

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Community Turtle Conservation and Monitoring Network

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** WWF SPPO

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** 1 November 2009 – 31 December 2010

**Date of Report (month/year):** November 1, 2009-December 31, 2010

## II. OPENING REMARKS

*Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.*

The project sought to initiate involvement of communities in the monitoring on turtle nesting and other activities to improve protection of these endangered species. It was an attempt to adopt the approach already in place in Vanuatu which was initiated by the NGO Wan SmolBag. That particular initiative has been very successful in that the network of community turtle monitors covers about 80 per cent of the country. These community monitors work on a volunteer basis.

While the project in Fiji targeted two communities, the opportunity was opened for communities that expressed interest and where community representatives volunteered to participate. The first community workshop was attended by about 30 community representatives from 10 villages. At that meeting, a total of 25 community representatives from 10 villages volunteered to be turtle monitors.

The community volunteer turtle monitors were active in awareness presentations at community meetings, turtle flipper tagging and turtle nesting monitoring. An additional milestone of the project is that 14 community turtle monitors were established as national Fish Wardens for their respective areas. Turtle nesting areas have been traditionally declared in certain areas and the management plan has been endorsed by communities as signed by the Head Turtle Monitors of 2 districts and 1 Province.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** Improved protection of nesting turtle populations in target communities through increased community awareness and involvement in monitoring and protection in Fiji.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
<i>Long term: People of the target communities are better able to manage and conserve turtle populations.</i>	Through the work of the established turtle monitors the communities are able to better manage and conserve turtle populations.
<i>Short term: Improved protection of nesting turtle</i>	Through capacity building and awareness

populations in target communities through increased community awareness and involvement in monitoring and protection	activities, communities, through their representatives who are turtle monitors are able to improve management and conservation of turtle populations. The management plan in place also provides for improved protection and information.
--	---

**Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.**

This project addressed the problem associated with turtle nesting areas and insufficient data/information on sea turtles and increase community awareness and involvement in turtle work leading to improved protection for these endangered species.

The project has achieved its intended objective and performance indicators. Community turtle monitors established under the project are now very active in awareness activities in their respective communities, monitoring turtle nesting, turtle tagging and enforcing the national Fisheries Regulation concerning the turtle moratorium. Several turtle nesting areas have been traditionally declared as protected.

The Management Plan endorsed by communities, as signed by community representatives, provides priority actions to which the monitors are committed to implement.

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

The project targeted two communities and a total of two turtle monitors from each community making the total of four turtle monitors. However, the interest created in the first community awareness workshop was overwhelming in that a total of 10 communities and 25 community representatives volunteered to be turtle monitors. Thus the project did not only exceeded the number of communities targeted but also exceeded the number of community turtle monitors.

In addition, 14 of the community turtle monitors were trained and became Fish Warden under the Fiji Fisheries Regulations concerning the turtle moratorium in Fiji. Thus they are licensed with the mandate to enforce the regulations of the 2009 – 2018 Turtle Moratorium under the Fisheries Regulations.

**IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS**

**Project Outputs:**

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Output 1 : Community awareness on turtles improved</b>  <b>-Improved awareness of local communities on the global and local status of the different species of marine turtles;</b> <b>-Improved awareness and knowledge of communities on aspects of turtle biology, ecology and migration, factors that impact on their population;</b> <b>-Improved knowledge on species identification.</b>	The initial 3-day community workshop and meeting provided the key to the enthusiasm of the community representatives to participate in the project. Presentations on the different aspects, including global and local status of turtles, turtle biology and migration and threats were well understood. On-the-spot translation of the presentation to Fijian when presented in English was helpful.
<i>Indicator 1.1: Presentations, guides and information papers developed/finalized. Compilation submitted.</i>	The presentations prepared for the workshop included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Marine Species Action Plans, including the marine turtle action plan;</li> <li>• Marine Turtle Life Cycle;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine Turtle migration in the Pacific from Satellite Tagging and Flipper Tagging;</li> <li>• Marine Turtle Species Identification;</li> <li>• Marine Turtle Status, Occurrence, Nesting and Species in Fiji;</li> <li>• Marine turtles and climate change;</li> <li>• Marine turtle role in the marine ecosystem;</li> <li>• Why Conserve turtles? Why communities?;</li> <li>• Cultural significance of turtles – conservation of turtles and preservation of local traditions;</li> <li>• Taking up the challenge – options &amp; alternative livelihoods for Communities;</li> <li>• Lessons Learnt from Vanuatu Experience.</li> </ul> <p>These presentations were submitted with the report under <i>Indicator 1.2</i> below.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the following posters were produced under the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Return Turtle Data (both in English and Fijian);</li> <li>• Fiji Turtle Moratorium 2009-2018 (both English and Fijian);</li> <li>• Community Based Turtle Monitoring in Fiji (English).</li> </ul> <p>Copies of these poster were submitted.</p>
<p><i>Indicator 1.2: Community awareness workshops conducted including training on species identification, tagging and record keeping completed.</i></p> <p><i>Report submitted.</i></p>	<p>The initial project workshop was conducted on 26-28 January 2010 in Nakalou village on Vanua Levu Island. This community workshop was attended by 30 community representatives from 10 villages along the Great Sea Reef Area (west/north side of Vanua Levu Island, Fiji).</p> <p>The presentations listed under <i>Indicator 1.1</i> above were presented at this workshop. Presentations given in English were also translated into Fijian, on-the-spot.</p> <p>In addition to the presentations, hands-on training were conducted on species identification, flipper tagging, tissue sample collection and record keeping. These were conducted using two live turtles (greens) caught by Nakalou village fishermen and brought for the exercise. Both turtles were released back to the sea. One was used for satellite tagging training in a sub-regional capacity building workshop conducted in Fiji after the community workshop.</p> <p>The initial community workshop report entitled, <b>Community Turtle Conservation and Monitoring Network in Fiji. Proceedings of the community workshop held in Nakalou village, Macuata Province 26 – 28 January, 2010</b>, was submitted together with some photos.</p> <p>In addition to the workshop and training, 3 community representatives were funded under the project to undertake a study tour in Vanuatu as</p>

	reported under Indicator 2.2 below. This activity improved capacity in turtle nesting monitoring.
<p><i>Indicator 1.3: National partners/consultant workshop conducted.</i></p> <p><i>Report submitted.</i></p>	<p>Prior to the initial community workshop under <i>Indicator 1.2</i> above, a 1-day workshop was conducted on 25 January, 2011 in Labasa, Vanua Levu. This involved the project partners (SPREP, WWF SPPO, Fiji Department of Fisheries and the National Trust of Fiji) with the consultant from Vanuatu Wan SmolBay leading. The presentations by the consultant included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setting up the turtle monitors network – the WSB Experience.</li> <li>• Setting up and Maintaining the network <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Challenges of a national network</i></li> <li>- <i>Activities</i></li> <li>- <i>National turtle tagging programme</i></li> <li>- <i>Turtle nesting beach surveys</i></li> <li>- <i>Annual turtle monitors workshops</i></li> <li>- <i>Roles of stakeholders within the network</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Incentives or Benefits</li> <li>• Taking up the challenge – options &amp; alternative livelihoods for communities</li> <li>• Maintaining the interest - Income generating opportunities within the network</li> <li>• Lessons learnt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What to adopt</li> <li>- what to avoid</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Consultancy report entitled, <b>Community Turtle Monitoring and Network Development in Fiji</b>, was submitted.</p>
<p><i>Indicator 1.4: Report on monitoring produced (covered under Sub-Grant, see 4.2)</i></p>	Refer to <i>Indicator 1.4</i>
<p><b>Output 2: Information on local turtle populations improved through community involvement in monitoring</b></p> <p><b>-Community monitoring designed and implemented by community representatives with assistance from partners;</b></p> <p><b>-Increased stakeholders commitment and involvement in turtle monitoring and conservation effort-</b></p> <p><b>Improved information available on local turtle populations.</b></p>	<p>The data collection form used by Vanuatu communities was modified to suit Fiji conditions. The Fiji form was used by established turtle monitors for recording information on turtle nesting activities and submitted during the 6-monthly meetings together with other activities.</p>
<p><i>Indicator 2.1: Two pilot communities/villages from the district selected and 2 monitors from each selected community/village appointed. Report submitted. (covered under Sub-Grant, 4.3).</i></p>	Refer to <i>Indicator 4.3</i>
<p><i>Indicator 2.2: Study tour to Vanuatu involving community monitors and partners completed. Report by community representatives and partners submitted.</i></p>	<p>Three community representatives from three villages under the CEPF-funded project undertook the study tour to the Tasiriki Village (Moso Island, Vanuatu) Marine Turtle Project on 20-27 February 2010. This was one of the main activities of the project. The overall objective of the study tour was to provide “hands-on” experience for the new Fiji turtle monitors on the work involved as turtle monitors. Thus the tour provided the opportunity to discuss</p>

	<p>community participation, activities undertaken, awareness, protecting nesting turtles and turtle nesting areas, challenges, etc. It also provided the opportunity for training on turtle tagging, conducting beach surveys for turtle nests and record keeping. In addition to the community representatives, a representative from the national partner, WWF SPPO, and SPREP were also involved.</p> <p>The report entitled, <b>Community Turtle Conservation and Monitoring Network (in Fiji). Report of the Study Tour undertaken by the Fiji Community and National Partner Representatives to a Community-based Turtle Monitoring Project in Vanuatu, 20-27 February 2010</b>, was submitted. In addition several photos were also submitted.</p> <p>The turtle nesting monitoring form used by communities in Vanuatu to record information was modified to suit local conditions in Fiji and used by the community turtle monitors. The form was also translated into Fijian for use of monitors.</p>
<i>Indicator 2.3: 6-monthly monitors meetings with partners conducted. (covered under Sub-Grant, 4.4)</i>	Refer to <i>Indicator 4.4</i> below
<i>Indicator 2.4: Monitoring of turtle-related activities and turtle tagging conducted by community monitors (covered under Sub-Grant-see 4.5).</i>	Refer to <i>Indicator 4.5</i> below
<p><b>Output 3: Turtle species in target sites protected</b></p> <p><b>-Management/monitoring plan developed;</b></p> <p><b>-Protected turtle nesting area recommended.</b></p>	The turtle management plan was developed and endorsed by communities as signed by representatives. Several turtle nesting areas were traditionally declared protected. The management plan also calls for increase in area protection for turtle nesting.
<i>Indicator 3.1: Turtle management/monitoring plan drafted and endorsed by communities. (covered under Sub-Grant, 4.6)</i>	Refer <i>Indicator 4.6</i> below
<i>Indicator 3.2: Strategy for implementation of the management plan agreed to by communities. Strategy and report submitted (covered under Sub-Grant, 4.7)</i>	Refer <i>Indicator 4.7</i> below
<b>Output 4: WWF SPP (Sub-Grant) Roles and Responsibilities</b>	
<i>Indicator 4.1: Share 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3</i>	Refer <i>Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 1.3</i> above.
<i>Indicator 4.2: Report on monitoring produced.</i>	<p>Turtle nesting monitoring conducted by the community turtle monitors under the project were compiled and reported during the 6-monthly monitors meeting. Two of these meetings were held during the life of the project and respective reports were written and submitted. The reports on monitoring are contained in the following submitted reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Inaugural Meeting Report Turtle Monitors meeting on Kia Island, Macuata, 7/22/2010.</b></li> <li>• <b>Second meeting report: 'Turtle monitors report and an assessment on the monitoring progress of the Dau ni Vonu network. February 2011.</b></li> </ul>

<p><i>Indicator 4.3: Two pilot communities/villages from the district selected and 2 monitors from each selected community/village appointed. Report submitted.</i></p>	<p>Two communities, Yadua (Bua Province) and Kia (Macuata Province) on Vanua Levu Island were the two targeted communities for the project. Initial consultation with these communities to seek their interest were undertaken in December 2009 by WWF SPPO and the National Trust of Fiji. Word about the project spread via other environment networks in Fiji and created interest in other villages in the two provinces to participate in the project. As a result 10 villages attended the first community workshop as report under <i>Indicator 1.2</i>.</p> <p>During the Initial community workshop reported under <i>Indicator 1.2</i>, a total of 25 individual community representatives from 10 villages volunteered to be community turtle monitors.</p> <p>The selection of the target communities and appointment of community turtle monitors are included in the submitted report, <b>Community Turtle Conservation and Monitoring Network in Fiji. Proceedings of the community workshop held in Nakalou village, Macuata Province 26 – 28 January, 2010</b> (under <i>Indicator 1.2</i>).</p> <p>In addition, a total of 14 community turtle monitors established under the project underwent the Fisheries Department Fish Wardens training in August, 2010. These community monitors are now licensed with the mandate to enforce the regulations of the 2009 – 2018 Turtle Moratorium under the Fisheries Regulations. This was necessary as under the regulations of the Moratorium, it is illegal for any person to handle turtles even for the purposes of research unless licensed / mandated by the Department of Fisheries. Their responsibilities as turtle monitors which includes, ensuring that there is no poaching of turtle eggs or nesters during nesting season, no harvesting of sea turtles and disturbance of nesting or foraging sites and ensuring a permit is acquired from the Department of Fisheries for any use of sea turtles in traditional occasions, has been further strengthened in their capacities as licensed Fish Wardens.</p>
<p><i>Indicator 4.4: 6-monthly monitors meetings with partners conducted.</i></p>	<p>For the duration of the project, national monitor meetings were conducted six months after the start of the project and at the end of 1 year. This is to report on progress, discuss issues and for problem solving. During these meetings, the information and data collected by community monitors were collected and compiled for reporting.</p> <p>The first 6-monthly monitors' meeting was held on 21 July 2010 on Kia Island, Macuata Province. A total of 18 turtle monitors attended the meeting and proceedings are contained the following report which had been submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Inaugural Meeting Report Turtle Monitors meeting on Kia Island, Macuata, 7/22/2010.</b></li> </ul> <p>The last (2<sup>nd</sup>) monitors meeting for the project was</p>

	<p>held in Lakeba Village, Namuka, Macuata Province on 3 December 2010. This monitors meeting was held in conjunction with a marine turtle awareness workshop conducted for the Namuka District. Apart from reporting on progress, discussion on issues and problem solving, this meeting also involved development of a management/monitoring plan for community endorsement. Although endorsement was not possible at the meeting, this was obtained prior to the submission of the Project Final Report. Due to bad weather, only four communities/villages (<i>Nakalou, Raviravi, Mali, and Kavewa</i>), were able to be present. However, a subsequent meeting was held to cater for the Bua turtle monitors in Yadua on 19 January 2011 at which all were present except for the monitor from Yaqaga village. Thus, of the 10 sites that implement the concept, nine were consulted throughout this process. Proceedings of the last 6-monthly monitors meeting and subsequent meeting on Yadua are recorded in the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Second meeting report: "Turtle monitors report and an assessment on the monitoring progress of the Dau ni Vonu network". February 2011.</b></li> </ul>
<p><i>Indicator 4.5: Monitoring of turtle-related activities and turtle tagging conducted by community monitors</i></p>	<p>Apart from turtle nesting monitoring, the turtle monitors were also involved turtle flipper tagging, monitoring of turtle use in traditional activities allowed via permits, and conducting awareness presentations at community meetings. These are contained in the 6-monthly monitors meeting reports submitted and produced under <i>Indicator 4.4</i> above.</p>
<p><i>Indicator 4.6: Turtle management/monitoring plan drafted and endorsed by communities.</i></p>	<p>During the second 6-monthly monitors meeting in December 2010, the turtle management/ monitoring plan was developed using the Project and Programme Management strategy. The plan was completed and endorsed by Head Turtle Monitors representing three districts. The plan is called <b><i>Dau ni Vonu (Turtle Monitors) action plan for the management of marine turtles along the Great Sea Reef, Fiji Islands, 2011 – 2015</i></b>, submitted together with the second monitors meeting report under 4.4.</p> <p>In addition to the Management Plan, communities from the Bua and Macuata provinces have traditionally declared protection for the critical nesting sites for sea turtles as a result of the project. The areas declared include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upper Macuata (District): Nukuvadra and Katawaqa Islands;</li> <li>• Qoliqoli Cokovata (District) : All turtle nesting sites;</li> <li>• Bua Province: All turtle nesting sites around Yadua waters.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Indicator 4.7: Strategy for implementation of the management plan agreed to by communities. Strategy and report submitted</i></p>	<p>The strategy for implementation of the management plan is incorporated in the <b><i>Dau ni Vonu (Turtle Monitors) action plan for the management of marine turtles along the Great Sea Reef, Fiji Islands, 2011 – 2015</i></b>. This comprises of activities</p>

	<p>and targets.</p> <p>The project partners are seeking funding for the continuation of the project particularly the implementation for the management plan.</p>
--	--

***Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.***

The project successfully delivered the intended outputs. Even though some activities were delayed due to circumstances, they were however delivered. Having an active national partner working on the similar subject matter and familiar with the targeted areas is a real advantage in progressing this project to deliver intended outputs. Having sufficient funds also played a major part in ensuring that the project progressed on a timely basis.

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

There are no outputs that were not realized.

**V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

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

The project did not involve activities that were likely to have adverse impacts on the environment or on local communities.

**VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT**

***Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF’s future performance.***

Having an active partner in-country is vital to the success of the project. In addition, as was the case with this project, the partner be familiar with the communities targeted and communicate well in the local languages. It is also important that local traditional protocols are followed/performed as it can be a big determining factor in the acceptability of the project and thus the success of the undertaking.

Flexibility to accommodate more, is important, where resources are determined sufficient, and in line with the focus of the project. E.g. the project was able to accommodate additional communities and establish more community turtle monitors when additional communities expressed interest in participation. However, this should not deter project from losing its focus.

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

Developing realistic activities within the resources (both implementing agencies manpower and financial resources requested for the project) is important. Budgeting, allowing for worst cases scenario where applicable, is also vital to the progress and eventual successful completion of any project. Under-estimating costs leads to frustration, activity delays and eventual failure of a project.



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

Where more than one agency is involved, allocation of responsibilities and their clarification and agreement prior to commencement is vital. This can be done via a Letter of Agreement. This strategy facilitated successful implementation of this project. Consistent communication, to ensure timely implementation, with all stakeholders through the execution of the project is important in maintaining the momentum and interest.

<b>VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING</b>
--------------------------------

**Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.**

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
SPREP		US\$25,000	Towards time and travel of SPREP officer to Fiji and Vanuatu for project activities, equipment and communication
WWF South Pacific Programme		US\$8,000	Staff time and other miscellaneous expenses on the project

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

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

**Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.**

The project will continue and expand in Fiji and project partners are seeking funding for its sustainability, implementation of management plan and expansion to new communities.

<b>VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
--

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

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

Name: Lui Bell

Organization name: SPREP

Mailing address: PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa

Tel: +685 21929 Ext 281 or +685 66281

Fax: +685 20231

E-mail: [LuiB@sprep.org](mailto:LuiB@sprep.org)