CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	National Trust of Fiji
Project Title:	Economic Valuation of Biological Diversity in the Sovi Basin Conservation Site.
Date of Report:	8 April 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Elizabeth Erasito eerasito@nationaltrust.org.fj

CEPF Region: Polynesia and Micronesia

Strategic Direction: 2 – Site Conservation

Grant Amount: USD 20,000

Project Dates: 01 April 2012 to 30 November 2012

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

National Trust of Fiji (NTF)
NTF will provide access to office facilities, arrangement of accommodation and local travel, scheduling of interviews with government and conservation partners.

Conservation International
Conservation International will provide a dedicated vehicle to support transportation of the Consultant and team during information gathering and field work.

TEV Consultant
TEV Consultant will undertake the required study.

Conservation Impacts

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

Work on the TEV study has strengthened the conservation status and management of Sovi Basin Conservation Area and Korobasabasaga Range which are identified as key biodiversity areas under Site Prioritization.

Examination of the important services provided the Sovi Basin Conservation Area have identified:

- Provision services: fresh water, food
- Regulatory services - climate regulation, water regulation and supply, nutrient regulation, pollination
- Cultural services - archaeological, recreational, educational, aesthetic
- Supporting services – water and nutrient cycles.

A key conservation goal of the Sovi Basin Conservation Area is its protection from extractive industries. Presentations and consultations on this project to the National Environment Council, Fiji National

Protected Area Committee, Ministry for National Planning committee looking at the proposed water and hydro-dam for the SBCA has enabled dialogue with different government stakeholders on how the determination of the economic valuation of the Sovi Basin Conservation Area can lead to the safeguarding and restoration of threatened species of ecological and cultural significance.

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

Projected Results/Impacts

The project was to undertake a total economic valuation of biodiversity in the Sovi Basin to estimate the value of ecosystem flows that will be foregone and the estimated cost to Government for infrastructure and other inputs necessary required to replace and maintain the same services that have been foregone as a result of allowing tailing dam in the conservation area.

In particular, the economic analysis was to focus on the cost of replacing loss of endemic species habitat, security of freshwater source, loss of food sources and impact of climate change from the mining activities.

The result of the analysis will be used to advise Government on the full cost of the impact of the mining activity as it will take into account market and non-market cost. The result should also highlight the cost to government for maintaining treated water as well as dredging cost that are associated with loss of natural freshwater system and siltation run-off from the open mine proposed by NJV.

Actual Results/Impacts

1. An intensive literature survey and secondary data collection was undertaken :

- National infrastructure development cost statistics
- National tourism, agricultural, forestry and fisheries statistics
- National hydrological, biological, climatic and geological data
- Economic valuation studies in country
- Local ecological knowledge, land use cover information, and Household survey data for the Sovi Basin Conservation Area

2. Presentations on this project and discussions with key informants were made to the following:

- Minister for Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment
- National Environment Council
- Fiji National Protected Area Committee
- Ministry for National Planning committee looking at establishing a proposed water and hydro-dam for the SBCA

3. Impacts resulting from these consultations and presentations:

- Government decision to suspend a decision on the proposed lease of the Wainavadu Valley to either the National Trust of Fiji or Namosi Joint Venture until the government has completed an exhaustive and detailed analysis of the situation.
- Incorporation of economic valuation into the Terms of Reference for the Feasibility study for a proposed water and hydro dam within the Sovi Basin Conservation Area.
- Enabled greater and improved dialogue with key government and other stakeholders regarding impacts and issues around mining.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 16,300
Species Conserved:
Corridors Created:

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

The project was not successfully completed within the timeframe provided due to delays in acquiring a consultant to undertake the TEV study. The Call for Expressions of Interest in the TEV Consultancy was made through the Pacific Resource and Environmental Economics Network (PREEN). Whilst the initial responses were positive, the selected consultant was later unable to accept the consultancy due to his commitments. A second Call for Expressions was made with no positive feedback. Positive responses and commitment to the consultancy was achieved in December 2012.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Given the delays in identifying a consultant for the study, the NTF commenced with the data collection and consultations and presentations from July 2012 to November 2012.

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)

The TOR did not place much emphasis on the national policies associated with economic valuation of ecosystems. Whist this is perhaps not directly present in Fiji, it would have been useful to have had a better understanding of the relevant policies present that may create an enabling mechanism for economic valuation of ecosystems and understanding its importance as a "goods and service" for the nation.

In order for the TEV to be fully effective, a thorough stakeholder analysis should be carried out to determine the key stakeholders who will be impacted by the activity in the Sovi Conservation Area and to identify the types of decisions that will need to be made. These discussions should also be held with the landowner communities. Once all key stakeholders are consulted the key values of the Sovi Basin Conservation Area to be measured and how these are to be measured will be identified. Given that values change over time, this was perhaps an area of weakness in the project design, as the collation of household survey data was based on the socio-economic survey results of 2008. The project design provided for field observations and questionnaires however these were not implemented as these were to be conducted by the consultant.

Having a good team to undertake the study is necessary to its success. The NTF would have benefitted/progressed better if a TEV 'expert' or 'advisory' committee had been identified prior to

commencing with the project. Whilst efforts were made to seek assistance from IUCN, this did not progress as anticipated.

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

As this project was mainly desk based research, the collation of data was very well executed.

Whilst the project timeframe was adequate for the proposed activities, the time taken to identify consultants in this field took too long. It is important to have a database of consultants in this field prior to commencing the project.

It was an advantage to use the structure of the Fiji National Protected Areas Committee to reach the relevant government authorities for meetings and presentations.

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
CI	B	5000	

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.

The proposed project is a short term consultancy which may be replicated across the Protected Area network in Fiji to estimate monetary value of ecosystem services derived from natural ecosystem such regulating climatic conditions, supporting freshwater systems and flow, ensuring availability of food

security, maintaining wealth to resource owners, sustaining species habitat as well as supporting cultural services.

The TEV consultant was anticipated to use standard methodologies in place in accordance to best practices and expected to incorporate use and non-use values, options and existence values as well as market and non-market values.

Whilst the consultant did not undertake the technical analysis, it was possible for the NTF to undertake the preliminary research and consultation required. In order to be able to conduct this study in more areas around Fiji, it is possible to consider a partnership arrangement whereby the primary and secondary research for the TEV study are undertaken by the host organization in consultation with the TEV expert consultant. This would have several positive impacts to the sustainability of the project such as to reduce the cost of implementing the study, contribute to local capacity building, whilst retaining ownership of the process nationally.

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.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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: Elizabeth Erasito
Organization name: National Trust of Fiji
Mailing address: PO Box 2089, Govt. Bldgs, SUVA, FIJI
Tel: 679 3301807
Fax: 679 3305092
E-mail: eerasito@nationaltrust.org.fj

*****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.

Project Results	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.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Yes	16,300	16,300	Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one. Sovi Basin Conservation Area
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.	Yes	16,300	16,300	Sovi Basin Conservation Area
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 1below.	No			

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

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
									Increased Income due to:												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	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
Total																					

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