CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Eco Oceania Pty Limited
Project Title:	Survey of Indigenous Biota and Pests in the Tokelau Islands
Date of Report:	25 May 2012
Report Author and Contact Information	Ray Pierce

CEPF Region: Polynesia Micronesia

Strategic Direction: 1. Invasive species prevention

Grant Amount: $57,500

Project Dates: Oct 1, 2010-Jan 31, 2012

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

- BirdLife Pacific – planning (Steve Cranwell) and participation in survey (Mere Valu) the latter of whom undertook bird and invasive surveys at Atafu.
- CI Pacific – planning with office staff and participation by James Atherton at Atafu survey
- two ant specialists (Monica Gruber and Allan Burne) from Victoria University of Wellington provided a strong framework for invasive ant work.
- Art Whistler – plant surveys of Atafu and part survey Nukunonu and Fakaofo
- SPC Fiji - one staff member (Roy Masamdu) provided comment on previous SPC work with Tokelau and commented on forward planning for biosecurity.
- Tokelau staff and volunteers – two new staff (Kele Kalolo, the Minister of Economic Development, Natural Resources and the Environment and his Director Mika Perez) coordinated Tokelau participation. Local staff and volunteers participated in surveys at each island and there was significant input from Council (Taulalega) at each atoll.
- Also some planning advice from staff of CI, PII and universities (including Kirsty Abbott who had previously worked on ants at Tokelau).

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.

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

The survey will result in key biodiversity sites (e.g. discrete motu within atolls) being identified and highlighted for subsequent maintenance or enhancement of their biodiversity values. It will identify and promote strategic links with other regional values and initiatives e.g. between the Phoenix Islands and Samoan restoration programmes at e.g. Alepatia Islands. With climate change scenarios having significance here, there are clear opportunities to establish stepping stones or linkages for biota to recover and "migrate" to higher latitudes.

There are two likely scenarios that could emerge after the surveys:

1. If pest-free motu are found they are likely to have very high biodiversity values (e.g. successfully nesting seabirds and Pacific pigeons, roosting shorebirds, e.g. bristle-thighed curlew) which will be described along with recommendations for maintaining their high values into the future. Key recommendations are likely to be along the lines of targeted education, biosecurity, surveillance and biota monitoring. The successful implementation of these tasks will ensure positive long-term impacts for the threatened and sensitive species found during the survey.

2. Potentially high value sites that are currently also infested with one or more pests species will also be described and their biodiversity potential highlighted, together with the restoration measures needed to restore their values (most likely involving pest removal, accompanied by education, biosecurity, surveillance and monitoring as above, and potentially also translocation of threatened seabirds).

Scenario 1 and 2 above will both involve local community initiatives into the future, with 1 effectively being able to start immediately, but 2 is more likely to involve outside funding and technical support to help to remove pests initially and implement effective biosecurity, surveillance and monitoring.

Longer-term strategies could include completing total atoll restoration via pest eradication if biosecurity measures are strong and community participation is guaranteed.

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

Of the two scenarios postulated above, the second emerged as the logical pathway. The survey identified that nearly all motu have a limited number of invasives, but indigenous values were greater than expected and clustered in groups of motu. These groups of motu have been highlighted as potential Key Biodiversity Areas which can be the focus of management for the protection and recovery of indigenous biota. There are potentially additional winners in this scenario as it is considered feasible to remove key invasives (especially rats, and in some cases cats and pigs as well) from these KBAs which would also benefit copra production, and ultimately crab densities and other potential foods.

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

Short-term impacts will see the following:

1. identification of key biodiversity areas that can and should be managed

2. raising of awareness locally about invasive species issues and the special requirements of threatened species, and potentially

3. the formalising of biosecurity tasks to protect pest-free key biodiversity areas (this would be the case if pest-free motu of high value are found during the survey)

4. the establishment of good linkages between the Tokelau administration and community with outside ecologists will enable ongoing advice to be provided in conjunction with partners - the fact that the islands are en route for Apia-Phoenix Islands

restoration work, means that more regular assistance and incentives may be forthcoming from teams who can call in periodically.

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

These were achieved to different degrees as follows:

1. Potential KBAs were identified in the field, confirmed with Councils (Taupalega) and mapped in the report.
2. Up to three meetings were held on each atoll with Councils and interested community members. Each meeting resulted in good understanding and feedback confirming the local desire to manage invasives and especially ensure that there are no new or repeat invasions.
3. Biosecurity tasks were not formalized, but at all three atolls, meetings confirmed the desire to identify actions to ensure there were no further invasions.
4. There is a good link now established between Tokelau administration/island counterparts and outside specialists. In particular we have renewed the link between the administration and ant specialists (Monica Gruber) and invasive vertebrate specialists/bird recovery specialists (Pierce) which come with significant support via BirdLife Pacific, CI, PII and independent ecologists who work collaboratively with Gruber, Pierce and the agencies above.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

None directly protected at this stage, but a process toward identifying the sites (KBAs) with their sensitive faunas and actions needed has been initiated.

Hectares Protected:
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 successfully completed although more days on Fakaofo in finer weather would have helped. Challenges were mainly to do with transport coordination (especially ship to Tokelau and back) and overall communications with staff on the island and frequent changing of roles by key personnel.

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: Background planning for the survey of biodiversity values, threats and restoration opportunities of Tokelau Islands

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

Detailed planning of objectives, methods and outcomes were planned with Tokelau administration at meetings in Apia and Auckland. Additional technical planning for specific goals and tasks were discussed with specialists at Birdlife Pacific, SPC, Victoria University and individual specialists including Abbot and Whistler.

Component 2 Planned: Carry out survey of the Tokelau Islands and their biota**]**

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

Surveys of indigenous biota and invasive species were undertaken at Tokelau in September-October 2011 and in January 2012. The surveys helped to identify biodiversity values, threats and potential conservation opportunities for the Tokelau administration.

Component 3 Planned: Report on findings

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

Progress on the atolls was reported on and discussed with Taupalega as we went. A report was drafted for Tokelau and circulated for comment and a meeting was subsequently held with the Director of Environment in April 2012 to discuss the way forward. A summary of the report follows:

A key finding was that the indigenous biota was showing some resilience to both the impacts of invasive species and the recent cyclonic storms. Notably, several species of seabirds have recovered on all three atolls since comparable surveys were undertaken in the 1960s. Some biodiversity hotspots supporting important vegetation areas and/or bird populations were apparent, e.g. in the Hakea motu of Atafu and the NE and SE motu of Nukunonu and the NE motu of Fakaofo. The recoveries in the seabird populations appear to reflect a reduction in species harvesting over the years and possibly also the local removal of invasives from some motu. However there are ongoing threats from several key invasives already present – Pacific rats, feral house cats, feral pigs and yellow crazy ants, and perhaps also mynas and some weeds e.g. Wedelia. On top of this the quarantine process at Apia and Tokelau is currently inadequate to prevent further invasives arriving from Apia, the main source of goods and supplies and therefore also invasives

Key recommendations encompass the strengthening of biosecurity, eradicating key invasive species, formalizing of species harvesting protocols and documenting management approaches. Biosecurity needs to be strengthened as a matter of urgency and should include re-instating the quarantine process at Apia and each of the three atolls along with surveillance on vessels and on shore, together with training and resourcing of quarantine staff for all of the above. Eradications of invasive species should involve two approaches initially – site-led and species-led eradications. Site-led eradications focus on the total removal of rats and other invasives from the key biodiversity areas, with subsequent prevention of rats, cats and pigs from recolonising. Species-led management involve the total removal or control of invasive species that could potentially invade all of the motu (notably yellow crazy ants which have invaded the village motu at Atafu recently, but which are difficult to control, while *Wedelia* is present on the inhabited motu of all three atolls – these invasives could access all motu). All of the biosecurity and management approaches should be prescriptive and supported

by good documentation of activities using standard or simplified data sheets to ensure that Tokelau can learn from and improve on past actions. Finally, the above management approaches necessitate working closely with technical specialists along with relevant agencies locally, e.g. CI, SPC, Samoa Port Authority and SPREP.

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

The survey of one atoll, Fakaofo, was limited in duration and coincided with mainly bad weather. Findings there are therefore broader than at the other islands, but they do not affect overall recommendations.

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

Full stand-alone report covering these items submitted electronically.

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.

A big issue was working through logistics with the people that were needed to help in conservation management. There was also a big difference between islands in how smoothly general island operations were running. It seemed to boil down to inter-personnel relationships and a s a consequence we contributed little to capacity building on one atoll, but were more effective on the other two.

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

Having multi-skilled team members capable of covering different roles if designated team members were unavailable was a bonus as changed shipping timetables meant we lost some team members part way through the survey.

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

Our flexibility and ability to adapt to changes in timetables, being stranded, having to repeat surveys etc, all contributed to a good outcome.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

There is a real need to develop a positive ongoing relationship between Tokelau conservation staff and outside specialists and organisations, akin to that currently happening with Kiribati.

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
Tokelau Administration	Co-finance	10000	Covered boat fares and accommodation at atolls
EcoOceania Pty Ltd	Contingency	4000	Additional staff time caused by delays

***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.

A one off survey in the tropics has fewer sustainability and replicability issues than say surveys in temperate areas and ongoing management projects, but there were some challenges. For example we deliberately timed the main survey to coincide with optimal detection periods for key nesting seabirds that were potentially present at Tokelau.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

None.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

None other than those covered in expedition safety plan.

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: Dr Ray Pierce
Organization name: EcoOceania Pty Ltd
Mailing address: 165 Stoney Creek Road, Speewah, Queensland 4881, Australia
Tel: +61 740930784
Fax:
E-mail: raypierce@bigpond.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.	No			No protected areas
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			No protected areas
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	0	0	I have answered “no” because we cannot guarantee that the recommendations will already be implemented
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	0		It raised awareness at least but we have not had the capacity to measure any strengthening of management, plus it is a very short period of time
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1below.	Yes	None		Project promotes sustainable use of natural resources in 3 communities but it is doubtful that any benefits will have accrued thus far.

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
Atafu			X			X																
Nukunonu			X			X																
Fakaofo			X			X																
Total																						

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