

## CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Te rau ati ati a tau a hiti noa tu
<b>Project Title:</b>	Feasibility Study on the Restoration and Conservation of Remnant Native Forests on Maraeti'a Plateau, Punaruu Valley, Tahiti, French Polynesia
<b>Date of Report:</b>	February 2013
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Ravahere Taputuarai : rtaputuarai@gmail.com

**CEPF Region:** Polynesia - Micronesia

**Strategic Direction:** 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

**Funding Request Amount –** 18 950 USD

**Grant Amount:** 18 950 USD

**Project Dates:** January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012

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

**Association pour la protection de la vallée de la Punaruu (NGO, French Polynesia) :** This local NGO, in charge of the management of the upper part of the Punaruu valley, helped in organizing and facilitating the field trip to Maraeti'a plateau by cleaning and securing the trails, bringing water and food supplies to the site prior to the field trip, setting up the base camp, and guiding and helping the different groups on the plateau;

**Pacific Invasive Initiative (NGO, New Zealand) :** PII provided its expertise in conducting feasibility studies on Pacific islands. PII's experts were in charge of the feasibility study report, they investigated every component of the project (environmental, social, political), and gathered and coordinated data obtained from the field trip, discussions with community people, and inputs from the other experts;

**Department of Conservation (Government of New Zealand) :** DoC's experts assessed the feasibility of controlling rat populations on Maraeti'a plateau, demonstrated and explained to the community the different methods and tools used in New Zealand for rat control, and provided inputs not only in the design of a rodent control program but also in the design of an ungulate-proof fence;

**The Auwahi and Leeward Haleakala Watershed Restoration Partnership (NGO, Hawaii - USA) :** ALHWRP's experts assessed the feasibility of managing invasive plant species and restoring the native vegetation, shared their experience in a similar project on the island of Maui and provided inputs in the design of an ungulate proof fence.

**Délégation à la Recherche (Research department, Government of French Polynesia) :** REC provided its long-time expertise in French Polynesia's ecology and botany and helped in the implementation of the feasibility study.

## Conservation Impacts

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

***Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.***

As stated in the approved proposal, the study assessed the feasibility of :

1. Constructing an ungulate exclusion fence around an approximately 2 hectare area (the proposed protection area) of the Maraeti'a plateau: this has been judged feasible. Designs, the range of cost options for an ungulate-proof fence and the size of the area to protect have been discussed with the experts;
2. Undertaking a rodent control program: judged feasible pending the implementation of a well-conceived program. Different control and monitoring methods have been discussed; a control of rat populations over the whole Maraeti'a plateau (20 hectares) and accessible sidings has been approved and thought more efficient than a control program restricted to the protected area, as proposed in the approved proposal;
3. Managing invasive plant species within the proposed protection area: judged feasible. Different management options for invasive species have been suggested.

The experts also inquired about the different components of the project, not mentioned in the approved proposal, namely the social, legal, political and environmental components. A meeting was organized at the Mairie de Punaauia with the Maire and collaborators in charge of the environment, with representatives of governmental agencies (department of research, department of the environment), local groups ("association des cueilleurs d'orange", hunters), the media (La Dépêche) and the invited experts. The Maire and his staff were very supportive for the Maraeti'a restoration project, which was included in the Management Plan of the Punaruu valley ("Livre Blanc de la Punaruu") as a future priority conservation project.

This project delivered a feasibility study report including the experts' observations and recommendations for the implementation of the project.

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

**Hectares Protected:** N/A

**Species Conserved:** N/A

**Corridors Created:** N/A

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

The current project is a feasibility study. All the objectives, previously cited, have already been accomplished.

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

There were no unexpected impacts.

## 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.**

The valuable lesson learned is that to implement this type of project, the involvement and support of the community is necessary. This has been obtained through several meetings and public consultations prior to the experts' visit. The field trip has been greatly facilitated by the involvement of the hunters and orange gatherers of the valley. For the future project to be sustainable, the needs and objections of the people from the community will have to be taken into account in its design.

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

Maraeti'a is very remote; the hike to access the plateau is long and exhausting. The field trip's success was mainly due to the intense preparation in advance of the experts' visit. Meetings with people knowledgeable of the valley, information on the experts' physical conditions and eventual health issues, and consideration of worst case scenarios and contingency plans, were all vital for the detailed planning of the trip and its eventual success.

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

The site visit conducted for the feasibility study, despite its difficult access, was a success due to the experts' and community people's motivation for the project to succeed. Again, the implication of the community was a key factor in the success of the field trip.

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

### ADDITIONAL FUNDING

**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.**

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

**\*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** Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)
- C** Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)

### Sustainability/Replicability

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

Not relevant; the project is a feasibility study.

*Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.*

Idem

### **Safeguard Policy Assessment**

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

The project is a feasibility study. We are not at the stage of the implementation of the recommendations yet.

### **Additional Comments/Recommendations**

None

### **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: Ravahere Taputuarai

Organization name: Te rau ati ati a tau a hiti noa tu

Mailing address: BP 5819, 98716 Pirae, Tahiti, Polynésie française

Tel: (+689) 712727

Fax:

E-mail: [rtaputuarai@gmail.com](mailto:rtaputuarai@gmail.com)

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

**Performance Tracking Report Addendum**

**CEPF Global Targets**

**(Enter Grant Term)**

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.  
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

<b>Project Results</b>	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	<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.	No			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
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.	No			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	No			

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



