

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Birdlife International
<b>Project Title:</b>	Convening the CEPF Final Evaluation Conference for the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot
<b>Date of Report:</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> September, 2013
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Mark O'Brien, BirdLife International Pacific Partnership Secretariat. Mark.obrien@birdlife.org

**CEPF Region:** Polynesia-Micronesia

**Strategic Direction:** 2, Improve management of key biodiversity areas

**Grant Amount:** \$122,361.00

**Project Dates:** December 1, 2013-June 30, 2013

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

### Conservation Impacts

*Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.*

*Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.*

**Project Approach (500 words)**

**Link to CEPF Investment Strategy**

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

To reduce the risks of extinction of globally threatened species and improve the conservation of key biodiversity areas. This project will help to sustain and grow conservation achievements by non-government organizations, community groups and other civil society partners within the Polynesian-Micronesian biodiversity hotspot beyond the CEPF 2008-2012 investment.

**Actual Progress Towards Long-term Impacts at Completion:**

This workshop enabled NGOs, community groups and other civil society partners to showcase their conservation work, to meet with colleagues and to liaise with donors and representatives of government and other institutions.

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

To provide opportunities for grantees to share experiences and lessons learned from their projects, and to jointly assess the legacy of CEPF's 7 million investment within the Polynesia-Micronesia biodiversity hotspot. To seek continued support for the investment by partners, governments and donors.

**Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:**

Grantees prepared standard posters and provided considerable feedback and reports to the CEPF RIT and other representatives. Discussions regarding the pros and cons of the Technical Advisory Group, the next steps for local NGOs and the funding opportunities enabled the organisations to depart with a renewed purpose.

**Please provide the following information where relevant:**

**Hectares Protected:** N/A  
**Species Conserved:** N/A  
**Corridors Created:** N/A

***Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.***

42 of the 55 people who attended the conference represented Local organisations, NGOs or other CSOs. There was considerable interaction between the representatives, in particular as much of the workshop sessions were organized in 4 geographically-related groups. These representatives had the opportunity to contribute to conclusions regarding the success of the Polynesia-Micronesia programme, and were able to discuss conservation issues and opportunities of next steps with CEPF, various donor, International NGO and Pacific Forum representatives. A number of lessons learned came through the process which should enable the representatives to better undertake their conservation aims in the future. A clear message from the Donors was that there needed to be a mechanism whereby the organisations could showcase their successes. The posters that the grantees prepared helped to highlight these successes.

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

Some of the biggest detractors of CEPF at the Polynesia Micronesia workshop (in 2011) were the biggest supporters at this Final Evaluation conference. This goes to show, I believe, the success of the continual work undertaken by the RIT team, and Leilani Duffy in particular, together with John Watkin to work with these detractors and win them over.

The support and interest of the representatives of the Pacific Forum was very welcoming. The advice and support that they provided to the process was beyond what I had expected from them. This has built up a longer term degree of communication between the NGOs and the Forum to the extent that another step in the inclusion of the Invasives issue in Forums communiqués was achieved at the August conference in Marshall Islands.

**Project Components**

**Project Components:** *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

**Component 1 Planned:** Plan and undertake a successful workshop.

**Component 1 Actual at Completion:**

Both a 2 day workshop and a 1 day donor roundtable were completed as part of this project. The workshop involved 55 attendees, of whom 42 represented grantees of the CEPF programme. The workshop was opened by the Acting Permanent Secretary for the Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment. The 2 day agenda was achieved with some issues, and a 1 page Final Statement from the participants was prepared and issued to the media.

Many of the attendees remained for the donor roundtable, which was chaired by Mr Feleti Teo, Deputy Secretary General of the Forum Secretariat's Strategic Partnership and Co-ordination Programme. Other attendees included representatives of Aus AID, NZ Aid Programme, GEF Small Grants and UNEP. This session centred around options for obtaining funds via a range of mechanisms, and the success or otherwise of these to date. Some advice from donors on how best to obtain funds for long term conservation programmes was welcome. Some issues with the applicability of these opportunities within territories in the region were raised.

**Component 2 Planned:**

Document conference proceedings, including an Executive Summary of the proceedings on how CEPF investment has been consolidated in the region.

**Component 2 Actual at Completion:**

Final report together with 1 page summary made available to the project manager and RIT manager within 1 month of end of workshop. How best to distribute this, and how best to highlight the messages on the posters, remains to be determined.

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

No, I don't believe so.

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

The final report has already been sent through to Leilani Duffy and John Watkin. PDF files of the posters may be useful to add to the CEPF Polynesia Micronesia website. The files are substantial at the moment – but I'm more than happy to transfer them as soon as I know how and to where.

**Lessons Learned**

***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.***

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

**Success.** Bringing so many grantees from so many of the countries was a great benefit, and really highlighted the breadth and scale of work that has been done for, what is a relatively small amount of money.

**Success.** Accommodation at the same location as the meeting, and out of Suva, ensured that the majority of attendees were able to meet, relax and network at leisure during the conference.

**Shortcoming.** The lack of attendees from CEPF was a little surprising to many of the grantees who had hoped to meet and discuss issues with a number of staff. John Watkin, was the sole representative – and did a sterling job in the circumstances.

**Shortcoming.** The fieldtrip coincided with World Environment Day (or somesuch) meaning that the site manager was unavailable.

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

**Success.** Providing a template for the posters, and funding to get the posters designed and printed, proved a great success. This not only provided an ideal means for each of the attendees to showcase their work but also enabled the RIT to present outcomes from the programme at future regional conferences.

**Success.** The one page summary document encapsulated the needs of the NGO/CSO environment community within the region, and the next steps required to enable the community to get onto a firmer, more long-term and secure, future.

**Shortcoming.** The decision not to use a facilitator was in hindsight a mistake. This added a lot of pressure to the co-ordinator both before and during the meeting.

**Shortcoming.** The decision of the rapporteur to dropout less than a month before the workshop didn't help the process – but was, possibly, less of a problem as many of the TAG representatives, and others helped to take notes during the conference.

***Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:***

Telling the world about the stories, in particular the success stories, that emanate from the programme.

## Additional Funding

*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 the CEPF investment in this project.*

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
N/A			

**\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- 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.)*

## Sustainability/Replicability

*Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.*

Not appropriate to this project

*Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.*

## Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

Not appropriate to this project.

## Additional Comments/Recommendations

An early indicator of whether the lessons have been learned, and whether the stories are well presented will come through the regional Pacific Islands Conference for Nature Conservation, to be held in Suva in December 2013.

## 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](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Mark O'Brien

Organization name: BirdLife International

Mailing address: BirdLife International, GPO Box 18332, Suva, Fiji.

Tel: 00679 331 3492

Fax: 00679 331 9658

E-mail: [mark.obrien@birdlife.org](mailto:mark.obrien@birdlife.org)

**\*\*\*If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages\*\*\***



**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.

<b>Project Results</b>	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 from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.				
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?				
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.				
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.				

**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											
<b>Total</b>																							

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