



CEPF Small Grants - Final Project Completion Report

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

Organization Legal Name	Natural Resources Development Foundation
Project Title	Forest Conservation through Payment of Environmental Services (PES) on 3 sites in Choiseul, Solomon Islands
Grant Number	GA 17/01
Date of Report	20/06/2018

CEPF Hotspot: East Melanesian Islands Biodiversity Hotspot

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 1, Investment Priority (1.4)

Grant Amount: USD 17595

Project Dates: 1 April 2017 til 30 April 2018

PART I: Overview

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

Live & Learn (Australia and Vanuatu): Provided technical support and guidance in the Nakau readiness process. In 2017 NRDF staff did an exchange visit to the Live and Learn coordinated Nakau DRAWA project in Fiji and worked on Project Documentation with Nakau founder Sean Weaver. Live and Learn Vanuatu facilitated the Nakau training workshops for all 3 target communities in Choiseul as part of this project.

Ecological Solutions SI: Close and practical collaboration to implement most of the project activities in Choiseul especially mapping and PA process activities.

Tagu Community Development Organization, Sirebe Tribal Association and Vuri Clan Association: all 3 newly registered entities representing the tribe members joining and implementing the activities and to manage the Nakau and Conservation programme.

2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

Although the project did not fully achieve the expected outcomes, it has greatly contributed in the process towards the project goals. The main reason for not fully achieving the proposed outcomes was the delay in certain processes. One of these processes was to get the 3 target areas protected under the Protected Area ACT. Nakau requires that an official protection mechanism is in place to make sure the areas are legally protected against any logging and mining activities, and that the Nakau designated areas remain from any other negative human impacts. This is required regardless of any (in)formal agreements that landowners may have to say they will conserve the forest. This process took longer than expected as it very much depends on the work by the Ministry of Environment. However, all the 3 submissions have been verified by the Ministry (February 2018 verification trip) and are ready for official declaration soon. (Photo right: Notice Sirebe Tribe in Solomon Star of July 2018)

Also, the process towards Nakau verification and accreditation took a bit longer than expected. But because of the activities under this project the 3 tribal communities managed to come very close to finalizing their project requirements and are almost ready for the final Nakau verification Audit planned for this year.



Most of the proposed activities have been successfully implemented as shown in the table below:

ACTIVITIES (as per CEPF proposal)	ACHIEVED
1. Determine (GPS) and map the exact boundaries of Nakau eligible forest areas in each of the 3 tribal lands.	For all the 3 tribal areas maps were created and eligible Nakau areas determined by the tribes during participatory land use sessions.
2. Establish permanent sample plots in each area to quantifying PES units	18 Permanent sample plots (6 in each area) were established and data was sent to the Nakau management team for analysis and further credit calculations.
3. Setting up legal entities in each forest community that will coordinate the Nakau activities in their respected areas and that are responsible for the financial management and benefit sharing.	With assistance from ESSI all 3 target communities managed to establish and register their tribal Associations.
4. Workshops to introduce communities to the Nakau business and benefit sharing planning. Nakau team from Fiji/Vanuatu to facilitate the introduction to write business and benefit	The workshops (facilitated by Live & Learn Vanuatu) were held in all 3 communities and provided the right training for the target communities.

sharing plans for each tribal community. Follow-up visits facilitated by NRDF staff to finalize the process with the target communities	For each tribe Business plans and benefit sharing plans were drafted during follow up visits.
5. Organize awareness sessions on Nakau and forest conservation in general for other communities that show interest in conserving their forest areas	Many awareness sessions were held during the project period. The Nakau programme was presented to members of the Siporae Tribe (ESSI partner), Garasa Tribe (ESSI Partner), Gome Tribe (NRDF Partner) and Kamanga Tribe (potential NRDF partner). The Nakau activities were also presented during a meeting in Honiara attended by representatives from Government Ministries and local/international NGO's.
6. Social economic baseline study for each tribal community	Social baseline surveys were carried out in all the 3 communities and data is currently analyzed by ESSI.

Proposed Outputs and Outcomes of the project:

OUTPUTS (as per CEPF proposal)	ACHIEVED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final project documents for each tribal area including: maps with eligible Nakau areas, Carbon credit stocks, area management plans (in line with PA management plans), Social economic baseline information and any other documents required for Nakau audit/verification 	The project documents (PD's) are in final draft. Finalizing the documents for the audit is a matter of editing and reviewing the final versions. All data required for the PD's has been collected. The documents will need some final input from the Nakau team, especially Sean Weaver for final reviewing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop: facilitated by Nakau team Fiji/Vanuatu to introduce all 3 communities in Nakau's business models and benefit sharing plans 	Workshop done and all business plans for each tribal community are in final draft. Workshop report submitted to CEPF.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brochure on the Nakauprogramme and forest conservation in the Solomon Islands to inform people on the programme and also to lobby for NakauPES unit off-set 	Not accomplished during this project period but still in the planning to be published soon.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Network of permanent sample plots (at least 30) to measure PES units in each area. Members of the tribe trained on how to establish and measure plots 	Partly achieved as only 18 plots were established. However, at this stage this number is sufficient. People received sufficient training and have the knowledge and ability to make more plots when required. Report attached to this Final report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Nakau-PES agreements signed with 	Not achieved. Planned in 3 rd or 4 th quarter 2018

the 3 communities and third-party verification carried out	under Bread for the World funding.
OUTCOMES	ACHIEVED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People in the 3 target tribal communities receiving incentives from selling PES units from their forest conservation areas and using those incentives according to a fair and equitable benefit sharing mechanism pointed out in their project owner business model 	Not achieved yet but expected to happen in the 4 th quarter of 2018. Through this project all 3 tribal communities are very close to obtain Nakau accreditation. All 3 areas have been verified by the Ministry of Environment and official PA declaration is expected in July/August 2018. The Kamaboe tribe however is still on hold due to logging issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More forest owning communities / tribes within the target area (Choiseul) decide to conserve their forest and object to logging, showing interest in joining Nakau programme 	Achieved through awareness sessions in many communities and during community and stakeholder meetings, gatherings and workshops. Many other tribes located in the same KBA showed interest in Conservation and Nakau activities. NRDF will focus on working with these new tribes through a new grant application with CEPF.

3. Briefly describe actual progress towards each planned impact(as stated in the approved proposal)

List each impact from your proposal

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
See outcome statements under 2	

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary

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

It is a common issue in Solomon Islands that timing of activities and achieving the necessary results on time is very hard to accomplish. Often activities are cancelled or postponed due to other commitments of the communities, availability of key persons, delays in decision making by communities and dependency on other stakeholders such as the Ministry of Environment. However, considering this harsh context the project was very successful and many of the proposed results have been achieved.

One of the main setbacks was the “out of the blue-sky” decision of the Chief of the Kamaboe tribe to sign with a logging company to log one part of the proposed Protected Area. This signing was done just a week after the representative of the Ministry of Environment did her PA submission verification in the area and agreed to progress towards declaration of the area to become a National Park. Many people from the Kamaboe tribe and Boeboe community opposed to this decision by the Chief (and some of his followers in Honiara) are now trying to seek ways to stop the proposed logging operation. NRDF as well as the Ministry of Environment are standing by for any further developments. At the time of writing this report there have been no further developments and it seems that the Chief is getting isolated from the community and tribe. NRDF is still in contact with some people from the opposing parties within the Kamaboe tribe. The fact that the company lacks certain documents necessary to enter the area (Development consent, Environmental Impact Assessment) is hopeful because the operation will be illegal and can be challenged easily by opposing parties. However, it will not be the first time that corrupt Government officers sign false documents that could be used to start logging operations.

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

As described under 4, an unexpected impact of a rather positive progress of the PA and Nakau process was that the Chief of Kamaboe got “cold feet” and decided to sign for a logging company for his own gain. Once an area is protected logging and mining are not allowed and thus closed for greedy chiefs to deal and negotiate with logging companies. Also, the Nakau programme makes sure that individuals cannot misuse money received from credits and introduces strict financial safeguards and mechanisms. This Chief with some of its tribal members in Honiara might have realized this.

Because of the project activities in Choiseul the Nakau programme received more interest from other tribal communities and Government Ministries. NRDF is a permanent member of the National REDD+ Committee and will lobby to get the Nakau programme recognized at National levels. Also, the Ministries that are currently implementing a 5 year (2017-2022) FAO supported Integrated Forest management Project have recognized NRDF and its Nakau Programme as a potential stakeholder to deal with the Livelihood and REDD components of this project.

Products/Deliverables

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

The following project outputs were produced:

- Maps of all 3 Tribal lands indicating the Nakau designated areas
- Revised PA Management plans for Sirebe, Vuri and Kamaboe for final PA verification
- Draft Business plans for Sirebe, Vuri and Kamaboe tribes
- Official registration of Vuri, Sirebe and Kamaboe tribal Associations
- Draft Project Document (PD) which includes the proposed areas.

- Data sheets Social Economic survey Sirebe, Vuri and Kamaboe tribes (Still to be analyzed and reported)
- Data sheet Permanent sample plots Sirebe, Vuri and Kamaboe tribes (Report)

Some other reports of workshops and training were submitted with progress reports.

Lessons Learned

7. Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.

Community engagement:

Processes such as the Nakau readiness process and the Protected Area process are complicated and time consuming. It requires a lot of intense community communication and staff members responsible need to be aware not to make quick assumptions that members of the community understand these processes immediately. Sometimes certain information needs to be explained many times over and over again before it is really clear and understood by the community members. Therefore, no rush in explaining things and rather capture less information during the community sessions, even if this will result in delay of the process. It was also important to clearly explain why certain activities, such as the social economic survey and the permanent sample plotting, is needed. Sometimes those activities are very sensitive and become subject for “conspiracy theories”. Many times, people think that data is collected for other purposes than for PA or Nakau. However due to the long-lasting relationship NRDF has had with the communities and the experience of staff facilitating community meetings, all went very well.

Boeboe logging case:

As mentioned under 4 some unforeseen movements by certain individuals can cause major setbacks, delays and sometimes ends up in wasted time/energy spent in certain activities and processes. Therefore, NRDF has decided that before any specific Nakau activities are started in areas, the tribes need to officially declare their forest (and proposed Nakau area) as protected. It will be set as a first requirement for tribes interested in Forest conservation and Nakau activities. The PA process however ticks a lot of boxes that are required in the Nakau process, so work on PA's is much in line with Nakau activities.

Sustainability / Replication

8. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.

Once the 2 or 3 tribal communities have declared their protected areas and Nakau activities (credit sales) are up and running, it is expected that many tribes will follow this conservation model. The Nakau projects in Vanuatu and Fiji have already shown some positive results and NRDF has high hopes that Nakau will be a game changer in the Solomon Islands. Although the marketing component of Nakau remains an uncertain challenge NRDF has all faith in the

(marketing) strategies and networks build around the programme. Also, NRDF’s own marketing strategy has not been developed yet. Once developed is expected to contribute towards some good marketing potentials.

Safeguards

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

NRDF did not encounter any issues during the implementation of the project activities. The project mainly focused on readiness activities and did not reach the stage in which project management issues and disputes could occur when running a PES project with benefits entering the community. Long before the starting of the project all communities already started the PA and Nakau process and the CEPF project was a continuation of the work already started.

The issue with the Kamaboe Chief was more or less an individual action. It was not the first time that he caused grievance with the community. Because of his decision NRDF did not continue with any further activities until the matter is cleared. If however a logging company comes down to log part of the proposed area then NRDF will withdraw from the area and terminate the partnership with the tribe. The community is informed about this by letter and was referred to the Partnership agreement which clearly states that a partnership will cease when (legal) logging activities occur within the tribal area.

Additional Funding

10. 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

a. Total additional funding (US\$)

b. Type of funding

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Bread for the World	A	USD 8,290	Salaries Team leader and Nakau contact person; Rental contribution Taro Office, Project canoe for transport between project areas
USAID/PACAM	A	USD 2,256	Support for PA submissions
	TOTAL	USD 10,546	

* 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

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

No comments.

We found working with CEPF team very positive and communication and support was excellent.

Impact at Portfolio and Global Level

CEPF requires that each grantee report on impacts at the end of the project. The purpose of this report is to collect data that will contribute to CEPF’s portfolio and global indicators. CEPF will aggregate the data that you submit with data from other grantees, to determine the overall impact of CEPF investment. CEPF’s aggregated results will be reported on in our annual report and other communications materials.

Ensure that the information provided relates to the entire project, from start date to project end date.

Contribution to Portfolio Indicators

12. If CEPF assigned one or more Portfolio Indicators to your project during the full proposal preparation phase, please list these below and report on the project’s contribution(s) to them.

Indicator	Narrative
NA	

Contribution to Global Indicators

Please report on all Global Indicators (sections 16 to 23 below) that relate to your project.

13. Key Biodiversity Area Management

Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) with improved management

Please report on the number of hectares in KBAs with improved management, as a result of CEPF investment. Examples of improved management include, but are not restricted to: increased patrolling, reduced intensity of snaring, invasive species eradication, reduced incidence of fire, and introduction of sustainable agricultural/fisheries practices. Do not record the entire area covered by the project - only record the number of hectares that have improved management.

If you have recorded part or all of a KBA as newly protected for the indicator entitled “protected areas” (section 17 below), and you have also improved its management, you should record the relevant number of hectares for both this indicator and the “protected areas” indicator.

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP
Mt Maetambe to Kolombangara River Corridor, Choiseul	1400	PP

* Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.

14. Protected Areas

15a. Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

Report on the number of hectares of protected areas that have been created or expanded as a result of CEPF investment.

Name of PA*	Country(s)	# of Hectares	Year of legal declaration or expansion	Longitude**	Latitude**
NA					

* If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.

** Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).

15b. Protected area management

If you have been requested to submit a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), please follow the instructions below. If you have not been requested to submit a METT, please go directly to section 16.

Should you want to know more about the monitoring of protected area management effectiveness and the tracking tool, please click [here](#).

Download the METT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with the protected area authorities to fill it out. Please go to the Protected Planet website [here](#) and search for your protected area in their database to record its associated WDPA ID. Then please fill in the following table:

WDPA ID	PA Official Name	Date of METT*	METT Total Score

** Please indicate when the METT was filled by the authorities of the park or provide a best estimate if the exact date is unknown. And please only provide METTs less than 12 months old.*

Please do not forget to submit the completed METT together with this report.

15. Production landscape

Please report on the number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity, as a result of CEPF investment. A production landscape is defined as a landscape where agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs. Production landscapes may include KBAs, and therefore hectares counted under the indicator entitled “KBA Management” may also be counted here. Examples of interventions include: best practices and guidelines implemented, incentive schemes introduced, sites/products certified and sustainable harvesting regulations introduced.

Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention

** If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.*

***Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.*

****Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).*

16. Beneficiaries

CEPF wants to record two types of benefits that are likely to be received by individuals: structured training and increased income. Please report on the number of men and women that have benefited from structured training (such as financial management, beekeeping, horticulture) and/or increased income (such as from tourism, agriculture, medicinal plant harvest/production, fisheries, handicraft production) as a result of CEPF investment. Please provide results since the start of your project to project completion.

17a. Number of men and women receiving structured training.

# of men receiving structured training*	# of women receiving structured training*
43	15

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received structured training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also received structured training in project management, the total number of men who benefited from structured training should be 5.*

17b. Number of men and women receiving cash benefits.

# of men receiving cash benefits*	# of women receiving cash benefits*
na	na

**Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received cash benefits due to tourism, and 3 of these also received cash benefits from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who received cash benefits should be 5.*

18. Benefits to Communities

CEPF wants to record the benefits received by communities, which can differ to those received by individuals because the benefits are available to a group. CEPF also wants to record, to the extent possible, the number of people within each community who are benefiting. Please report on the characteristics of the communities, the type of benefits that have been received during the project, and the number of men/boys and women/girls from these communities that have benefited, as a result of CEPF investment. If exact numbers are not known, please provide an estimate.

18a. Please provide information for all communities that have benefited from project start to project completion.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)							# of Beneficiaries		
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	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	# of men and boys benefiting
Sirebe Tribal Community	X	X	X								X	X		X	X	40	40
Vuri Tribal Community	X	X	X								X	X		X	X		
Kamaboe Tribal Community	X	x	X								X	X		X	X	130	140

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

2																			
...																			

19b. For each law, policy or regulation listed above, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

No.	Country(s)	Date enacted/ amended MM/DD/YYYY	Expected impact	Action that you performed to achieve this change
1				
2				
3				

20. Sustainable Financing Mechanism

Sustainable financing mechanisms generate financial resources for the long-term (generally five or more years). Examples of sustainable financial mechanisms include conservation trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, and other revenue, fee or tax schemes that generate long-term funding for conservation.

All CEPF grantees (or sub-grantees) with project activities that pertain to the creation and/or the implementation of a sustainable financing mechanism are requested to provide information on the mechanism and the funds it delivered to conservation projects during the project timeframe, unless another grantee involved with the same mechanism has already been or is expected to be tasked with this.

CEPF requires that all sustainable financing mechanism projects to provide the necessary information at their completion.

20a. Details about the mechanism

Fill in this table for as many mechanisms you worked on during your project implementation as needed.

NO.	Name of financing mechanism	Purpose of the mechanism*	Date of Establishment*	Description***	Countries
1	Nakau Programme	Provide income and capacity building for landowners that conserve their forest instead of going into agreement with large scale logging companies	Officially launched in June 2015, Suva, Fiji.	The Nakau Programme is a Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) programme focusing on community based forest protection and enhancement and sustainable development. The purpose of the Nakau Programme is to provide a financing mechanism to cover the costs of environmental management activities and addressing any landowner opportunity costs where relevant.	Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands

*Please provide a succinct description of the mission of the mechanism.

**Please indicate when the sustainable financing mechanism was officially created. If you do not know the exact date, provide a best estimate.

***Description, such as trust fund, endowment, PES scheme, incentive scheme, etc..

20b. Performance of the mechanism

For each Financing Mechanism listed previously, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

NO.	Project intervention*	\$ Amount disbursed to conservation projects**	Period under Review (MM/YYYY -MM/YYYY)***
1	Supporting an existing		

	mechanism		
2			
3			

**List whether the CEPF grant has helped to create a new mechanism (Created a mechanism) or helped to support an existing mechanism (Supported an existing mechanism) or helped to create and then support a new mechanism (Created and supported a new mechanism).*

***Please only indicate the USD amount disbursed to conservation projects during the period of implementation of your project and using, when needed, the exchange date on the day of your report.*

****Please indicate the period of implementation of your project or the period considered for the amount you indicated.*

Please do not forget to submit any relevant document which could provide justification for the amount you stated above.

21. Biodiversity-friendly Practices

Please describe any biodiversity-friendly practices that companies have adopted as a result of CEPF investment. A company is defined as a legal entity made up of an association of people, be they natural, legal, or a mixture of both, for carrying on a commercial or industrial enterprise. While companies take various forms, for the purposes of CEPF, a company is defined as a for-profit business entity. A biodiversity-friendly practice is one that conserves or uses biodiversity sustainably.

Number of companies that adopt biodiversity-friendly practices

No.	Name of company	Description of biodiversity-friendly practice adopted during the project
1	Sirebe Tribal Association	Forest protection
2	Vuri Clan Association	Forest protection
3	TaquMarine and Forest conservation project	Marine and Forest protection

22. Networks & Partnerships

Please report on any new networks or partnerships between civil society groups and across to other sectors that you have established or strengthened as a result of CEPF investment.

Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable even if they do not have a Memorandum of Understanding or other type of validation. Examples of networks/partnerships include: an alliance of fisherfolk to promote sustainable fisheries practices, a network of environmental journalists, a partnership between one or more NGOs with one or more private sector partners to improve biodiversity management on private lands, a working group focusing on reptile conservation. Please do not use this tab to list the partners in your project, unless some or all of them are part of such a network / partnership described above.

Number of networks and/or partnerships created and/or strengthened

No.	Name of Network	Name of Partnership	Year established	Did your project establish this Network/ Partnership? Y/N	Country(s) covered	Purpose
1						
2						

...						
-----	--	--	--	--	--	--

23. Gender

If you have been requested to submit a Gender Tracking Tool (GTT), please follow the instructions provided in the Excel GTT template. If you have not been requested to submit a GTT, please go directly to Part V.

Should you want to know more about CEPF Gender Policy, please click [here](#).

Download the GTT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with your team to fill it out. Please do not forget to submit the completed GTT together with this report.

Part V. 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:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 17. Name: | Wilko Bosma |
| 18. Organization: | Natural Resources Development Foundation |
| 19. Mailing address: | PO Box 158, Gizo, Solomon Islands |
| 20. Telephone number: | 00677 60912 |
| 21. E-mail address: | nrdf@solomon.com.sb |