 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.

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

We relied heavily on the design and materials from previous, highly successful training courses that have given on the economics of managing IAS. The first course held in Fiji in 2011/12 was also funded by CEPF (Polynesia Biodiversity Hotspot), and although the topic is similar, both the overall content and structure of course have changed over the past four years. This is due to insight from participants who attended the course in Fiji, the Caribbean, and SE Asia as well as new data and research available for the Pacific Island region (e.g., formal CBAs available to present as case studies).

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

Key aspects of the project implementation include the following:

- Classroom exercises were important to ensuring that participants grasped key economic terms (e.g., discounting and net present value) and case studies from the Pacific proved to be invaluable for facilitating experiential learning.
- Excel represented a familiar platform through which participants could undertake their analytical analyses.
- Participants were eager to learn more about techniques that can be used to estimate non-market values such as species protection and clean water. Some methods such as stated and revealed preference survey questionnaires were touched upon during the classroom session, but a longer course period would be required to adequately train participants on non-market valuation techniques (five days rather than three).
- Participants that had specific projects to manage found particular value in the hands-on training and follow-on mentoring. However, even the most enthusiastic participants found it difficult to undertake comprehensive CBAs in the given timeframe, largely due to limitations in existing biophysical and social data and time constraints associated with still having to carry out their day-to-day work tasks.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Most professionals who attended the training were well educated in the biophysical aspects of IAS management but had limited formal economics skills. Despite the lack of formal training,

many picked up the concepts quite easily, particularly when explained in layman's terms and related back to decisions that we make in everyday life.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Please provide:

- 1) *Details of any additional donors who supported this project*
- 2) *Details of any further funding secured for this project or for your organization as a result of CEPF's investment in this project.*

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
RESCCUE-Vanuatu	Not applicable	~ 35,000 Euros	This funding was to undertake economic analyses associated with a range of environmental issues and ecosystem services on North Efate, Vanuatu. It was decided that due to the training undertaken in Port Vila, one of the issues to address should be IAS management. It is anticipated that the project could use some of the contacts and data collected as a result of participant's working on CBAs in the region to support part of this work. These analysis will be undertaken in 2016/2017.

***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

Please summarize the success or challenges in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of the project activities and results.

Please summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability that has been achieved.

CBA training for professionals was considered a means to enable CBA to be undertaken more widely in the Pacific and to inform conservation decisions. We envisioned that this would happen within the region.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

Please provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project. This may be attached in the form of an updated Social Safeguards document.

This section was not applicable to our project.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Please note any additional comments or recommendations arising from the project.

- There was an expectation that external funding would be available for participants to attend trainings. Several applicants were disappointed to learn that the workshop was not fully funded despite the call for applications making this point very clearly. We had chosen not to fund travel and participation for the course on the advice of USP-Institute of Applied Sciences, who routinely run short courses in the region. They had observed that when travel and participation funds were provided, the applicant pool tended to be senior managers rather than practitioners and that actual course attendance was unreliable. To ensure that we had practitioners who would most benefit from the training, we chose not to fund any associated travel and participation.
- Some practitioners who would benefit from the training do not participate in the relevant listservs. As such, we also used personal and professional networks to publicise the call for applications.
- The training materials work well: by the end of the course, every participant – including those with no previous exposure to economic analysis – was confidently and accurately completing a CBA on managing IAS based on the case studies that we provided.
- While the toolkit streamlines and simplifies the process of conducting a CBA, it still requires good biophysical and socioeconomic data, which may be costly to collect in terms of time and other resources. An important component of the training, then, is highlighting the data requirements.
- With no financial support for collection of biophysical and socioeconomic data, it was infeasible for many participants to undertake CBAs of their own after undergoing the training. Should those resources become available, participants demonstrated that they do indeed have the tools necessary to undertake detailed, accurate CBAs.

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 NZ

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

ANNEX 1: 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 (attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate the 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			Please also include name of the KBA(s)
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			Please include the names of protected areas
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.

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	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 rate	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									
Not Applicable																					
Total																					

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

