

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
<b>Project Title:</b>	Pacific Invasives Learning Network: Expanding and Consolidating the Network to Build Capacity for Invasive Species Management Across the Pacific Islands
<b>Date of Report:</b>	31 May 2012
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Dr Posa Skelton Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme PO Box 244 Apia, Samoa Tel. +658 21929 ext. 276 Fax +685 20231 Email: posas@sprep.org www.sprep.org

**CEPF Region:** Polynesia-Micronesia

**Strategic Direction:** 1. Invasive species prevention

**Grant Amount:** \$81,950

**Project Dates:** February 1, 2010-March 31, 2012



Pacific Invasives Learning Network participants of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Network meeting held on Kiritimati Island, Kiribati

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

- The Nature Conservancy (TNC) provided co-financing for the Coordinators position. TNC also provided advice to the PILN coordinator, technical advice to PILN teams, as well as working directly with PILN teams in Micronesia.
- Conservation International (CI) – Provided technical advice to the PILN coordinator and PILN teams.
- IUCN's Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) – advisory role to PILN, including provision of invasive species information
- IUCN Oceania – advisory role to PILN
- NZAID – provided co-financing support through the Invasive Species Advisor, as well as some of the PILN team activities
- Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII) – has been a strong partner in the implementation of this project. Their role is providing sound advice and support to PILN teams, working on the ground with PILN teams, agencies and individuals to build capacity (both individual and institutional) in invasive species management. PII have also provided strategic advice and guidance through work-planning and developing of training material in response to PILN team needs and requests.
- Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) – advisory role to PILN teams and Coordinator
- University of the South Pacific (USP) - advisory role to PILN teams and Coordinator
- United States Forest Service (USFS) - advisory role to PILN teams and Coordinator
- BirdLife International - advisory role to PILN teams and Coordinator, facilitated sessions at PILN meetings and active participants at PILN teams.
- PILN Teams (American Samoa, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Fiji, French Polynesia, Guam, Hawaii, Kiribati, Kosrae, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, Niue, Palau, Pohnpei, Samoa, Wallis & Futuna, Yap) – the main constituents for implementation of invasive species management activities

### **Conservation Impacts**

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

#### **Background**

Invasive species are considered one of the most serious threats to biodiversity and sustainable development in the Pacific region. It is recognized in the Regional Invasive Species Strategy (2000) that invasive species need to be managed regionally due to their trans-boundary nature. However, invasive species workers in the Pacific are typically isolated and there is also a general lack of awareness of the risks associated with the introduction or spread of invasive species, from community to government level. In response, the Pacific Invasives Learning Network (PILN) was launched in 2006 to build capacity in invasive species management in the Pacific region. PILN is a peer-learning network for information and skill sharing, with the objective of reducing the impact of invasive species on biodiversity and sustainable development. The PILN mission is *“to empower effective invasive species management through a participant-driven network that meets priority needs, rapidly shares skills and resources, provides links to technical expertise, increases information exchange, and accelerates on-the-ground action.”*

Peer learning networks have been proven as effective instruments for capacity building, emphasizing the value of peer learning. Network coordination is essential for their effective operation and the PILN

coordinator works with PILN teams and partners (Pacific Invasives Partnership) to facilitate the delivery of meetings and exchanges to strengthen professional networks, set priorities, build capacity in technical areas and disseminate lessons learned. Teams include members with a long-term commitment to conservation, strong cultural understanding, and the potential to act as innovators and motivators to increase invasive species management and prevention in their islands. Multi-sector team membership ensures that a combination of agency and sectoral stakeholder interests are addressed at both levels. Participating teams determine the specific invasive species issues that they will address using the network.

A successful 2-year pilot programme was completed in May 2008. Achievements over this period include:

- Network membership expanded from 6 founding teams to 13, and information being shared among over 260 people in and around the region;
- Invasive species strategic action planning process initiated in 6 of the 22 SPREP countries, states and territories;
- National coordination mechanisms established in 4 countries and states;
- Marine invasive species recognized as a priority issue;
- Sharing of skills and knowledge among invasive species workers in the priority areas of social marketing, rat management, weed management and biosecurity;
- The Global Invasive Species Database recognized as the regional depository for information and network participants contributing to its content;

An external review of the network carried out in May 2008 concluded that the two-year PILN pilot proved very successful and achieved more than had been expected:

*"This participant-driven peer-learning network clearly should continue and be placed on a secure longer term footing. It is highly valued by its country participants and is now well-placed to contribute to real outcomes on the ground." PILN External Review 2008*

At the 19<sup>th</sup> SPREP meeting in September 2008 members endorsed the institutionalization of PILN within SPREP, subject to funding, and noted the excellent support provided by PILN to invasive species action in the Pacific.

The CEPF funding was secured to build on the momentum of the PILN pilot project allowing for team consolidation and strengthening of the network; and expanding it to the islands on the Polynesia/Micronesia Hotspot and beyond. Matching funds covered activities focused on non-CEPF qualifying countries, states and territories to ensure a region-wide approach for peer-learning.

***Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.***

The network coordination at the regional level provided the support to countries in the Polynesia/Micronesia Hotspot to ensure that multi-agency and multi-sectoral stakeholder teams were meeting on a regular basis, with the sole purpose of addressing invasive species to safeguard biodiversity, trade and other national, community and individual interests. Through empowering invasive species practitioners on the value of their knowledge and experience, and building their confidence to share this with the rest of the network ensured that a strong south-south partnership and capacity building were being realized.

Countries and islands were able to meet regularly, to strategize and prioritize invasive species issues and implement on the ground invasive species actions. Encouraging the development of invasive species programmes as well as strategic planning had enhanced the opportunities for generating interests amongst local communities, sectors and individuals, beyond traditional invasive species networks.

For Invasive Species Practitioners working in isolated communities, they were assured that there was a wealth of information, as well as help and support existed within and outside of the region for PILN teams to take advantage of. The challenge had been for some of the teams, not knowing who to contact or how to approach an expert for assistance. Most of the teams are now working closely with experts, or are sharing information about experts with other teams. The Pacific Invasives Partnership had been a blessing in terms of congregating a range of experts in invasive species management.

Overall, addressing the threat of invasive species had reached a significant milestone – and this is attributed largely to the CEPF investment in the Polynesia and Micronesia Hotspot.

### **Project Approach (500 words)**

PILN worked closely with the Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII) as programmes of the Pacific Invasives Partnership in the implementation of this project. Whilst PII assisted with building the capacity within agencies implementing invasive species management projects in the region, PILN provided the mechanism for disseminating the lessons learned from these projects and applying them in new situations.

The project objectives focused on advancing biodiversity conservation through effective management of priority invasive species through capacity building. It further focused on strengthening the knowledge base of invasive species, as well as biosecurity and pilot rapid response for the elimination of new incursions.

Addressing the objectives was carried out through overseeing the network and the country teams. Teams focused on strategic action planning – identifying priorities, exchanges, workshops and training attachments, advice and mentoring and expansion to other countries and territories of the Polynesia/Micronesia Hotspot. Integrating the PILN work programme with other Pacific programmes and sharing information with invasive species data management were also means of addressing the project objectives.

### **Link to CEPF Investment Strategy**

PILN contributed primarily to the CEPF Investment Priority 1.3: *Perform research, provide training in management techniques, and develop rapid response capacity against particularly serious invasive species.*

- 1) Technical capacity built for invasive species research and management, focusing on priority issues identified through a strategic action planning process within the framework of the Regional Invasive Species Strategy;
- 2) Effective rapid response systems depended on collaboration between different sectors and agencies in country. PILN worked to establish or strengthen multi-agency and sector invasive species teams, and through them to generate support for the design and implementation of effective, collaborative rapid response systems;
- 3) Linking these teams, agencies and projects in a network facilitates the rapid spread of successes, skills and lessons between participating teams, and more broadly in the Pacific.

Through the strengthened multi-agency and sector teams, increased technical capacity and more comprehensive knowledge base, PILN also contributed to Investment *Priorities 1.1 Strengthen defenses against the introduction and spread of invasive species and pathogens that threaten biodiversity, and Priority 1.2 Control or eradicate invasive species in key biodiversity areas, particularly where they threaten native species with extinction.* Overall PILN also contributed significantly to Priority 3.2 *Strengthen leadership and effectiveness of local conservation organizations by developing peer-learning networks and promoting exchanges and study tours.*

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

Invasive species will continue to be a major threat to biodiversity and remain a significant challenge for governments, communities and individuals to manage. The project has proven to be an important vehicle catalyzing immediate and long-term impacts to invasive species management in the region. Almost all of the islands that participated in the PILN project have the capacity to recognize the threat of invasive species, recognize the importance of effective coordination, prioritizing species and issues that can be addressed, and mobilizing a force or a multi-disciplinary team to deal with invasive species. These are the essential elements for long-term management of invasive species. Some other critical elements, which are important to have, include effective leadership and good governance, and having strong support by decision makers and an enabling environment.

The PILN teams have set the bar for themselves as well as for new teams on how to manage invasive species. Only when they work collaboratively, recognizing that invasive species is not a single-entity or agency's problem but a collective one, are they truly making progress in this fight.

The tools that have been provided to PILN teams through strategic planning, setting priorities, choosing the fights they can win, and seeking assistance from the wide-and-excellent partnership that exist in the region will augur well as long-term impacts of this project. The risk remains that the relevance of these efforts will be determined by time-bound leadership. A good leader will ensure lessons learned from this project are being utilized as a means for working effectively now and in the future.

### **Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:**

There have been considerable achievements made by PILN teams over the life of the project for biodiversity conservation. Eradication and control of some of the key invasive species have reduced the threat to native biodiversity. For example, the eradication of the 'chain-of-love' from Pohnpei in the Federated States of Micronesia provides the opportunity for native flora to thrive. The release of the Guam rail (Koko) back on a snake-free island (Cocos Island) has given the bird an opportunity to survive in the wild. Importantly, is the capacity of PILN teams, which has built over the life of the project enabling them to undertake invasive species planning and implementation.

Species control:

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

- *Knowledge base of invasive species in the region strengthened;*
- *Technical capacity built for all aspects of invasive species management;*
- *Emphasis placed on international and inter-island biosecurity and rapid response, and on weed management and marine invasive species.*

### **Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:**

*Knowledge base of invasive species in the region strengthened;*

- Native forests in American Samoa restored – through removal of invasive trees and distribution of 7000 native trees for community planting
- Ko'ko' (Guam rail) breeding on Cocos Island, after removal of invasive rodents and Brown Tree Snakes
- Involvement of the Environment Youth Club in Kiribati on invasive species activities
- School programmes in Kosrae (FSM) included invasive species awareness activities
- Develop a communication campaign with a long-term goal of sensitizing communities on invasive species (Kosrae)

- Community response to invasive species management efforts (on myna in Samoa).
- Government investing money in community efforts to fight invasive species (Samoa)
- Awareness materials produced – e.g. Regional Invasive Species Council Calendar distributed to communities, schools and governments
- Research for priority invasive trees in American Samoa (e.g. Red-Seed Tree - *Adenanthera pavonia*).
- Published research on *tamaligi* (*Falcataria albezi*) work in American Samoa
- Species inventories and impact assessments undertaken (New Caledonia)
- Invasive Species Council established by law in Guam

*Technical capacity built for all aspects of invasive species management;*

- Control of *Falcataria* in Palau with skills learning from American Samoa
- Tahiti monarch (*Pomarea nigra*) – exist due to rat control programme in French Polynesia
- Invasive species programmes for Fatu-iva, Nuku Hiva and Raiatea in French Polynesia
- Up-skilling of Kiribati invasive species workers on invasive species management
- Success of rat eradication on McKean Island has led to similar efforts to eradicate rats on neighboring islands of Enderbury and Bernie in Kiribati.
- Successful removal of *tamaligi* from a National Park has led to an island-wide programme of removal of this tree. This equates to about 2500 acres of native forest being saved.
- The success with *Imperata cylindrica* has led to actions against the little-fire-ant and coconut-rhinoceros-beetle, with ensuing monitoring programmes
- Eradication of rats on McKean Island (Kiribati)
- Eradication of rabbits from Rawaki Island (Kiribati)
- Eradication of rats from 28 motus on Kiritimati Island (Kiribati)
- Removal of *tamaligi* (*Falcataria moluccana*) from Tutuila National Park (American Samoa)
- Control of the Panama Rubber Tree (*Castilla elastica*) in Samoa and American Samoa
- Eradication of rodents, cats and snakes from Cocos Island (Guam)
- Biocontrol for Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle on Guam is self-spreading
- Biocontrol of Cycad Scale in Palau
- Captive macaque monkeys sterilized in Palau
- Rat eradication efforts on Kayangel atoll (Palau)
- Cats neutered on Kayangel atoll (Palau)
- Control efforts on Imperata/cogon Grass (*Imperata cylindrica*) in Yap (FSM)

*Emphasis placed on international and inter-island biosecurity and rapid response, and on weeds*

- Invasive species management integrated into the National Integrated Environment Policy
- Creation of an early detection unit for invasive species in New Caledonia
- Tools developed (Cybertracker, Database PI@ntnote) for invasives in New Caledonia
- Suppression and eradication programme established in Kosrae (FSM)
- Kiribati's Biosecurity Act 2011 passed
- Biosecurity Guidelines for Phoenix Island developed
- National Invasive Species Action Plan approved by government (Samoa)

**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.***

Successes:

- Project built on a successful 2-year PILN pilot project. The PILN pilot project from 2006-2008 was successful providing the impetus for this project. It was based on a successful model – one that worked for the Pacific.
- Initially a strong PILN partners who felt responsible for its welfare. The PILN pilot project had support from ten regional and national partners. Each contributed either funding or technical advice to the network. This goodwill and partnership continued to this project.
- Having a regional coordinator is critical. Having a dedicated focal point for PILN teams to focus on or to turn to for more information, assurances and other support has proven to be a critical part of the network and the project. This will remain an important factor for the future directions of the project.
- Merging of PILN and PII as programmes under the Pacific Invasives Partnership helped in forging a closer working relationship between the two initiatives. It made sense as partners supporting both initiatives were the same. It also helped in sorting out the roles and reduced duplication of efforts.
- PILN being hosted and supported by SPREP. Being based at SPREP has been a real blessing for PILN. It allowed it to focus on assisting countries by the same token access the wealth of knowledge, capacity and resources that other organizations would not have. Strategically, it also allows closer working directions with SPREP's invasive species programme, where there were also CEPF investments.

Challenges

- PILN Coordinator left – gap of 2 years before new Coordinator was appointed. Just before the CEPF PILN Project came online (2008) – the PILN Coordinator left leaving a serious gap. It took almost two years later before the new Coordinator came on board. This gap had some impacts on the network.
- In the gap between the PILN coordination, some of the PILN teams became less active. Most notable were Niue and Fiji. The establishment of the Micronesia Chief Executives and their leadership in invasive species issues may be a shining factor in ensuring that PILN teams in the Micronesian region continue to function at the same level if not more when PILN pilot project was run. The Fiji team was revitalized and received the highest endorsement by the Fiji Government under the National Environment Council as the advisory body for invasive species management in the country. Niue remains a challenge, largely due to lack of people to build capacity on. There is hope that the GEF-PAS Invasive Species project (started 2012-2014) will provide support to invasive species management in the region. Effort to support a multi-sector and multi-agency team in Niue will continue.
- Partnership merged meant that partners' role and participation in PILN affairs waned. While there were some spinoffs in uniting PILN and PII (the two regional initiatives) under the Pacific Invasives Partnership – it also meant that some of the commitment by partners to one initiative ended, most probably because they didn't want to be seen as supporting one but not the other. This was especially true with financial support, and it fell on one agency (SPREP) to provide financial support for PILN. Fortunately, partners continue to provide technical support.

Despite all the successes and challenges, the true impact of this project will only be realized in a much longer timeframe than the life of the project. However, there are many positive signs indicating the CEPF investment in this area has been a pivotal catalyst. The CEPF investment in this particular instance has been about strengthening the process enabling a participatory approach by the different stakeholders to work towards a common and necessary theme of keeping fragile island ecosystem and species safe.

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

The merging of the two initiatives PILN and PII under the PIP for wanting of an improved regional coordination of invasive species management had unexpected consequences in that partners commitment (and also passion) became less in supporting PILN or PII. PILN has always been a country-driven and partner-driven network but as of late is more country-driven and coordinator-driven initiative.

**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:**

Consolidate existing PILN teams and committees, and expand Network to include the remaining countries, states and territories in the Polynesia/Micronesia Hotspot.

**Component 1 Actual at Completion:**

At the conclusion of the CEPF support PILN project there were 15 multi-sector teams. The Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands and Wallis & Futuna were recent additions. Discussions were initiated with other countries for the establishment and expansion of invasive species teams – specifically Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea and Tonga and these will continue under a recent invasive species project (Global Environment Facility – Pacific Alliance for Sustainability project).

The consolidation of the PILN teams remains an ongoing issue and one that requires persistent effort and consistent visits to the teams. Of the northern Micronesian teams – all are still working to certain levels of functionality. Palau, Guam, CNMI, Kosrae, Pohnpei and Yap were meeting regularly and were active in the PILN 3<sup>rd</sup> regional meeting. They also provided many contributions to the PILN Soundbites in 2010-2012 ([http://www.sprep.org/piln\\_soundbites](http://www.sprep.org/piln_soundbites)). Truk remains to be added to the PILN network and discussions were held in 2011 with them for their inclusion. Signs were positive that this will take place in 2012. Although Kiribati is one country – there are effectively two teams functioning. The Kiritimati team was very active in protecting seabirds through the eradication of rats and cats from seabird nesting sites. The other Kiribati team is based in Tarawa and is providing great leadership in policy work ensuring that invasive species are included in high level planning. One more Micronesia country that needs further work is Nauru. Again there are positive signs that invasive species are one of the issues they would like to address (David Sheppard pers. comm.). Of the Polynesia countries – French Polynesia, Wallis & Futuna, Samoa, Fiji and Niue are part of PILN and all (except Niue) remain active participants of the network. Cook Islands, Tonga and Tuvalu have expressed interest in the PILN network and will be an area of focus for the next few years.

**Component 2 Planned:**

Integrate the PILN work programme with that of other Pacific invasive species programmes.

**Component 2 Actual at Completion:**

PILN workplanning for the period of 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 have been integrated with the Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII), SPREP and the Pacific Invasives Partnership (PIP) – the working group of the Roundtable for Nature Conservation in the Pacific. This integration will continue in 2012-2013 planning and into the future.

**Component 3 Planned:**



Provide advice and mentoring on project development and management, particularly on fund raising and reporting. Implement a programme of skill, knowledge and experience sharing, by means of exchanges, training attachments, thematic workshops and Network meetings.

**Component 3 Actual at Completion:**

One of the functions of the PILN coordinator is providing technical advice and mentoring to PILN teams. This was done for aquatic invasive species issues, especially with regards to the introduction of the Genetically Improved Food Tilapia (GIFT) to the Solomon Islands. Further assistance in terms of mentoring was provided to the Fiji Invasive Species Taskforce, particularly to the chairman, Mr Ilaisa Dakica of Biosecurity Authority Fiji on meeting process, and facilitation. Issues that are important to PILN teams were addressed through workshops, such as fundraising training held at the 3<sup>rd</sup> PILN meeting. Assistance also provided through learning exchanges and attachments between Samoa and New Caledonia (in forest honeyeater survey and invasive species management planning), law and enforcement for Kiritimati ranger and also Samoa to attend species conservation training in Europe.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> PILN meeting was successfully held on Kiritimati Island, Kiribati and attended by over 40 participants. This was one of the significant investments of the CEPF project and one that supported the participation of almost all of the PILN teams. This investment also helped leverage funding from Fonds Pacifique to support non-CEPF eligible participants. A summary of the meeting report was provided as a special edition of the PILN-Soundbites (March-April, 2012).

**Component 4 Planned:**

Promote the relevant online and physical resources as repositories for Pacific invasives information, including PIER and Global Invasive Species Database.

**Component 4 Actual at Completion:**

Promotion of invasive species information through PIER, GISD and other relevant database information system was done through the PILN Soundbites, the 3<sup>rd</sup> PILN Meeting and also a special side-event held at the 22<sup>nd</sup> SPREP Annual General Meeting held in Samoa. The side-event was co-hosted with IUCN-ISSG promoting the Pacific Islands Invasive Species Database.

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

All components were realized.

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

PILN Soundbites – ([www.sprep.org/Pacific-Invasives-Learning-Network-PILN/pilndocuments](http://www.sprep.org/Pacific-Invasives-Learning-Network-PILN/pilndocuments))  
PILN Overview - <http://www.sprep.org/Pacific-Invasives-Learning-Network-PILN/introduce-piln>  
PILN images from the last 3<sup>rd</sup> PILN Network Meeting – <http://www.sprep.org/Pacific-Invasives-Learning-Network-PILN/piln-welcome>

## 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 project focused on supporting the coordination of a network comprising 16 multi-agency and multi-sector teams in the Pacific. By having someone whose entire focus was to encourage, communicate, assist and support teams, it allowed for a better on the ground actions by invasive species practitioners. Furthermore, it allowed for a region-wide approach to invasive species management – where peers learned from each other and built trust and assurance needed for holistic invasive species management.

The Coordinator focused on consolidating the network by working with existing teams in the Polynesia/Micronesia Hotspot. This work had permeated to neighbouring countries – e.g. Vanuatu, Tonga, Tuvalu, Solomon Islands and PNG wishing to join PILN. These countries recognized that invasive species are as much as a regional problem as it is locally. We will continue to work with them to establish PILN teams.

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

The project was successfully implemented. A minor set-back was due to the recruitment of the PILN coordinator that took two years. This was largely an internal issue relating to recruitment process, which has since been rectified.

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

Learning networks are one of the best capacity building tools for island communities. It empowers invasive species practitioners to share their knowledge with peers from other island communities.

Having a coordinator – both at the regional and national level is so vital in the functioning and continuing development of a network. Regular interactions – either via emails, phone calls or skype, or face to face are also important in maintaining interest and momentum.

Having a partnership such as the Pacific Invasives Partnership to provide the technical support to the country teams is also a great positive.

Work planning with partners and organizations is also important in progressing issues and achieving action plans.

## 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
The Nature Conservancy	A	121,440	Travel, Staff time, financial and administrative support, office supplies and communication expenses
Fonds Pacifique	A	€100,000	Communication expenses, meeting and conference costs,
SPREP (Programme Funding)	B, C	95,000	Staff time through the Invasive Species Advisor, PILN Coordinator, travel, meeting, office expenses

**\*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.**

Two main challenges to the sustainability of a regionally coordinated invasive species management in the region are country-based (function and cohesiveness of multi-agency and multi-sector teams) and regional-based (having a dedicated network coordinator). The country-based challenge requires a multi-prong approach through strong leadership, political and management support, setting aside silo-driven mandates and focusing on what is good for the country. The regional challenge is having a full-time PILN coordinator with the sole purpose of providing support and encouragement to the teams and assists with consolidation and expansion of the Network. SPREP remains the ideal place for the PILN Coordinator to be based. Exploring options of making PILN a core funded post at SPREP should be undertaken.

**Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.**

N/A

**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.cepfn.org](http://www.cepfn.org), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

### **Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Posa Skelton  
Organization name: SPREP  
Mailing address: PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa  
Tel: +685 21929  
Fax: +685 20231  
E-mail: [posas@sprep.org](mailto:posas@sprep.org)

**\*\*\*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>	<b>Is this question relevant?</b>	<b>If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.</b>	<b>Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.</b>	<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.	N/A			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?	N/A			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.	N/A			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	N/A			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	N/A			

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



