

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Te Ipukarea Society
Project Title:	The Sustainable Management of Rarotonga Flycatcher and its Habitat
Date of Report:	
Report Author and Contact Information	Kelvin Passfield. Kelvin.passfield@gmail.com

CEPF Region: Polynesia-Micronesia

Strategic Direction: 2. Strengthen the conservation status and management of (2 of) 60 key biodiversity areas

Grant Amount: \$ 102,200

Project Dates: September 1, 2009-December 31, 2013

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

**Takitumu Conservation Area (TCA). On the ground implementation of the work
Te Ipukarea Society Inc. Project management and reporting**

Conservation Impacts

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

This project has contributed to the preservation of the POLYNESIA-MICRONESIA BIODIVERSITY HOTSPOT by removing rodents from the Takitumu Conservation Area in Rarotonga, one of the KBAs in the region, and also supporting bird conservation work in Atiu Both TCA and Atiu are included in the CEPF profile as priority sites

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

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

The long-term objective of this project is the establishment of an adequately-funded Conservation Trust as a means for the perpetual conservation of the forests in the Takitumu Conservation Area (TCA) (CEPF Site #4) as well as contributing to the conservation management of Atiu (CEPF site #1). The development and management of this Conservation Area by the three landowning families should result in the maintenance of viable populations of Kakerori (CEPF species #413) on Rarotonga and Atiu (CEPF Site #1). In this way, the project addresses one strategic direction (SD2), but contributes to two other strategic directions of the CEPF Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot Ecosystem Profile/ CEPF investment.

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion: During the design of this project, assumptions were made that a Trust could be established and it would be straight forward. The Trust has not been established, as the landowners are apprehensive and they feel the land will be alienated indefinitely. The suggestion of an easement/covenant seemed to have more appeal, as this could result in leaving ownership fully retained but activities restricted However, this too was not able to be progressed, largely due to the

key person in the lanowners committee becoming quite ill, and nobody stepping up to fill this role effectively.

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

The short-term impacts will be to keep the Kakerori from slipping back into the critically endangered threat category of IUCN/ BirdLife, to allow measurement of the effectiveness of a new rat poisoning regime in the TCA, and to improve the genetic structure of the Atiu 'insurance' population of Kakerori, This ongoing success of this work is absolutely critical to being able to engage landowners and stakeholders in the development of a legal TCA Trust aimed at ensuring the long-term protection of the TCA, and especially to gain the necessary institutional and individual donor funding needed to sufficiently build up a trust fund to be able to maintain the values of the Conservation Area in perpetuity out of interest gained.

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

Kakerori numbers continue to increase, with in excess of 350 birds 10 Kakerori successfully transferred to Atiu in August 2011, improving the genetic base for that population.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: **155**
Species Conserved: **Kakerori**
Corridors Created:

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

The major difficulty was that the land tenure system in the Cook Islands did not lend itself to the establishment of a trust. This was always something that was felt to be being pushed from outside, and there was little support from within. There are just too many landowners to agree on giving up all rights to that land in the future. A decision was made to pursue an easement or covenant in place of the trust, but due to the illness of the key player in this, no progress was made.

The short term impacts we met with no difficulty.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

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: Project Management

Component 1 Actual at Completion: **The project management did suffer due to the illness of the TCA project manager. Despite this, the short term objectives were met, but the long term objective from Component 2 will require more work. Though we were late getting some reports in, due in part to changes in project management, we did manage to catch up in the end.**

Component 2 Planned: Subgrant to Takitumu Conservation Area (TCA) for Project Activities

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

This component also suffered due to the illness mentioned above. Despite this, the TCA buildings were completed to the extent possible. School visits we completed according to the project proposal, and a number of articles were published in the local news. Rat baits were laid on schedule, and bait take was reduced over the period of the baiting

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

Yes, the Trust was not developed, as detailed above. This of course is not a desired outcome, but it was thought to be very difficult to achieve given the land tenure system in Rarotonga. Despite this, there appears to be sufficient interest from donors to continue to fund the basic costs associated with laying the rat baits in the TCA (baits and staff time), as the project has been proven to be successful in the past, and does not require big injections of funds.

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

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)

People assisting from outside in project proposal preparation need to be mindful of local concerns. Despite it apparently being made clear that it was unlikely a trust would work, considerable external pressure was applied to include this in the proposal.

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

Difficulties associated with one entity (TIS) being responsible for the reporting, and another (TCA) being responsible for implementation could be overcome by the funding going directly to the TCA

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

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
TIS	A	USD18000	In kind
Takitumu Conservation Area	A	USD26522	To support TCA staff time
Air Rarotonga	A	USD3000	Airfares to Atiu and back

**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.

The new poisoning regime worked well, and can be easily replicated

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: Kelvin Passfield
Organization name: Te Ipukarea Society
Mailing address: PO Box 649, Rarotonga, Cook Islands
Tel: 682 21144
Fax:
E-mail: te.ipukarea.society@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.

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	155 hectares, Takitumu Conservation Area	155 hectares	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.	Yes	155 Hectares	155 hectares	
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

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													
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:			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	
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities										Payment for environmental services
Total																					

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

