

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Auckland UniServices Limited
Project Title:	Developing Long-term Capacity for Invasive Species Management in the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot
Date of Report:	
Report Author and Contact Information	

CEPF Region: Polynesia-Micronesia

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 1: Prevent, control and eradicate invasive species in key biodiversity areas

Grant Amount: USD \$131,000

Project Dates: June 1, 2009-June 30, 2011

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

- New Zealand Department of Conservation (DOC): Provision of skilled invasive species specialists to assist with the design and implementation of the project.
- Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP): Alignment of work with the *Guidelines for Invasive Species Management in the Pacific*.
- Pacific Invasives Learning Network (PILN): Assistance with contacts for country invasive species teams and dissemination of information.
- Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research Ltd.: Provision of technical advice especially on any research needed for CEPF grantee agencies to implement their projects.
- Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG): Provision of information on invasive species in the Pacific.

Conservation Impacts

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

The importance of invasive species management in the conservation of Pacific biodiversity is being acknowledged and acted upon by more and more agencies as capability and confidence grow. Of the three Strategic Directions funded by CEPF investment, the majority of applications approved (45%) were in Strategic Direction 1: Prevent, control and eradicate invasive species in key biodiversity areas.

PII contributed to the growth of confidence and capability by supporting CEPF grantees with authoritative technical assistance, provision of best practice knowledge and skills and training in the development and implementation of their projects. Many of the projects that PII assisted are in important terrestrial conservation areas. Of these, 20 are Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA), 10 are Important Bird Areas (IBA), 5 are Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites, 4 are Endemic

Bird Areas (EBA), 4 are Marine Reserves, 2 are World Heritage Sites and 1 is a Wildlife Sanctuary.

The grantees supported by PII were working on projects involving the following endangered species:

Common Name	Scientific Name	Red List Status
Birds - pelagic:		
Fiji petrel	<i>Pseudobulweria macgillivray</i>	Critically Endangered
Henderson petrel	<i>Pterodroma atrata</i>	Endangered
Phoenix petrel	<i>Pterodroma alba</i>	Endangered
Wedge-tailed shearwater	<i>Puffinus pacificus</i>	Least Concern*
Birds - terrestrial and shore:		
Bokikokiko	<i>Acrocephalus aequinoctialis</i>	Endangered
Bristle-thighed Curlew	<i>Numenius tahitiensis</i>	Vulnerable
Fatu Hiva Monarch	<i>Pomarea nigra</i>	Critically Endangered
Friendly Ground Dove	<i>Gallinucula stuarti</i>	Vulnerable
Henderson crane	<i>Porzana atra</i>	Vulnerable
Henderson lorikeet	<i>Vini stephensi</i>	Vulnerable
Henderson fruit-dove	<i>Ptilinopus insularis</i>	Vulnerable
Henderson reed-warbler	<i>Acrocephalus taiti</i>	Vulnerable
Island Kingfishers	<i>Todiramphus gambieri</i>	Critically Endangered
Micronesian megapode	<i>Megapodius laperouse</i>	Endangered
Polynesian Ground Dove	<i>Gallinucula erythroptera</i>	Critically Endangered
Polynesian Megapode	<i>Megapodius pritchardii</i>	Endangered
Ratak Imperial Pigeon	<i>Ducula oceanica Ratakensis</i>	Near Threatened
Rimatara Lorikeet	<i>Vini kuhlii</i>	Endangered
Tooth-billed pigeon	<i>Diduculus strigirostris</i>	Endangered
Samoa broadbill	<i>Myiagra albiventris</i>	Vulnerable
Tahiti Monarch	<i>Pomarea whitneyi</i>	Critically Endangered
Mammals:		
Marianas flying fox	<i>Pteropus mariannus</i>	Endangered
Samoa flying fox	<i>Pteropus samoensis</i>	Near Threatened
Plants:		
Meryta	<i>Meryta brachyopoda</i>	Critically Endangered
Reptiles		
Fijian Banded Iguana	<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>	Critically Endangered
Fijian Crested Iguana	<i>Brachylophus vitiensis</i>	Critically Endangered
Green Turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	Endangered
Hawksbill Turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>	Critically Endangered

*Locally threatened in Fiji (BirdLife Pacific)

In addition to endangered species, there were grantee projects supported by PII that addressed the Pohnpei Watershed Forest and Fiji Tropical Dry Forest threatened ecosystems.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

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

To aid the CEPF in maximizing the effectiveness of its investment in Strategic Direction 1 for the Polynesian-Micronesian Biodiversity Hotspot.

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

As the technical partner to the CEPF on Strategic Direction 1, PII contributed to the effectiveness of the CEPF investment by strengthening the invasive species management capacity and increasing the confidence of CEPF grantees. PII worked with 17 grantees from 11 countries and territories on a total of 26 projects. These grantees gained knowledge and skills for immediate use on their projects and that provide the foundation for future capacity development within these agencies.

In addition, as a member of the Technical Advisory Group, PII contributed to decision-making for the CEPF investment by reviewing proposals, assisting with project selection and providing technical advice to the Regional Implementation Team.



Pita Biciloa, ranger at Yadua Taba Iguana Reserve, Fiji, removing *Leucaena leucocephala* saplings during the PII Invasive Plant Project Management training course. (Photo: Glen Coulston)

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

To ensure CEPF grantees have the capacity necessary to successfully complete their CEPF-funded invasive species management projects.

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

PII's contribution to the development of invasive species management capacity and confidence in CEPF grantees has helped increase conservation action in the Pacific. As well as providing assistance to 85% of the projects in Strategic Direction 1, PII also helped with seven projects from the other two Strategic Directions that had invasive species components.

This assistance contributed to the effectiveness of the CEPF investment in Strategic Direction 1 by; assessing grantee needs, providing best practice advice, reviewing and guiding project documents, developing and delivering training and skill sharing opportunities, sourcing and coordinating subject matter experts, sourcing equipment and mentoring staff. PII also assisted at the decision-making level as a member of the Technical Advisory Group.

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.

PII had long-term relationships with many of the grantees assisted and the time previously invested in developing trusting relationships and networks showed its value as those with longer experience were able to make better use of PII services. These grantees were confident in approaching PII and seeking support. They were also better able to use the technical assistance provided as they already had a foundation level of knowledge and skills which allowed them to continue with long-term projects or start new ones.

This project also successfully introduced new grantees to invasive species management. However, working with agencies for the first time was challenging. Those new to invasive species management are often overwhelmed by its complexity and the commitment and effort required to be successful. Establishing relationships with grantees and helping them to unravel this complexity took significant time and dedication.

Invasive species management is still a new discipline for many conservation practitioners and this is reflected in the level of knowledge, skills and standard procedures of grantee agencies. Grantees need long-term support and encouragement to strengthen confidence and competence and to ensure that best practice becomes a routine procedure in their agency.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

No.



Community leaders and Government of Samoa staff receive training in ant identification at the PII Island Biosecurity training course in Samoa. (Photo: Bill Nagle)

Project Components

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

Component 1 Planned

Support for CEPF grantee organisations to develop proposals, assess, design and implement their invasive species management projects is provided as requested.

Component 1 Actual

PII responded to all requests for assistance. These came from a wide range of grantee agencies (NGOs, private sector, CROP, Quasi-governmental). The variety of projects required many different types of support varying from sourcing and supplying technical information to

coordinating and leading a feasibility study and included developing and delivering training courses. Through this work, PII continued to strengthen existing relationships with grantees and develop relationships with new grantees working on invasive species management in the Pacific.



The feral goat eradication feasibility study team with goat musterers on Monuriki Island, Fiji.
(Photo: Bill Nagle)

Technical services:

The most common requests were for the planning and implementation of rodent and invasive plant projects. Other target species included an invertebrate, a reptile, and feral goats and cats. Assistance to grantees ranged from; helping with proposals, coordinating and leading a feasibility study team for goat eradication, helping to design projects, operational planning and implementation. Some of our responses were straightforward advice about species, but some involved complex advice in relation to toxicants, baits, traps, firearms, permits and biosecurity. We also sourced and briefed subject matter experts and provided on-going mentoring of key staff in grantee agencies.

Knowledge and skills strengthened:

PII encouraged grantees to follow best practice and discussions about capacity needs resulted in many grantees taking advantage of PII and other specialist input to their projects (ant identification, biosecurity, wildlife health and captive husbandry, invasive species eradications (plants, goats, cats, rats, iguana, mongoose), invasive species control, native pigeon conservation, wildlife monitoring) as well as review of project documents.

Further capacity was built through the development and delivery of formal training, as well as “on-the-job” training made possible by the significant in-kind contributions leveraged by PII from its networks. These activities have given grantees new knowledge and skills and exposed them to best practice methods for their projects. Some participants have showed behavioural changes in their work activities following the training and others have passed on their knowledge to other staff and community groups. PII invited the Coordinator of the Pacific Invasives Learning Network (PILN) to the PII Resource Kit training course to familiarise himself with the Resource Kit, encourage country teams to use the Kit and identify potential training participants.

Specialist inputs into projects	PII sourced and briefed subject matter experts to provide specialised technical input into grantee projects. Most of this input was face-to-face, but some advice was given remotely. Target species included invertebrates, mammals, reptiles and invasive plants.
Peer review of key project documents	As part of its commitment to best practice, PII encouraged grantees to have project documents independently reviewed and arranged for the reviews. Subject matter experts were engaged when expertise outside of the PII team was required.
Facilitate and coordinate training activities	Five training courses (Island Biosecurity (2), Invasive Plant Project Management (2), Eradicating rodents and cats on Islands) were developed and delivered to 42 participants. Follow-up invasive plant training was delivered for the Conservation Society of Pohnpei.
Facilitate and coordinate skills exchanges	Four on-the-job training activities were organized and led by PII for grantee agencies. These covered rodent and goat eradication, rodent and cat control and invasive plant management.

Sharing lessons learned:

As well as responding to individual grantees, PII disseminated information on best practice, current developments and project progress through its website, quarterly Newsletter, Facebook page and presentations in meetings and conferences.

Component 2 Planned

Support to CEPF Regional Implementing Team is provided as requested.

Component 2 Actual

As the technical partner to the CEPF on SD1 and a member of the Technical Advisory Group, PII contributed to decision-making by reviewing proposals, assisting with project selection and providing technical advice to the Regional Implementation Team.

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

None.



Anne Gouni (L) of SOP-Manu discussing eradication planning with a subject matter expert in Auckland, New Zealand. (Photo: Marleen Baling)

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

PII produced a one-page information sheet on its services for the CEPF-RIT to attach to introductory emails to CEPF grantees.

Grantees were encouraged to use the PII Project Process (a six-stage systematic approach to planning and implementing invasive species management projects – Appendices 1 and 2) in the development of best practice for their projects.

Many of the tools and guidelines developed for the PII Resource Kit (the world's first best-practice process for managers of rodent and cat eradication projects) were used by grantees in their projects < <http://pacificinvasivesinitiative.org/rk/index.html> >. Many of the tools and process are generic and can be applied to other invasive species management projects. (Development and production of the PII Resource Kit was funded by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the NZ Aid Programme).

The “*How to eradicate rodents and cats from islands training course*” which showed practitioners how to take full advantage of the power of the Resource Kit was attended by CEPF grantees from Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, New Caledonia and Samoa and the PILN Coordinator. A report on the training is at < <http://pacificinvasivesinitiative.org/rk/index.html> >.

Posters were prepared in three languages and used in the Island Biosecurity training course < http://pacificinvasivesinitiative.org/awareness_materials.html >.

A flat database (spreadsheets) was developed and used in the Invasive Plant Project Management training course. This is currently being refined as the course is being reviewed.

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)

This project was successful because we were responsive to agencies needs and adopted a consultative and participatory approach.

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

Being recognised as the leading capacity development agency for invasive species management in the region, having established long-term relationships and being able to complement our capacity through our extensive networks were aspects that made the implementation of this project a success.

The main challenge faced by this project was that of time. Developing capacity and building confidence takes time, there are no short-cuts. Collating, analyzing and delivering technical information and advice to grantees in a package that was useable for them is one side of the equation; the other side was the time that grantees had to process it before they had to apply it.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

- Building strong, long-term, trusting and respectful relationships with grantees is essential. Capacity cannot be developed quickly. A one-off project is a good start, but long-term commitment is required. All parties involved in capacity development need to be open and honest from the start and agree to periodically review each parties’ progress against agreed capacity development goals and objectives.

- The capacity development process must be led by the grantee. The need for capacity development has to be recognised and owned by the grantee and there is a greater chance that capacity will be strengthened when decision-makers show leadership and embrace learning as part of their organisation’s culture.

- Capacity development requires long-term commitment.

Many, if not most, staff in conservation agencies in the Pacific are ‘all-rounders’ working on many different aspects of conservation projects. Invasive species management requires specialist knowledge and skills which can only be developed over time. The commitment required for an agency to develop invasive species management capacity of its staff is often underestimated.

- Capacity development is a process, not just delivery of one-off training events.

Capable practitioners require encouragement, opportunities to keep on developing confidence in their role and opportunities to share their knowledge, skills and experiences with others. There is a need to regularly reinforce knowledge and skills. Staff turnover in agencies also means that regular development of capacity is required. Funders and capacity development providers must plan for this.

- Capacity development does not work to a recipe

Best practice must be the goal at all times, but grantee knowledge and skills and project requirements mean that innovative solutions/methods have to be developed. One size does not fit all and a flexible and adaptable approach is required.



Milika Ratu of the National Trust of the Fiji Islands receiving telemetry instruction from a volunteer at Ark in the Park in Auckland, New Zealand. (Photo: Bill Nagle)

Additional Funding

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

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
NZ Aid Programme	A	\$NZ57,547	Core funding, sourcing subject matter experts for training and feasibility study
Packard Foundation	A	\$NZ15,017	Grantee participation in PII Resource Kit training

**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.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

N/A

Additional Comments/Recommendations

CEPF should consider a consolidation phase to 'cement-in' the gains made by the investment to date.

Any future funding in the region should target agencies/projects that have benefitted from the CEPF investment. This would help consolidate gains made, including capacity developed for invasive species management.

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:

Name:

Souad Boudjelas

Organization name:

Auckland UniServices Ltd for Pacific Invasives Initiative

Mailing address:

Auckland UniServices Ltd
Private Bag 92019
Auckland Mail Centre
New Zealand

Tel:

+64 9 373 7522

Fax:

+64 9 373 7412

E-mail:

s.boudjelas@auckland.ac.nz

Appendix 1

The PII Project Process



The stages of the PII Project Process



Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6
Project Selection	Feasibility Study	Project Design	Operational Planning	Implementation	Sustaining the Project
1.1 Define the selection criteria and weightings	2.1 Consult stakeholders	3.1 Consult stakeholders	4.1 Consult stakeholders	5.1 Consult stakeholders	6.1 Continue stakeholder engagement
1.2 Score the project Ideas	2.2 Describe the site	3.2 Describe the site and target species	4.2 Secure consents and permits	5.2 Implement biosecurity prevention	6.2 Continue biosecurity prevention
1.3 Notify the stakeholders	2.3 Describe the Target Species	3.3 Define the goal, objectives and outcomes	4.3 Resolve any identified issues	5.3 Train the team	6.3 Prepare for biosecurity incursion response
Project Selection Spreadsheet	2.4 Define the goal, objectives and outcomes	3.4 Describe the project approach	4.4 Describe the problem	5.4 Source the services	6.4 Commence biosecurity surveillance
	2.5 Start the 'Can It Be Done?' section	3.5 Plan stakeholder engagement	4.5 Plan the details of the eradication operation	5.5 Source the Equipment	6.5 Respond to possible incursions
	2.6 Complete the site visit biosecurity assessment	3.6 Define the project governance	4.6 Plan how to manage the non-target species risks	5.6 Complete the remaining pre-operation tasks	6.6 Conduct post-operation monitoring
	2.7 Visit the site and update the 'Can It Be Done?' section	3.7 Define project outcome monitoring	4.7 Plan how to manage the environmental effects	5.7 Conduct a readiness check	6.7 Complete a project report
	2.8 Assess the feasibility of the project	3.8 Plan the project timeline	4.8 Plan the monitoring	5.8 Do pre-operational monitoring	6.8 Notify the stakeholders
	2.9 Complete the feasibility study report	3.9 Estimate project costs	4.9 Plan the biosecurity	5.9 Hold a pre-operation briefing	Project Report
	2.10 Notify the stakeholders	3.10 Plan the project risk management	4.10 Plan the safety of people	5.10 Conduct the eradication operation	
	Feasibility Study Report	3.11 Complete the project plan	4.11 Plan the logistics	5.11 Conduct post-operation tasks	
		3.12 Notify the stakeholders	4.12 Prepare an equipment list	5.12 Hold a post-operation debriefing	
		Project Plan	4.13 Plan the operation task schedule	5.13 Notify the stakeholders	
			4.14 Decide the eradication operation team	Operational Review	
			4.15 Complete the operational plan		
			4.16 Notify the Stakeholders		
			Operational Plan		
			Biosecurity Plan		
			Monitoring Plan		



Plan to succeed