

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Wildlife Conservation Society
<b>Project Title:</b>	Strengthening Conservation and Management Across the Mt. Navotuvotu-Mt. Kasi Forest Corridor, Fiji
<b>Date of Report:</b>	
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Stacy Jupiter, Wildlife Conservation Society Fiji Program Director, 11 Ma'afu St, Suva, Fiji, sjupiter@wcs.org

**CEPF Region:** Polynesia Micronesia

**Strategic Direction:** 2: Strengthen the conservation status and management of 60 key biodiversity areas; 2.1 Develop and manage conservation areas that conserve currently unprotected priority sites, especially critical refugia such as large forest blocks and alien-free habitats; 2.2 Improve the management of existing protected areas that are priority site outcomes.

**Grant Amount:** \$99,925.00

**Project Dates:** May 1, 2012-June 30, 2013

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

**Fiji Department of Forestry (DoF):** A representative from DoF served on the project steering committee. Officers at the DoF Northern Division office in Labasa, Fiji, provided spatial locations of timber plantations, logging concessions and some logged areas for the spatial prioritization analysis. DoF Northern Division forestry officers participated in the first round of clan level consultations to present back outcomes from the spatial prioritization analysis and identify potential forest areas to designate as community forest parks and/or river buffer zones.

**NatureFiji-MareqetiViti (NFMV):** A representative from NFMV served on the project steering committee. She provided spatial data on clan willingness to participate in management, obtained through work under a CEPF grant to NFMV to raise awareness with landowners of the opportunities for establishing permanent forest estates (PFEs). NFMV also provided all of their awareness materials to deliver to landowners to refresh their understanding of PFEs, of which community forest parks and river buffer zones could form core components.

**iTaukei Land Trust Board (TLTB):** A representative from TLTB served on the project steering committee. Regional staff from TLTB participated in the first round of clan level consultations to present back outcomes from the spatial prioritization analysis and identify potential forest areas to designate as community forest parks and/or river buffer zones.

**iTaukei Affairs Board (TAB):** A representative from TAB served on the project steering committee.

**iTaukei Lands and Fisheries Commission (TLFC):** A representative from TLFC served on the project steering committee.

**Bua and Cakaudrove Provincial Offices:** Staff from Bua and Cakaudrove Provincial Offices participated in the first round of clan level consultations to present back outcomes from the spatial prioritization analysis and identify potential forest areas to designate as community forest parks and/or river buffer zones.

Additional biodiversity data for the prioritization analysis was provided by the **National Trust of Fiji** and the **University of the South Pacific Herbarium**.

### Conservation Impacts

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

Our project has contributed to strengthened management within and between two of the 60 priority CEPF key biodiversity areas (Mt. Navotuvotu, Mt. Kasi) identified within the CEPF Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot profile. This project has resulted in the creation of new forest parks and river buffer zones within this area, as described more fully below. We have incorporated local community involvement from the beginning to the end, and embedded the management implementation within broader ecosystem-based management frameworks. WCS continues to support management initiated under this project through leveraged donor funding and by building the capacity of a provincial site support liaison group, the Bua Yaubula Management Support Team, to provide ongoing management assistance to land-owning clans.

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

We targeted 23 clans for engagement to discuss the establishment of protected areas and sustainable land management leading towards permanent forest estates, as recommended under the Fiji Forest Policy (DoF 2007). As a direct result of CEPF investment, eleven landowning clans across the Mt. Navotuvotu-Mt.Kasi forest corridor committed to establish 6,585 ha new community forest parks (CFPs) and river buffer zones (RBZs). These new protected areas increased the total area protected within the planning region from 5.6% to 10.8%, with 6.9% of key biodiversity areas protected and 13.1% of the broader forest corridor protected. Management rules for the protected areas have been included in adapted ecosystem-based management plans (EBM) for Kubulau, Wainunu and Wailevu/Koroalau districts, which will be endorsed by the respective councils of chiefs in October 2013. New EBM plans for Nadi and Solevu districts have additionally been developed and are awaiting endorsement by their council of chiefs.

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

WCS will work with local communities (approximately 8250 people across 5 districts) towards a goal of achieving 20% protection of forests/streams inside the Mt. Navotuvotu

and Mt. Kasi KBAs and 10% protection of forests/streams in the broader conservation corridor by 2020.

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

As of June 2013, work under our project resulted in a total increase from 5.6% to 10.8% of the total area protected within the planning region. WCS worked with communities to achieve a total protection of 13.1% of forests/streams across the broader conservation corridor, which already surpassed the 10% target. However, we have only achieved protection of 6.9% within the KBAs across the planning region. This is partially due to the fact that landowners were unwilling and unable to commit to protection on large portions of the KBAs are already under logging or mining concession. Future work will focus on working with communities to secure additional available area within KBAs for conservation and sustainable land management.

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

Native forest sustainably managed through clan-level action plans for 10 community forest parks (estimated total size = 1825 ha) nested within 5 district level ecosystem-based management (EBM) plans within the Mt. Kasi-Mt. Navotuvotu corridor

River buffer zones established to protect 50 km (100 ha) of priority streams along the Mt. Kasi-Mt. Navotuvotu corridor with the highest biodiversity, clear migratory pathways and least fragmentation, and managed under 5 district-level EBM plans

Management plan implementation supported by resource management committees, coordinated through a knowledge sharing network, and at least partially financed by small-scale livelihood activities

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

Eleven clans have established 5 community forest parks covering 6,361 ha total. Although we did not reach the target number of community forest parks, the area committed to protection by communities (6,361 ha) greatly surpassed the original target. However, we fell short of the target to protect 50 km (1000 ha) of river buffer zones, with only 32 km (678 ha) committed to community management and protection to date. This may have been because rivers are often the defining boundary of clan land tenure parcels therefore clans may have been reluctant to establish protection on only one side of the river when they could not control the activities of other landowning clans on adjacent land parcels.

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

**Hectares Protected: 6585**

**Species Conserved:**

**Corridors Created: Mt. Navotuvotu-Mt Kasi Conservation Corridor**

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

One major project success is that, in the cases where landowning clans were willing to protect their lands, they protected a much larger percentage of their land holdings than anticipated. As a consequence, we exceeded our target goal to have 1,825 ha under community forest park by 4,536 ha.

A major challenge to establishment of community forest parks and/or river buffer zones was that the majority of likely intact native forest within the Mt. Navotuvotu and Mt. Kasi KBAs is already under logging or mining concession. In many cases, when we consulted landowners whose land parcels were under logging concession, the landowners either claimed that they were not involved in the sale of logging concessions on their land or were unaware of the existence of the logging concessions prior to WCS staff arrival. In some cases, clan members suggested that the leases may have been negotiated and sold by district or provincial high chiefs without the consent of the majority of landowners in the clan. Most clans were unaware of when the logging concessions expire and when (and whether) the logging is likely to take place. Several clans claimed that they have not been able to access the premium and six-monthly payments from the logging companies because they are not signatories to the bank accounts in their clan's name. All of these contentious issues made it difficult to plan conservation or sustainable management of forest and freshwater areas and suggested that we needed stronger collaboration with and involvement of the iTaukei (Native) Land Trust Board (TLTB), which brokers all land leases and houses all records of logging leases. The TLTB did serve on the Steering Committee to the project and provided input during regular committee meetings, however TLTB staff were not available to participate in clan-level consultations when many of these issues arose. We did not want to interfere too heavily in these internal and contentious issues, but we did want to provide some assistance to the clans. So WCS provided a template to clans with disputed logging concessions with suggested language they could use to draft a letter to TLTB to find out who signed the lease on their behalf and is signatory to the bank accounts with proceeds from the lease agreements. We intend to follow up periodically to find out if the landowners have received any resolution from TLTB regarding the signatories to the leases.

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

As described above, we did not anticipate that local landowners would be willing to set aside such large percentages of their land holdings as community forest parks, which resulted in a positive outcome of exceeding our short-term target for community forest parks by 4,536 ha.

## **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.*

The paragraphs below provide a summary of achievements by WCS and our community, government and non-government partners throughout the grant period. A full project report detailing outcomes can be downloaded from: <http://tinyurl.com/CEPFrpt>

**Component 1 Planned:** Clans prioritized for consultation based on locations of their land tenure parcels in areas of high diversity and value for forest ecosystem services as well as willingness to establish management

**Component 1 Actual at Completion:** We compiled and edited existing spatial data on biodiversity features (e.g., intact native forest, rivers), threats or alternative land uses that would preclude management (e.g., logging, mining, agriculture, locations of overhanging culverts), and community willingness to conduct management to conduct spatial prioritizations to identify optimal areas for management across the Mt. Navotuvotu-Mt. Kasi conservation corridor. We used the conservation planning software Marxan with Zones (Watts et al. 2009) to conduct two parallel spatial prioritization exercises to enable identification of: (1) land tenure parcels with high biodiversity value for community forest parks (CFPs) and minimum threats; and (2) priority river buffer zones (RBZs) based on degree of ecological intactness. A full report on the outcomes of the spatial prioritization can be downloaded from the WCS Fiji website at: <http://tinyurl.com/CEPFbiodiv-rpt>

**Component 2 Planned:** District EBM plans finalized or adapted to include provisions for management of riparian buffer zones and community forest parks

**Component 2 Actual at Completion:** Eleven clans have established 5 community forest parks covering 6,361 ha total. Some of the parks span tenure boundaries of multiple clans. The boundaries for each park are mapped and clans have developed management rules and action plans. Ecosystem-based management plans for Kubulau, Wainunu and Wailevu (including the adjacent upstream portion of Koroalau) districts have been amended to include the additional 6,361 ha of community forest parks and 32 km (678 ha) of river buffer zones. The updated management plans are in the process of being implemented and monitored by the respective district resource management committees. The EBM plans can be downloaded from the WCS Fiji website:

Kubulau: <http://tinyurl.com/KubulauEBM>

Wainunu: <http://tinyurl.com/WainunuEBM>

Wailevu: <http://tinyurl.com/WailevuEBM>

**Component 3 Planned:** Management support networks created to ensure monitoring, enforcement and financing

**Component 3 Actual at Completion:** To improve opportunities for management support for monitoring and enforcement and development of livelihoods from sustainable harvests of natural resources, we worked throughout the project to build and strengthen two separate networks of practitioners: (1) Yaubula Support Management Teams in Bua

and Cakaudrove provinces to strengthen management implementation and improve livelihoods indirectly from the improved availability of natural resources; and (2) women's weaving cooperatives focused on the production and sale of mats to directly derive income from the sustainable management the kuta reef source material.

Yaubula Management Support Teams (YMSTs) are site support groups made up of community representatives who function as liaisons between community interests and the Fiji Locally Managed Marine Area network (FLMMA) and provide information, tools and motivation to sites to implement local resource management. During project implementation we worked with the Bua Provincial Office and other FLMMA partner organizations to formally establish and develop the capacity of a Bua YMST to assist their respective districts with management implementation. We also provided capacity building support to the complementary Cakaudrove YMST. We trained the YMST and other district representatives how to carry out conceptual modeling to define threats and management strategies to build ecosystem-based management (EBM) plans, inclusive of rules and processes for monitoring and enforcement, based on the models developed for Kubulau, Wainunu and Wailevu.

With regards to the network of women practitioners, following our trainings, three localized 'kuta mat weaving teams' were established, made up of workshop participants and each with a nominated leader, a quality control process, and a communications protocol to notify buyers when products are ready. All 60 trainees were able to produce the highly-sought-after decorative round mats and all initial mats were sold, providing income for families. We have worked with the women to consider their business aspirations, define goals, and identify challenges and opportunities. The women reported having gained confidence, particularly in their ability to communicate about their businesses, with clearer ideas about their business and how they can make a profit. As next steps under complementary funding from the Flora Family Foundation and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, we will: help the women build skills in market research, pricing, and financial planning; support development of individual business plans; cement support networks between the women; and assist the women to integrate management of kuta wetlands within district ecosystem-based management planning processes.

**Component 4 Planned:** Legislative review undertaken to identify opportunities to recognize community-managed forest areas and riparian buffer zones in new Protected Area Legislation

**Component 4 Actual at Completion:**

Under this project, establishment of community-managed protected areas was constrained by current legal, political and institutional frameworks in Fiji. In order to determine options available to communities for long-term protection of CFPs and RBZs across the Mt. Navotuvotu-Mt. Kasi corridor, we participated in two complementary reviews of the legal, institutional and policy conditions that support and hinder establishment of indigenous community conservation areas in Fiji:

Govan H, Jupiter S, Comley J (2012) Recognition and support of ICCAs in Fiji. In: Kothari A, Corrigan C, Jonas H, Neumann A, Shrumm H (eds) Recognising and supporting territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities: global overview and national case studies Technical Series no 64. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, ICCA Consortium, Kalpavriksh, Natural Justice, Montreal, Canada, 32 pp [available from: [Govan et al. 2012](#)]

Vukikomoala K, Jupiter S, Erasito E, Chand K (2012) An analysis of international law, national legislation, judgements, and institutions as they interrelate with territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities. Report No. 19 Fiji. Natural Justice and Kalpavriksh, Bangalore and Delhi, 61 pp [available from: [Vukikomoala et al. 2012](#)]

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

Our goal for local chiefs to endorse ecosystem-based management plans for Nadi and Solevu districts has not yet been achieved, but complete drafts have been developed which are currently undergoing further consultation at the request of local chiefs. The plans are scheduled to be launched later in October 2013.

Although complete business and marketing plans for the sale of kuta mats have not yet been fully developed, the women weavers have set their vision and goals and have already started selling their products to new markets. Since the women had little or no knowledge of basic business concepts, WCS chose to first focus on introducing basic business skills before developing formal plans. The capacity building workshops facilitated by WCS staff provided a solid foundation in business fundamentals upon which we will develop tailored business and marketing plans with the women. WCS has complementary funding from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the Flora Family Foundation to continue this process through June 2014.

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

We will submit the following documents with this final report:

Askew N, Mailautoka K, Caginitoba A, Jenkins A, Jupiter S (2013) Strengthening conservation and management across the Mt. Navotuvotu - Mt. Kasi Forest Corridor: Biodiversity summary report, December 2012. Wildlife Conservation Society, Suva, Fiji, 35 pp

Govan H, Jupiter S, Comley J (2012) Recognition and support of ICCAs in Fiji. In: Kothari A, Corrigan C, Jonas H, Neumann A, Shrumm H (eds) Recognising and supporting territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities: global overview and national case studies Technical Series no 64. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, ICCA Consortium, Kalpavriksh, Natural Justice, Montreal, Canada, 32 pp

- Jupiter S, Acton G, Caginitoba A, Koto K, Askew N, Wainiqolo G (2013) Strengthening conservation and management across the Mt. Navotuvotu-Mt. Kasi forest corridor: Final stakeholders report. Wildlife Conservation Society, Suva, Fiji, 18 pp
- Vukikomoala K, Jupiter S, Erasito E, Chand K (2012) An analysis of international law, national legislation, judgements, and institutions as they interrelate with territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities. Report No. 19 Fiji. Natural Justice and Kalpavriksh, Bangalore and Delhi, 61 pp

## 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)***

At the suggestion of CEPF, we developed a project Steering Committee of key government and non-government stakeholders, including local NGO NatureFiji-MareqetiViti (NFMV). Involvement of NFMV specifically allowed us to build directly on their prior CEPF project to advise landowners in Vanua Levu about expectations for permanent forest estates, as described under the Fiji Forest Policy (DoF 2007). By bringing NFMV on as an advisory partner, we were able to access their information about landowner willingness to participate in management, a key part of our prioritization to optimize use of our resources for landowner consultations. Involvement of other government stakeholders (e.g. Department of Forestry, iTaukei Land Trust Board, iTaukei Lands and Fisheries Commission) gave legitimacy to the project in the eyes of landowners, while also ensuring that we were aligned to government protocols and processes.

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

We found clan level consultations about land and forest protection to be more difficult than originally anticipated. In many cases, the clan members empowered to make decisions resided elsewhere in Fiji or overseas, and not in the districts we targeted. In some cases we were able to contact clan members based elsewhere in Fiji, however this slowed the entire consultation process. In other cases, we were unable to reach important decision-makers, which limited the number of commitments that could be made to establish community forest parks and river buffer zones.

Even when we were able to reach decision-makers, we found some reluctance by communities to establish protected forest and freshwater areas due to the lack of formal supportive legislation or viable financing mechanisms available to support management implementation. Even though there is some momentum in Fiji to develop new protected area legislation, several clans expressed a lack of faith in the Fiji Government to carry this forward and, consequently, did not see the possibility of deriving financial benefits from community managed forest or freshwater areas in the future.

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

An initial lack of general awareness among clan members required us to spend considerable time to build their understanding of: the value of biodiversity in their forest; ecosystem services they receive from the forest; threats and impacts of unsustainable logging on biodiversity and ecosystem services; and the national laws and guidelines in the Fiji Forest Decree and the Forest Logging Code of Practice. While building this foundation of awareness took time, our outreach efforts are likely to encourage conservation of forests beyond the timeframe of this project.

## 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.*

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
David and Lucile Packard Foundation (#2010-35664)	A	\$48,159	Grant finished 6/30/2012
Disney Friends for Change Initiative	A	\$4,773	Grant finished 8/31/2012
David and Lucile Packard Foundation (#2012-37915)	A	\$182,624	Of this: \$9,240 is complementary funding to support livelihoods activities; \$40,743 is complementary funding to support management plan development, strengthening and implementation, including support to the Bua YMST; and \$132,641 is support for WCS Fiji salaries and overheads. Grant to finish 6/30/2014.
Flora Family Foundation (#2012-2196)	B	\$20,000	Livelihoods component of CEPF grant used to leverage funding. Grant to finish 6/30/2014

**\*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.*

Long-term sustainability of management implementation across the Mt. Navotuvotu-Mt. Kasi forest corridor will be dependent on institutionalizing management support into provincial government and community networks. During the planning stage of our

project we identified a risk related to continuity of the Conservation Corridor management support network, which will be composed of members of the Bua Yaubula Management Support Team (YMST), as well as a Conservation Officer under the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs embedded in the Bua Provincial Office. As we reported in our second six-monthly narrative report, we submitted a proposal to AusAID to fund additional training of the Bua YMST and to pay the salary of the Bua Conservation Officer, but the proposal was unfortunately unsuccessful. In the meantime, we received support from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation to improve the capacity of the Bua Provincial Office staff and YMST members to coordinate management efforts across the province and integrate district-level resource management plans with the provincial-level development agenda. The Packard Foundation has additionally verbally promised to support the salary of a Bua Conservation Officer for 3 years from 2014 to oversee management implementation across the province. After this time, it is anticipated that salary support for the Conservation Officer (and possibly operational funds for the Bua YMST) will become mainstreamed into the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs corporate plan, which is a condition of the funding from the Packard Foundation.

A risk to sustainability described in our third six-monthly narrative report is that mineral prospecting has expanded across parts of the project site, with new prospecting licenses recently granted. There is a risk that proposed mining sites could overlap with or impact upon community forest parks and riparian buffer zones. We have been compiling information to assist communities to engage in environmental impact assessment (EIA) processes. As we continue to work with these communities through a grant currently funded through the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and a pending grant with the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, we will conduct management support workshops with the district resource management committee members, as well as representatives to the Bua YMST, to instruct them at which points communities can provide input into EIA processes and the correct protocol to report potential infringements of conditions of approved development and mining leases.

***Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.***

N/A

## **Safeguard Policy Assessment**

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

To mitigate any potential social issues regarding competing interests on local lands, we included a representative from the northern division of the iTaukei Land Trust Board (TLTB) as part of the team conducting initial consultations with local landowners. This was a successful strategy, and the representative answered questions from landowners regarding existing leases, especially the considerations for proposed conservation actions on leased land.

In addition, during the consultations with landowners we found that several clans were unaware of the existence of logging leases on their land parcels and/or who was the signatory to these leases. In order to mitigate arising conflicts, we provided a template with suggested language for clans with disputed logging concessions to use to draft a letter to TLTB to find out who signed the lease on their behalf and is signatory to the bank accounts with proceeds from the lease agreements.

<b>Additional Comments/Recommendations</b>
--

## 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: Stacy Jupiter

Organization name: Wildlife Conservation Society

Mailing address: 11 Ma'afu St, Suva, Fiji

Tel: (+679) 331 5174

Fax: (+679) 331 0178

E-mail: [sjupiter@wcs.org](mailto:sjupiter@wcs.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**

**(5/1/2012 – 6/30/2013)**

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>	<b>Is this question relevant?</b>	<b>If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.</b>	<b>Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.</b>	<b>Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)</b>
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Y	5378	5378	Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.  Kilaka Community Forest Park: 1207 ha Kilaka River Buffer Zone (inside Kilaka CFP): 105 ha
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	Y	6585	6585	Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.  Wasakalau Community Forest Park: 2738 ha Wasakalau River Buffer Zone (inside Wasakalau CFP): 168 ha Maururu West Community Forest Park: 1192 ha Maururu West River Buffer Zone (inside Maururu West CFP): 96 ha Maururu East Community Forest Park: 653 ha Maururu East River Buffer Zone (inside Maururu East CFP): 41 ha Nukubolu Community Forest Park: 571 ha Nukubolu River Buffer Zone (inside Nukubolu CFP): 45 ha Upper Nasakawa River Buffer Zone: 153 ha Mataqali Nadicake River Buffer Zone: 40 ha Nasavu Creek River Buffer Zone: 31 ha
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.	Y	3309	3309	Wasakalau Community Forest Park: 2738 ha Wasakalau River Buffer Zone (inside Wasakalau CFP): 168 ha Nukubolu Community Forest Park: 571 ha Nukubolu River Buffer Zone (inside Nukubolu CFP): 45 ha
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management	Y	117850	117850	Kubulau District land area managed under Kubulau EBM Plan: 9850 ha Wainunu District land area managed under

practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				Wainunu EBM Plan: 27757 ha Wailevu and Koroalau district land area managed under Wailevu EBM Plan: 57515 ha (Wailevu), 22728 (Koroalau)
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	Y	21	21	<p>21 communities were supported to develop businesses from weaving and selling kuta mats.</p> <p>Bua Province Lekutu District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kavula</li> </ul> <p>Navakasiga District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driti</li> </ul> <p>Nadi District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nasavu</li> <li>• Nasawana</li> </ul> <p>Kubulau District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Namalata</li> <li>• Navatu</li> <li>• Waisa</li> <li>• Nakorovou</li> <li>• Raviravi</li> </ul> <p>Wainunu District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nabunikadamu</li> <li>• Nakawakawa</li> <li>• Batiniuciwai</li> </ul> <p>Cakaudrove Province Wailevu District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dreketi</li> <li>• Laucala</li> <li>• Valeni</li> <li>• Vakativa</li> <li>• Natua</li> <li>• Waisali</li> <li>• Naloaloa</li> <li>• Naiqaqi</li> <li>• Dawara</li> </ul>

**If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table**



