

CEPF Final Project Completion Report

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

Organization Legal Name	<i>American Museum of Natural History Center for Biodiversity and Conservation</i>
Project Title	Advancing a Conservation Strategy for the Uplands of Guadalcanal
CEPF GEM No.	64276
Date of Report	29 March 2016
Report Author	Chris Filardi and Cynthia Malone
Author Contact Information	filardi@amnh.org

CEPF Region: East Melanesian Islands Biodiversity

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 1. Empower local communities to protect and manage globally significant biodiversity at priority Key Biodiversity Areas under-served by current conservation efforts

Grant Amount: \$77,000.00

Project Dates: 1 March 2014 – 30 September 2015

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

- Solomon Islands Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management, and Meteorology (MECDM). Government agency with legal designation to establish and maintain protected areas under the 2012 Protected Areas Act. MECDM have provided Ministry support for advancing a conservation strategy for Guadalcanal including a protected area, involved in initial scoping and subsequent consultations with customary landowners.
- Guadalcanal Province. Provincial Assembly provided support to AMNH advancement of conservation strategy including protected area design and implementation in partnership with customary landowners.
- Islands Knowledge Institute. This local non-profit consortium of leading thinkers, academics, and skilled field scientists and social organizers has been a key partner in framing our engagement on the ground and with other partners in the region. In planning stages of this work, both IKI and AMNH felt that there was scope to directly implement project components together. This shifted however, as other partner strategies evolved and as the Uluna-Sutahuri emerged and gained capacity to partner and implement within their key customary lands.
- World Bank and Tina River Hydroelectric Development Project Team (TRHDP). Early in the proposal and program development phases of this work, TRHDP approached AMNH for leadership and technical assistance. Relationship has transitioned throughout project as TRHDP became more invested in the processes of land acquisition around the dam and hydropower site. Partnership has continued, but AMNH has prioritized partnership with the Uluna-Sutahuri and transitioned to working with TRHDP through this partnership.
- Solomon Islands National University (SINU). SINU established partnership with AMNH on numerous components of strategy towards advancing Guadalcanal conservation strategy. In the September 2015, USP-led, Rapid Biodiversity Assessment, over 8 SINU students were involved in biological surveys and assessments, resulting in 3

honors theses submitted towards completion of resource management degrees and also informing proposals for further data collection. SINU involved in initial strategic planning stages for the Chupukama research and education center, with proposals for inter-disciplinary curriculum at the center.

- Uluna-Sutahuri Tribe. The primary customary landholding group within the core of the Guadalcanal Watersheds KBA, the largest and most under-served KBAs in the EMI Hotspot. The Uluna-Sutahuri are lead partners on formalizing protected areas design and implementation in the central uplands of the KBA and have led the creation of a vision and action plan for formalizing a protected area under the Solomon Islands PA Act.
- University of the South Pacific Institute of Applied Sciences (USP). The premier regional tertiary education and research institution in the SW Pacific. USP is the lead on biodiversity surveys supported by CEPF that are framed to link with social organizing actions, build local capacity, and advance understanding and support for area-based conservation with the Guadalcanal Watersheds KBA.
- Solomon Islands Community Conservation Partnership (SICCP). SICCP is a locally established NGO based in Honiara. Through partnership with communities, SICCP seeks to bridge local conservation, sustainable development, and resource management efforts with broader national and international initiatives to ensure financial sustainability and sound stewardship of the rich natural and cultural heritage of the Solomon Islands. SICCP has partnered on some logistics and communications aspects of this work and is aligned to potentially partner with the Uluna-Sutahuri going forward.

Conservation Impacts

2. Describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile

Direct contributions of this project to the CEPF EMI Ecosystem Profile primarily fall under Strategic Direction 1 – Empower local communities to manage globally significant biodiversity at priority Key Biodiversity Areas under-served by current conservation efforts. The Guadalcanal Watersheds KBA is arguably one of the highest priority sites in the hotspot with high endemism and some of the highest numbers of IUCN listed taxa, and little current attention from conservation efforts. At the same time, mining and industrial forestry pressures within the KBA are some of the highest in the region. Through community organizing and awareness programs, support for strengthening capacity of local governance, and design of a shared action plan with local communities going forward, this project has made clear progress toward implementing several investment priorities under SD1: 1) our social organizing and governance work linked USP-led baseline surveys of key sites within the KBA to building government-civil society partnership toward formal area-based conservation actions; 2) community engagement and broader education actions among landholding communities within the KBA raised awareness about biodiversity values and threats (relating to mining and logging, but also diminishment of biocultural connectivity with customary lands and indirect threats from climate and demographic change); 3) we now have a maturing partnership with one of the primary landholding groups in the KBA with governance strengthening and direct conservation actions outlined going forward; and 4) we have an agreed set of initiatives to design and pilot a conservation incentive program through development of a research and education center within a proposed site for protected area status.

3. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

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

List each long-term impact from Grant Writer proposal

- Tina River Hydropower Development Project (TRHDP) Customary Protected Areas establishment catalyzes formal recognition of additional protected areas currently awaiting MECDM process for protected areas designation.
- Establishment of a central Protected Areas Support Unit at Ministry of Environment, Climate Change,

Disaster Management, and Meteorology (MECDM) to steward and otherwise support a network of national, provincial, customary, and private sector protected areas across the Solomon Islands.

- Establishment and sustainable financing (through TRHDP revenues, co-managed by community leadership, and with TRHDP technical management structure and capacity) of the Tina River Research and Education Center. Employment and capacity development opportunities as seen with the Imbu Rano model on Kolombangara Island.
- Tina River Research and Education Center develops as a gathering point for local and international students and scientists to share knowledge, build research collaborations, and advance training and research agendas for terrestrial biodiversity in the Solomon Islands.

4. Actual progress toward long-term impacts at completion

A primary impact of this phase of our work was to identify and advance partnership with Uluna-Sutahuri tribal membership as the key customary landholding group for the most biologically critical areas of the Guadalcanal Watersheds KBA. Further, the initial stages of partnership laid a foundation for protected areas management capacity strengthening and socialization with tribal leadership, constituencies, and potential partners.

One especially important focus of initial stages of AMNH partnership building was social organizing around the USP-led research expedition to Guadalcanal highlands. Through this work with the Uluna-Sutahuri we catalyzed a multi-institutional network of local and national NGOs, universities, and government officials who carried out the expedition including capacity and training aspects of the work. In the wake of the expedition, enhanced understanding of Guadalcanal biodiversity and montane ecosystems has contributed furthering conservation planning. Through its planning, implementation, and follow up, the expedition has galvanized government and customary landholder support of a multi-institutional network towards the formal protection of the uplands of Guadalcanal under the Solomon Islands Protected Areas Act.

Continued progress towards a viable funding and management partnership for establishing the Chupukama Research and Education Center as a gathering point for local and international students and scientists to share knowledge, build research collaborations, and advance training and research agendas for terrestrial biodiversity in the Solomon Islands. In parallel with above impacts, progress toward ultimate establishment of this center and programs supported by it is essential to long-term social buy-in for supporting protected area formalization.

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

List each short-term impact from Grant Writer proposal

- Customary landholder capacity enhanced to leverage TRHDP for both local community and national biodiversity conservation benefits.
- As a final step to work proposed here, design of a clearly mapped protected area(s) will be completed, with a parallel social process established for community-based organizations to ultimately submit a formal proposal for protection to MECDM under the Protected Areas Act.
- Advance of a balanced, science-based, community-driven strategy for natural resource use and biodiversity conservation across the entire Guadalcanal Watersheds KBA (~ 150,000 ha), including the social, geographic, and ecological design of a 15,000-20,000 ha protected area within the upper catchments of the Tina, Toni, and adjacent drainages.

- Cadre of 6–8 Solomon Islands National University (SINU) students trained.
- SINU Natural Resource Management Faculty and Administrative leaders invested in leveraging TRHDP infrastructure to provide enhanced capacity building opportunities to students in natural sciences.
- Project implementation provides the first formal designation of a customary lands protected area under the Protected Areas Act.
- Adaptive mapping and management plan protocols established with ongoing process of review and refinement.

5. Actual progress toward short-term impacts at completion

USP-led research expedition to Guadalcanal highlands provided capacity building opportunity for Solomon Islands National University students. Involved over 10 Solomon Islands National University (SINU) students in biodiversity expedition, resulting in at least 3 honors theses that have informed proposals for further data collection. Several presentations to groups of 50-100 SINU students that have resulted in growing mentorship and research collaborations with participating scientists in the expedition.

Regional and local press highlighting the uniqueness and important of Guadalcanal montane biodiversity and local and regional government commitment to a legal protected area in the Guadalcanal KBA.

With financial and technical support from AMNH, interim tribal governance structure for protected area management identified and established.

AMNH Leading the process of resolving grievance issues resulting from the USP-led Biodiversity Surveys of the Chupukama/Bobosogo Areas. Summary of the grievance and social safeguards procedures to date has been submitted to CEPF separately and is described in sections below.

Though public mapping products were not possible during this phase of work (see below), we did finalize internal Uluna-Sutahuri mapping products that have socialized agreed focal customary areas for Protected Areas status.

Letter of partnership outlining protected area design and management partnership between Uluna and AMNH has been finalized, including socialization of Uluna-Sutahuri constituency in the process.

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

The primary challenges to this project relate to shifting strategy of the TRHDP and landholder dynamics surrounding those shifts (and the TRHDP itself), as well as engagement of other interests in the focal areas (e.g. Participants in the USP-led Biodiversity Surveys). As described below, these challenges limited mapping components of the work proposed, and delayed advance of governance components. However, investment in building strong relationships among Uluna-Sutahuri leadership enabled continued advance of short-term capacity, social awareness, and governance aspects of project objectives.

As for long-term impact objectives relating to establishment of a nationally recognized protected area and catalyzing broader advances of regional protected areas networks, success during this phase of work was mixed. Delays in advancing short-term objectives due to social TRHDP social dynamics limited direct linkage between social organizing, internal tribal mapping exercises, and Ministry of Environment institutional capacity to implement the Protected Areas Act for the first time. However, we were able to make progress with the Ministry in establishing understanding and both public and internal support for nationally recognized area-based conservation in Uluna-Sutahuri and adjacent lands.

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

The most notable unexpected impacts relate to the collection of tambu specimens during the University of the South Pacific (USP) Biodiversity Surveys (see reporting for CEPF EMI Grant No. 64282). In short, during the September 2015 biodiversity surveys, specimens were collected from species that should have been identified as restricted under a June 2015 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) signed by the University of the South Pacific Institute of Applied Sciences (USP), the Uluna-Sutahuri Tribe, the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH), and the Solomon Islands Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM). In the process of building relations with the Uluna-Sutahuri, together with the tribe, AMNH, USP, and MECDM developed a set of parameters to govern partnership to carry out a biodiversity assessment of core areas for consideration under the Solomon Islands Protected Areas Act. Two of these parameters set forth obligations regarding species that have restrictions on capture or other customary significance.

In the lead up to, and during the expedition, lapses by all parties to the MOA in communication and in following these parameters resulted in collection of specimens considered “tambu” or off-limits to scientific collection. These include a frog (most likely *Litoria spp. (lutea?)*), and at least one bird species as yet to be identified (but likely *Rhipidura drownei*). Expedition leads were not made aware of this issue until a series of de-briefing gatherings designed to review Uluna-Sutahuri impressions of the work after the expedition had been completed.

Upon learning of this grievance in September 2015, AMNH held a series of gatherings with the EPT and Uluna-Sutahuri leadership to listen to their perspective of what occurred and how we may resolve the issue in a respectful and appropriate way. Initially, a plan for dealing with the issue was not clear among Uluna-Sutahuri membership and, in response, AMNH provided resources to facilitate further meetings by the tribe in October and November 2015. Subsequent meetings between AMNH and Uluna-Sutahuri representatives in December 2015 resulted in a proposal to explicitly include resolution of the tambu specimen issue in a letter of partnership outlining next steps to advance area-based conservation in Uluna-Sutahuri customary lands and tribal members agreed to meet to propose potential pathways to resolve the issue. However, in AMNH meetings with Uluna-Sutahuri in February 2016, no specific proposals were presented but it became evident that, prior to any partnership moving forward, AMNH, and other parties to the expedition MOA should invest in coming together with a broad set of Uluna-Sutahuri perspectives to work through resolution of this grievance.

During February 2016 meetings in Honiara, AMNH (Chris Filardi) and Uluna-Sutahuri representatives (Noelyn Biliki, Joshua Kera, and Patricia Rodi) updated CEPF Grants Director, Michele Zador, and staff from the CEPF EMI Regional Implementation Team, Helen Pippard and Luisa Tagicakibau, to the above grievance issues.

Through our social safeguard procedures all parties have reached consensus to a series of basic next steps:

1. Independently and with AMNH support, Uluna-Sutahuri will gather in March and April to agree upon proposed resolution actions (e.g. public “tiangi” presentation of pigs, other foods, and a token amount of money to be deposited in the tribal account).
2. In May 2016, AMNH and USP will support gatherings with Uluna-Sutahuri membership to present a summary of expedition results, acknowledge the tambu specimen issues and openly discuss potential resolutions.
3. Following initial gatherings in May 2016, should consensus emerge around tambu specimen resolution, carry out resolution gathering under the guidance of Uluna-Sutahuri leadership.
4. Should consensus not emerge, we have agreed to support another round of tribal gatherings and then convene follow up meetings with Uluna-Sutahuri in June/July 2016 to work on refining pathways to resolving this issue.

The negative impacts of these events are fairly apparent. This has delayed progress and has also revealed some clear social divides within the Uluna-Sutahuri community. However, these same impacts have positive dimensions to them as well. Delays in progress toward anticipated outcomes facilitated Uluna-driven refinement of our strategy. Not exactly an unanticipated process, but difficult to predict what kinds of social spaces would present themselves and anticipate how we would best capitalize on them. In this case, delays in progress combined with the social dynamics surrounding the tambu specimen collection revealed, to us and to the Uluna-Sutahuri, clear governance and social organizing issues critical to address prior to advancing more direct progress toward protected areas goals. Thus the positive here is a more lasting, albeit more limited, progress toward tribal governance that can underpin advances in mapping and protected areas recognition in the next phases of our work.

Project Components and Products/Deliverables

Component 1 (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

Tina River Hydropower Development Project (TRHDP) landholder engagement transformed into a framework for Protected Area design and management within the upper catchment of the Tina River, and (as resources allow) within the Toni River drainage.

Component 1 Product/Deliverables:

- 1.1. Customary landholders in the upper Tina River (above the hydro-electric production site) and Toni River Catchments are identified and patterns of tenure mapped. Products include listing of all key primary and secondary landholding groups for the Tina and Toni River basins (and possibly basins within Uluna tribal lands to the east) and linked maps that overlay general customary agency over key upper catchments in the Guadalcanal Watersheds.
- 1.2. Following protocols of engagement developed during the TRHDP social assessment and access agreement processes, a Customary Protected Areas Design (CPAD) Forum is established, including representatives from all relevant local communities and tribal lineages.
- 1.3. A framework for the formation of Protected Areas Management Committee(s) appropriate to local communities is established.
- 1.4. Acting Management Committee(s) (AMC) formed and linked to the Protected Areas Act authority at MECDM.

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

- 1.1 – Through initial engagement with TRHDP, two sister tribes and their respective constituencies were identified hereafter identified as the Uluna-Sutahuri Tribe. This tribal group has clear ownership (as corroborated in 2 recent Solomon Islands High Court cases) over the Chupukama and Bobosogo areas, a gateway to the heart of the Guadalcanal Watersheds KBA. Through the process of identifying the Uluna-Sutahuri as primary landholders, we were also able to identify adjacent landholding groups (e.g. Koinehau, other Bahomea sub-groups). Despite this identification of adjacent groups during this phase of work, the Uluna-Sutahuri did not advance with us to the stage of direct engagement with adjacent groups. As Uluna-Sutahuri governance strengthens, this will be a key aspect of the next phase of work and partnership.
- 1.2 – Initially we set a gathering/forum structure through TRHDP, but with shifts in TRHDP strategy relative to the prioritization of a protected area, we shifted to a gathering forum structure driven by the Uluna-Sutahuri to begin by building governance and protected areas understanding within this large primary constituency. By the close of this phase of work we were able to catalyze reasonable Uluna-Sutahuri representation through an interim protected area governance committee. This group aided in the planning and implementation of the USP-led Expedition and follow up and is now

stewarding governance capacity strengthening and socialization of an initial protected area plan for Chupukama and Tetena Haiaja.

1.3 – As above.

1.4 – Throughout the latter stages of this phase of work, the interim PA governance committee established contact and partnership with relevant officers at Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) and Ministry of Forests and Research.

Component 2 (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

Parallel biodiversity survey work in upland Guadalcanal [CEPF Proposal "Rapid Biodiversity Assessment of the Guadalcanal Watersheds" submitted by University of the South Pacific (USP)] leveraged to inform protected areas design and advance local protected area management capacity.

Component 2 Product/Deliverables:

2.1. Survey results mapped with overlay of customary patterns of access, use, and rights; mapping outputs to include basemaps that illustrate biological values associated with patterns of tenure which can be verified with landholders.

2.2. Mapping and data outputs from the surveys fed back into key communities to inspire discussions around global and local interests in protected areas establishment in the Guadalcanal Watersheds CEPF Priority Area.

2.3. Rapid Ecological Assessments for montane Guadalcanal involve at least one key landholder from each customary landholding group identified in community engagement and mapping work in the upper Tina River catchment.

2.4. One or two advanced SINU students engaged in survey work for each major vertebrate group (birds, mammals, herps, fish), plants, and mapping work.

2.5. Strengthened capacity among SINU students as measured by all students involved contributing to survey reporting and peer-review publications resulting from the work and at least 50% of students carrying some aspect of training received over into work (e.g. honors theses) toward their degree program.

9. Describe the results from Component 2 and each product/deliverable

As expected, mapping was a sensitive issue for customary landholders. With the TRHDP progress prior to the start of this phase of work, we had anticipated advancing mapping to a stage of producing outputs that could be shared and begin a process of public/broader awareness and consultations. With the shift in TRHDP strategy and investment, we worked to support mapping products internal to Uluna-Sutahuri gathering and discussions and are now poised to work with internal mapping capacity that we strengthened during this phase of work within the tribe, and are now poised to advance public, open source mapping products during the next phase of work.

2.1 – Basemaps for internal Uluna-Sutahuri use produced. Survey results are still in process at the time of preparation of this report, but results are being formatted to overlay proposed areas for protected under a submission to the MECDM Protected Areas Act Committee.

2.2 – Initial mapping products shared with Uluna-Sutahuri constituencies. Plans for sharing summary results and mapping are in place for formal gatherings in May 2016 with Uluna-Sutahuri constituencies. These gatherings will be held in Uluna villages and hosted by the interim protected area governance committee.

2.3 – Our work ensured that reps from Uluna, Sutahuri, and Koinehau tribes participated in survey planning and implementation.

2.4 – SINU students were involved in all field and base station activities of the USP rapid assessments. Additionally, several post-expedition events targeted all students from the SINU School of Natural Resource Management and have ongoing linkages with SINU students identified during these SINU events.

2.5 – Three students identified and under mentorship; reporting and publications still in prep, with May 2016 deadline in place to engage SINU students in MS prep and integration of key questions going forward into honors and post-graduate work.

Component 3 (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

Key areas of the upper Guadalcanal watersheds mapped to include broad social and ecological features, as well as proposed customary protected area(s) in the upper Tina Catchment and Toni River basin.

Component 3 Product/Deliverables:

3.1. Dynamic mapping platform created to characterize forest and land use types across focal and adjacent areas that can serve as a visualization tool for social and ecological information in the process of participatory design of proposed customary protected areas.

3.2. Proposed community-driven protected area(s) designed and reported in mapping outputs that foster biodiversity conservation and cultural values.

10. Describe the results from Component 3 and each product/deliverable

See above for discussion of limitations of external mapping products at this phase.

3.1 – Basic mapping platform and high-resolution images secured; due to delay in social appropriateness of sharing mapping information publicly, this deliverable has been shifted to the next phase of work.

3.2 – Internally (within Uluna-Sutahuri constituencies), we have shared maps of the proposed protected area(s) and culturally significant sites adjacent to and within them. This initial process was used to socialize the idea of focusing initial consultation and management planning within two areas in Chupukama and Bobosogo lands with clear, now uncontested Uluna-Sutahuri ownership via recent court decisions.

Component 4 (as stated in the approved proposal)

List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

Conservation benefits sharing opportunities for local communities assessed using the Conservation Agreement Feasibility Assessment process. *

Component 4 Product/Deliverables:

4.1. Conservation feasibility analysis completed; results analyzed and summarized.

4.2. As a primary component of benefits sharing opportunities, development of a proposal for the establishment of a Tina River Research and Education Center to be co-managed by MECDM and SINU with support from private sector (to include look-and-learn visit to Imbu Rano Lodge on Kolombangara Island).

11. Describe the results from Component 4 and each product/deliverable

4.1 – Analysis completed in partnership with Uluna-Sutahuri and oral summary of results have been presented to broader community. A more detailed discussion and reporting (oral) is set for May 2016.

4.2 – Look-and-learn visit and inclusion of tribal members in our broader ranger training and support programs in the Solomon Islands have been completed. Planning strategy in place for the research and education facility at Chupukama, but formalization awaits Uluna-Sutahuri governance strengthening.

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

One of the biggest shifts from what we proposed to what we ended up completing was the decision to not finalize formalized and publicly distributed mapping products. As suggested in previous reporting and above, given the strategic changes in TRHDP implementation, and working with Uluna-Sutahuri and other landowners to better understand tenure status and governance, we decided to keep mapping work and products internal to identified landholding groups. The logic here was to align socialization of area-based protection proposals that leverage existing customary area-based conservation with existing governance capacity and land tenure issues. Early in the process of responding to TRHDP decision to shift away from area-based upper catchment protection as part of the core landholder benefits sharing package, it became clear that our strategy needed to link clear land tenure lines as a starting point to adjust toward an independent protected areas governance structure. Through our consultations with both TRHDP and Uluna-Sutahuri we were able to identify several core areas with clear land tenure under Uluna-Sutahuri tribal control (via several recent court cases) and internally produced mapping products provided a baseline for beginning the process of socializing national recognition of customary lands under traditional protected status. This allowed good positive progress and growing consensus around core areas proposed for nationally recognized conservation status, but the decision to delay sharable mapping products did limit progress toward early stages of legal protection.

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

N/A

CEPF Global Monitoring Data

Respond to the questions and complete the tables below. If a question is not relevant to your project, please make an entry of 0 (zero) or n/a (not applicable).

**14. Did your organization complete the CEPF Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT) at the beginning and end of your project?
(Please be sure to submit the final CSTT tool to CEPF if you haven't already done so.)** N/A

15. List any vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered species conserved due to your project

NOTE: The list below includes all currently IUCN listed vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered species that have been verified as occurring within the focal area of this program.

Birds

Actenoides excelsus (Guadalcanal Moustached Kingfisher) Status: Endangered
Hypotaenidia woodfordi (Guadalcanal Rail) Status: Near Threatened
Megalurulus whitneyi (Guadalcanal Thicketbird) Status: Near Threatened
Ninox granti (Guadalcanal Boobook) Status: Vulnerable
Ducula brenchlyi (Chestnut-bellied Imperial Pigeon) Status: Vulnerable
Zoothera turipavae (Guadalcanal Thrush) Status: Vulnerable
Accipiter imitator (Imitator Goshawk) Status: Vulnerable
Haliaeetus sanfordi (Sanford's Sea Eagle) Status: Vulnerable
Aplonis brunneicapillus (White-eyed Starling) Status: Endangered

Mammals

Pteralopex pulchra (Montane Monkey-faced Bat) Status: Critically Endangered
Pteralopex atrata (Guadalcanal Monkey-faced Bat) Status: Endangered
Pteropus woodfordi (Woodford's Flying Fox) Status: Vulnerable
Uromys rex (King Rat) Status: Endangered
Uromys porculus (Guadalcanal Rat) Status: Critically Endangered
Uromys imperator (Emperor Rat) Status: Critically Endangered

Frogs, Snakes, and Lizards

Palmatorappia solomonis (Palmatorappia solomonis) Status: Vulnerable
Litoria lutea (Litoria lutea) Status: Vulnerable
Loveridgelaps elapoides (Solomons Black-banded Krait) Status: Vulnerable

Insects

Graphium meeki (Meek's Graphium) Status: Vulnerable
Lieftinckia lairdi (Lieftinckia lairdi) Status: Vulnerable
Parantica garamantis (Angled Tiger) Status: Vulnerable
Tiradelphe schneideri (Schneider's Surprise) Status: Endangered

Plants

Terminalia rerei (Terminalia rerei) Status: Vulnerable
Mastixiodendron stoddardii (Mastixiodendron stoddardii) Status: Vulnerable
Aglaia brassii (Aglaia brassii) Status: Vulnerable
Aglaia rubrivenia (Aglaia rubrivenia) Status: Vulnerable

Hectares Under Improved Management

Project Results	Hectares*	Comments
16. Did your project strengthen the management of an existing protected area?	N/A	List the name of each protected area
17. Did your project create a new protected area or expand an existing protected area?	N/A	List the name of each protected area, the date of proclamation, and the type of proclamation (e.g., legal declaration, community agreement, stewardship agreement)
18. Did your project strengthen the management of a key biodiversity area named in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile (hectares may be the same as questions above)	300k	Guadalcanal Watersheds – direct impacts within the KBA on approximately 65-85k hectares.
19. Did your project improve the management of a production landscape for biodiversity conservation	N/A	List the name or describe the location of the production landscape

* Include total hectares from project inception to completion

20. In relation to the two questions above on protected areas, did your project complete a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), or facilitate the completion of a METT by protected area authorities? If so, complete the table below. (Note that there will often be more than one METT for an individual protected area.) N/A

21. List the name of any corridor (named in the Ecosystem Profile) in which you worked and how you contributed to its improved management, if applicable. N/A

Direct Beneficiaries: Training and Education

Did your project provide training or education for . . .	Male	Female	Total	Brief Description
22. Adults for community leadership or resource management positions	8	4	12	Through community organizing efforts and establishment of expedition planning committee and interim customary lands and protected areas management committee, work emphasized strengthening leadership among tribal elders, chiefs, and educated elites.

23. Adults for livelihoods or increased income				
24. School-aged children	~ 50	~ 50	~ 100	Educational and awareness programs through SINU and in communities provided numerous secondary and tertiary school children exposure to the linkages between biodiversity science, international conservation interests, and customary stewardship of ancestral lands.
25. Other				

26. List the name and approximate population size of any “community” that benefited from the project.

Community name, surrounding district, surrounding province, country Population size

Uluna-Sutahuri Tribe, Central Guadalcanal, Guadalcanal Province, Solomon Islands ~ 1,800 – 2,000 tribal members

27. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Based on the list of communities above, write the name of the communities in the left column below. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. N/A

Community Name	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 line	Other	Increased income due to:				Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services	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

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

Lessons Learned

28. 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

One key lesson relates to the importance and complexity of social engagement in customary and other local land tenure settings. Building in iterative community consultation processes that recognize the dynamic and diverse nature of any community is essential both ethically and in terms of achieving conservation outcomes. We often use the word community to denote a single set of stakeholders or actors relating to any given issue, when in reality, contrasting perspectives and values typically characterize even very small communities. In Melanesia, these social clines may be difficult to predict, combining land tenure and other social or cultural groupings across family, clan, tribe, village and religious lines. Exactly how attitudes will play out may not be clearly known, even to community members themselves, prior to confronting some novel issue or challenge. Thus building and investing in time and space to discuss, probe, and assess attitudes and perspectives on key program objectives and related community issues is critical. Also key is that this type of engagement and social space cannot emerge solely through group meetings in any given venue. Programs need to invest in varied forms of communication and social communion, from large group meetings to small meetings with family clan or village/hamlet groupings, written communication, phone calls, public notices with forum for anonymous and non-anonymous comment, and with program staff both present and, at times, not present.

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

As suggested above, even with all the experience we have, it is difficult to over-estimate investment in basic engagement. And this is not linear workshop and outcome-based engagement, but really sitting and storying in various contexts, being around town and available for a late night rendezvous out for a stroll under moonlight in the villages – this is a difficult yet critical dimension of this kind of work to capture in log frames or proposals written, and budgets estimated, prior to work being done. To CEPF's credit, the flexibility allowed this program has enable a programmatic nimbleness that has allowed the design process to adapt and reshape as we worked together with communities and came to a clearer understanding of pathways forward.

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

Retooling objectives and engagement actions, and the flexibility afforded by CEPF support were critical to transforming the proposal framing into advancing objectives on the ground and shaping a sound, sustainable, and replicable pathway into later phases of this work.

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

See 28 above.

Sustainability / Replication

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

Delays in actions as described herein certainly challenge some of the sustainability aspects built into this program (e.g. establishment of research and education center at Chupukama). However, this idea has been socialized and once tambu specimen issues have been resolved, Uluna-Sutahuri constituencies have prioritized actions to advance this aspect in the next phases of our work and partnership.

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

As suggested in 7 above, the positive aspects of tambu specimen collection issues will ultimately contribute to increased sustainability. Pathways to resolution, and lessons such as presented above in 28, can also guide replicable strategies with improved social safeguards and ultimate success.

Safeguards

34. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social, environmental, or pest management safeguards

Our social safeguard policy was reviewed with the customary landholding groups with which we are partnering. Recently, it was implemented when AMNH facilitated the payment of an access fee for all researchers participating in the USP-led rapid ecological assessment and we are now in the process of following it for the inadvertent collection of tambu specimens. The Uluna-Sutahuri tribal leadership has formally stated in writing and verbally at a recent convening that they appreciated the implementation of this social safeguard policy to address these issues. As outlined in a separate letter to CEPF summarizing Grievance issues and triggering of safeguards policy, we are pursuing appropriate customary channels to resolve these issues in a transparent and meaningful way and to further our longer-term partnership goals with the Uluna-Sutahuri and, in turn, with the Solomon Islands Government authorities in broader area-based conservation strategy and action.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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

Additional Funding

36. Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
MacArthur Foundation	A	~ USD\$65K	This support indirectly aided in the work here by supporting Pacific Programs general operations in the Solomon Islands, and that of key partners (e.g. SICCP).
American Museum Of Natural History	A	~ USD\$30k	Salary and in-kind support for staff.

* 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)*

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:

- 37. Name:** Chris Filardi
38. Organization: American Museum of Natural History
39. Mailing address: Central Park West at 79th Street, New York USA 10024
40. Telephone number: 01 (212) 769-5742
41. E-mail address: filardi@amnh.org