



## EMI Small Grants – Project Completion and Impact Report

*Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions listed below.*

<b>Organization Legal Name</b>	BirdLife International
<b>Project Title</b>	Exploring the Removal of Threats on East Rennell as a Local Response to a World Heritage Area in Danger
<b>Grant Number</b>	GA18-01
<b>Strategic Direction</b>	1. Empower local communities to protect and manage globally significant biodiversity at priority Key Biodiversity Areas under-served by current conservation efforts
<b>Grant Amount</b>	USD 20, 000.00
<b>Project Dates</b>	1 May 2018 – 30 April 2019
<b>Date of Report</b>	30 May 2019

### CEPF Hotspot: East Melanesian Islands

#### PART I: Overview

##### **1. Implementation Partners for this Project (*list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project*)**

###### BirdLife International Pacific Regional Office

The Pacific Regional Office is BirdLife International's youngest Secretariat office and is based in Suva, Fiji. It is responsible for the Pacific Partnership which consists of seven national grassroots conservation organizations in 7 Pacific island countries. The Regional Office also looks to support the development of local grassroots capacity to conserve biodiversity in high priority non-Partner countries, one of which is the Solomon Islands. The project was managed by Steve Cranwell, BirdLife Pacific's Invasive Alien Species & Island Restoration Programme Manager. Steve led the development of the Invasive Alien Species (IAS) survey plan and the survey itself on Rennell in July 2018. In finalizing the survey report, Steve will lead on discussions for the development of biosecurity response in collaboration with the Solomon Islands Government Departments of Biosecurity and Environment. Miliana Ravuso, Coordinator for the IAS Programme led on the community liaison with the Lake Tegano World Heritage Site Association (LTWHSA). Miliana managed the logistics for the survey, led on the community discussions during the survey and coordinated the technical and financial reporting for the project. Mark O'Brien, BirdLife's Regional Programme Coordinator played a key role in the IAS survey, supporting both the bird and invasives component of the survey and leading on data collection and reporting.

###### Lake Tegano World Heritage Site Association (LTWHSA)

The LTWHSA, the project's local Partner is the recognized local civil society group that coordinates work at the East Rennell World Heritage Area (WHA). Led by its Chairman, George Tauika, the LTWHSA provided local support and made all necessary arrangements for meetings with stakeholders on Honiara and Rennell. Two members of the LTWHSA, including the Chairman participated in the survey. The Chairman facilitated all community meetings and introduced the project (and personnel) to all the relevant Government Departments.

### Solomon Islands Government

The Solomon Islands Department of Environment is the focal point for work on Rennell and was instrumental in the liaison with the National Commission for UNESCO at the Ministry of Education in Honiara. Successful meetings were held with Trevor Maeda of the Department of Environment, Francis Tsatsia of Biosecurity Department and Christina Bakolo, the UNESCO Desk Officer, all of whom will continue to play a key role in the coordination of follow-up biosecurity efforts for Rennell.

### Rennell and Bellona Provincial Government

The Renbel Provincial Government represent all interests of the landowners and communities of the two islands. The project team met with Provincial Secretary Adrian Tuhanuku before the survey and the LTWWSA Chairman has since kept the Secretary informed of all project developments.

### EcoOceania Pty Ltd

Dr Raymond Pierce, a renowned Conservation Scientist and the Principal Founder of EcoOceania is an established survey partner for BirdLife in the Pacific. Dr Pierce provided technical support throughout the survey on Rennell, leading on the bird, invasive weed and surveys. Dr Pierce has a history in biodiversity research and working with government agencies in Honiara, thus he will play a key role in the supporting the rat management and biosecurity responses for Rennell.

## **2. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project**

The project addressed the key components outlined in the project document, all of which have ensured engagement at the local grassroots level and involvement of the LTWWSA. Consultation meetings were held with all four villages in the World Heritage Area (WHA) and representatives from the four villages participated in the field survey. A 10-day survey was conducted to assess rat penetration and distribution across the WHA as well as to assess the distribution of vulnerable species particularly endemic birds. Bird surveys were undertaken both within and outside the WHA. In the same sampling range, surveys were also done for invasive weeds and ants with a particular focus on the Little Fire Ant and Yellow Crazy Ant. The data collected from this survey has provided a good baseline to assess changes within the WHA and for replication of surveys in the future.

The survey confirmed Black Rat *Rattus rattus* had established widely across the WHA and Rennell generally. Detections were made at all locations surveyed including the four villages of Tevaitahe, Niupani, Tegano and Hutuna, their associated gardens and surrounding forest. Black rats were found on the Islets in Lake Tegano and forest at the lake's eastern end on the northern side (furthest point from the four villages). Detections were made along the forest road margin connecting the WHA to Lavangu (outside the WHA) and within Lavangu. Pacific rat *Rattus exulans* was also confirmed present, but detected only in the forest interior and in low numbers. The impacts of rats were apparent with immature coconuts, papaya, kumara and taro observed to have been damaged (consistent with signs known for Black rat), with reports of other crops similarly affected. While these Rennell communities have a range of agricultural pests effecting local food production, the addition of Black rats has significantly added to the effort needed (due to crops and in some instances entire gardens failing) with likely time losses to other activities. Mechanisms to reduce rat damage have been limited with local poisoning formulations tried and exclusion (netting) of rats to tomatoes and seedlings.

The bird survey confirmed all species known for the island present, the endemics were readily detected suggesting the population as consistent with previous surveys (which are limited), and no direct effects of Black rat on Rennell's birds were witnessed. However, a census can only detect coarse change (such as a species loss or dramatic reduction) and it's possible that Black rats may be affecting the island's birds that only more intensive research and monitoring will detect. The possibility of which is heightened by the known effects of Black rats on island birds and particularly endemics, its relatively

recent establishment and the reproductive behavior of some birds making them potentially vulnerable (to predation) such as those that nest on the ground, near to the ground, in tree cavities or the crown of coconuts.

Eradication of Black rat from Rennell would require the entire island to be baited with rodenticide and while the bait application is possible (with helicopters), issues associated with eliminating alternative food sources (to the bait) for rats, and particularly in all areas of human habitation would be immense. The biosecurity for the Island is also extremely limited and the multiple pathways for Black rat and no 'biosecurity culture' practiced on the island means the risk of re-introduction would be high. This, combined with a lack of infrastructure to detect and respond to an incursion, Black rat would most definitely reestablish. While rat eradications of a scale similar to Rennell have been successful, an operation on Rennell would be several orders of magnitude greater than the largest tropical rat eradication to date which also have a lower success rate than among temperate equivalents. Theoretically, the challenges to rat eradication on Rennell could be overcome, but the time and cost to do so would run into years and tens of millions of dollars. Even in the event that financing is possible, the uncertainty (but low likelihood) with which stringent standards would be met, are such that the risk of failure remains unacceptably high thus rat eradication is not considered socially (and financially) feasible for Rennell. Technological developments including alternative methods for eliminating rat populations may provide viable solutions in the future.

Other management options identified for rats on Rennell include the potential to reduce and sustain rats at very low densities across priority areas. Clear benefits are necessary for rat control programs and reducing, if not eliminating the impacts of rats to crops, may provide this. Additionally, there could be benefits for birds and other biodiversity. To provide protection to a meaningful agricultural area, 100ha of contiguous gardens and surrounding forest would need to be managed for rats. A grid network of bait stations would dispense rodenticide bait maintained throughout the year. To evaluate the effectiveness of the control, crops would be assessed and similarly birds and other biodiversity indicators. Replicating this treatment and evaluating crops and biodiversity for areas without rat control, and for more than one year would increase the rigor of results. A two year trial involving all 4 WHA villages in a treatment and non-treatment regime would provide a meaningful sample along with the opportunity for all communities to engage, develop the associated skills and establish a wide representation in understanding interest, motivation and constraints to sustaining future rat control or otherwise.

Biosecurity poses a significant risk for the island's natural values and the welfare of its people with few (active) controls for vessels moving between islands nationally including Guadalcanal and internationally with vessels transiting directly from China and Indonesia. Guadalcanal hosts many invasive species not present on Rennell including Giant African Land snail and Rhinoceros Beetle, pests of Asian origin and many others alien to the Solomon Islands. Species at high risk of introduction and of harm for the island have been identified in conjunction with the Ministry of Agriculture's Biosecurity Division. The development of a Biosecurity Action Plan for Rennell which also provides for local awareness of high risk species and understanding of response procedures, is key to reducing the present risk.

The project has been strongly linked to CEPF Investment Priority 1.3 which seeks to *Support local communities to design and implement local relevant conservation actions that respond to major threats at priority sites*. Local communities have been engaged from the onset of the project.

The project proposal itself was designed with the Chairman of the Lake Tegano World Heritage Site Association, George Tauika. Thereon, engagement of the local communities was done with George as the focal point.

Throughout the survey, local capacity was built through one on one discussions; members of the LTWHA were trained in survey techniques, including rat trapping, monitoring and identification and ant survey techniques. Members of the community are now keen to undertake conservation actions that will help address the threat of IAS at the world heritage area. Input from the communities have helped inform what will be the Biosecurity Action Plan, which has to be developed collaboratively with the Solomon Island Government Departments of Environment and Biosecurity.

**3. Briefly describe actual progress towards each planned long-term and short-term impact (as stated in your approved proposal)**

*List each long-term impact from your proposal*

**Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years**

<b>Description of long-term impact</b>	<b>Summary of progress towards long-term impact</b>
Identify an effective & feasible response to rats; and for the prevention & management of future IAS incursions on Rennell.	The eradication of Black rat is not considered socially and financially feasible for Rennell. However, localized rat control securing critical agricultural areas, crops and overlapping habitats for birds and other wildlife could be beneficial and achievable. Key threats of IAS incursion have been identified and National and International shipping is the primary risk for IAS introduction. A future Biosecurity Action Plan for the Island and associated awareness and implementation will provide the necessary safeguards.
Establish a local foundation through which initiatives can be delivered & sustained.	The Lake Tegano World Heritage Site Association is the only established local body recognized to coordinate initiatives at the world heritage area. The Association is well governed and the project has built some capacity for bird monitoring, and IAS management. Future projects collaborating with the Association with appropriately delegated responsibility and support (i.e. technical and project management), will grow their capacity and independence.
Monitor environmental indicators to assess the biological condition of the WHA, as a mechanism for removing the LTWHA off the 'WHA In Danger' List.	A baseline has been established for birds, rats and invasive species in general. This will help inform future trends on the WHA condition and the impact of conservation action including biosecurity. Locally trained field guides have some capacity to replicate monitoring which future projects will strengthen. BirdLife has secured funding for a post-survey consultation to develop the next phase of the project with the Association, community and other stakeholders. This will leverage additional grants for future invasives management & monitoring within the WHA.

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years

Description of short-term impact	Summary of progress towards short-term impact
Assess the presence of IAS on Rennell	Presence & distribution of Black rat or Black kimoa <i>Rattus rattus</i> and Pacific Rat <i>Rattus exulans</i> have been confirmed for Rennell. Other priority invasives that are present and affecting local gardens are the Little fire ant <i>Wasmannia auropunctata</i> and numerous agricultural pests including Fruit-fly.
Establish population baselines for birds as a primary biological indicator	Baseline populations for Rennell's birds have been established through the bird survey & given that 2 priority IAS have invaded Rennell, the bird populations are still healthy. It's recommended that transects be used to measure trends in numbers of key indicator bird species.
Local engagement of members of the LTWHTSA and Rennell communities	An average 10 people from each of the 4 villages were engaged, either through one-on-one discussions, village collective meetings or the survey. Forty percent of these were women.
Identify points of IAS introductions onto Rennell and pathway risk analysis	Points of the current IAS introductions are mainly via mining & logging vessels. Whilst a preliminary risk assessment and pathway analysis has been produced, more communication needs to be established with the Solomon Island authorities to understand sources & pathways of invasions for potential new IAS threats on Rennell.

**4. Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impacts**

The successful completion of the 10-day field and community survey which was the main activity of the project can be attributed to the collaborative efforts of the communities of East Rennell, in particular the Lake Tegano World Heritage Site Association (LTWWSA). The Chairman George Tauika who is the Head Teacher of the local village school is a strong conservation advocate and has been supportive of the project from the onset. Mr Tauika and members of the LTWWSA contribute their time voluntarily to the Association and their support for the project must be commended. The LTWWSA has also had their fair share of challenges working with the communities, as there's been a lot of frustration expressed towards the authorities for the lack of tangible benefits received. The lack of resources, both financial and technical within the LTWWSA severely limit opportunities to address conservation needs and projects such as this, which help develop local capacity must be encouraged.

One of the key challenges of working on Rennell in general is the vast travel distance from mainland (Honiara) and again between the main 'town area' of Tigoa and East Rennell. Travel costs are not cheap and undertaking comprehensive consultations and implementing conservation actions requires significant time and finance in order to develop the necessary local capacity and deliver results. While this isolation has helped protect the natural values of the world heritage area, it has also presented the local communities with limited opportunities. Accordingly, the local communities within the WHA are self-sufficient and connecting with an 'external market' in delivering livelihood outcomes is challenging (because of the isolation, lack of infrastructure and capacity limitations).

Detailed market research and understanding of the opportunities and constraints for the WHA communities and Rennell generally is a prerequisite to informing potential alternative livelihoods (including tourism). The lack of communication mediums in East Rennell despite it being the only UNESCO World Heritage Site in the Solomon Islands, poses another challenge. Information sharing as part of an ongoing monitoring program for WHA will be difficult.

Logging (and by extension mining) remain threats to the WHA, but safeguards have so far protected the area from these activities whereas the (substantial) risk and actuality of invasive species introduction have affected the WHA. Biosecurity (or the lack of) is currently the single most significant risk and challenge to the natural values, livelihoods and food security on Rennell.

Invasive species already present elsewhere in the Solomons, such as Giant African Land Snail and Rhinoceros Beetle could severely impact lives, livelihoods and biodiversity. However these threats are dwarfed by the risk that international vessels pose in transiting directly to Rennell. There is little evidence to indicate that a substantive biosecurity procedure is enforced and the suite of invasive invertebrates, mammals, reptiles, plants and pathogens that could invade from China and Indonesia is of significant concern for Rennell and the Solomon Islands generally.

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

Local communities at the East Rennell World Heritage Area have expressed disappointment at the slow response and lack of action by the relevant government authorities to fulfil assurances made at the Roundtable Meeting held in Honiara in August 2017. A Cabinet resolution was made to revoke and refuse all logging licenses for Rennell

<http://www.pina.com.fj/?p=pacnews&m=read&o=143968249599a5c8d7e049bce5934e>

While there was no formal platform for communities to voice their concern, the field (and community) survey in August 2018 provided an opportunity for open, informal discussions to take place. Following the survey, the communities had a better understanding of the impacts of invasive species to the world heritage area and its resources and there was an increased appreciation for the work of the LTWWSA in trying to address concerns raised by the communities.

In September 2018, a month after the survey, the LTWWSA was informed that a Development Consent was to be issued to a logging company up to the WHA ‘boundary’. While this was completely unexpected, the LTWWSA intervened positively by way of a signed letter by all members to the Director of Environment and Conservation Division in Honiara, appealing to reconsider this consent and presenting a number of Resolutions. BirdLife International – Pacific also submitted a letter to the Director of Environment and UNESCO identifying the effects of the concession.

**PART II: Project Outcomes and Products/Deliverables**

**6. Outcomes (as stated in the approved proposal)**

Describe the results of your project and each deliverable:

<b>Expected Outcome</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>Associated Deliverable</b>
IAS presence on Rennell assessed	10 day field & community survey	Survey Report
Population baseline established on Rennell	Bird survey completed & recorded; rat & ant traps set, monitored & reported.	Survey Report
Points of IAS introductions & pathway risks identified and analyzed	Domestic points of entries identified for Rennell; more work needed to identify sources & pathways of international vessels	Preliminary Risk Assessment & Pathway Analysis

Rat management options identified and recommendations suggested to eliminate risk of new arrivals of IAS	Locally-led rat management options identified with local communities; biosecurity discussions to be held with authorities	Rennell Biosecurity & Action Plan
--	---	-----------------------------------

**7. Please describe and submit any project outputs – e.g. tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.**

East Rennell IAS and Bird Survey, Biosecurity risk assessment and recommendations.

**PART III: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing**

**Lessons Learned**

**8. Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.**

The project site is remote and isolated and communications are limited; hence sufficient external capacity (time and travel) is essential to achieving well-designed project concepts, effective project implementation and building of local capacity.

All four communities remain interested and supportive of opportunities for nature conservation. However, the lack of infrastructural support (access and communications) are universally regarded as the main impediments to local people benefiting from the WHA program.

**Sustainability / Replication**

**9. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.**

BirdLife Pacific has secured a small fund to discuss the findings of the 2018 survey and resulting recommendations with the communities of East Rennell. This will be conducted in July 2019 and BirdLife will work with the LTWHSA to also meet with key Government stakeholders in Honiara. Outcomes of these consultations will inform the scope, scale and support for future invasive management program on East Rennell, including the development of a biosecurity framework.

**Safeguards**

**10. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social or environmental safeguards that your project may have triggered.**

The project team had been well informed by the LTWHSA of all recent work and discussions within the East Rennell communities regarding the management of the WHA and its benefits. The team ensured that no expectations were raised as part of this project. Expectations in terms of rat management were managed well and it was made known to the communities, from the onset that rat eradication was not currently feasible due to a number of variables, including scale, complexity and cost, all of which would result in low probability of success.

The Safeguards documents has been updated and is submitted as part of this Final Reporting.

## Additional Funding

### **11. 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 CEPF investment**

a. **Total additional funding (US\$) 16, 605**

b. **Type of funding**

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Birdfair & Tokyo Gala Foundation	A	USD 11, 370	Birdfair and the Tokyo Gala supported salary expenses for the Programme Manager, Programme Coordinator & some of Consultant's (Ray Pierce) time, travel & meeting expenses.
Department of Conservation, NZ Government	B	NZD 8, 000	Agreement signed for post-survey consultation to discuss findings of 2018 survey and resulting recommendations.

\* Categorize the type of funding as:

- 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)*

## Additional Comments/Recommendations

### **12. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF.**

All comments and recommendations have been explicitly explained in the various sections of this report. Nothing further to add.

## PART IV: Impact at Portfolio and Global Level

CEPF requires that each grantee report on impact at the end of the project. The purpose of this report is to collect data that will contribute to CEPF's portfolio and global indicators. CEPF will aggregate the data that you submit with data from other grantees, to determine the overall impact of CEPF investment. CEPF's aggregated results will be reported on in our annual report and other communications materials.

**Ensure that the information provided pertains to the entire project, from start date to project end date.**



### Contribution to Portfolio Indicators

13. If CEPF assigned one or more Portfolio Indicators to your project during the full proposal preparation phase, please list these below and report on the project's contribution(s) to them.

Indicator	Narrative
-	

### Contribution to Global Indicators

Please report on all Global Indicators (sections 16 to 23 below) that pertain to your project.

#### 14. Key Biodiversity Area Management

##### Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) with improved management

Please report on the number of hectares in KBAs with improved management, as a result of CEPF investment. Examples of improved management include, but are not restricted to: increased patrolling, reduced intensity of snaring, invasive species eradication, reduced incidence of fire, and introduction of sustainable agricultural/fisheries practices. Do not record the entire area covered by the project - only record the number of hectares that have improved management.

If you have recorded part or all of a KBA as newly protected for the indicator entitled "protected areas" (section 17 below), and you have also improved its management, you should record the relevant number of hectares for both this indicator and the "protected areas" indicator.

Name of KBA	# of Hectares with strengthened management *	Is the KBA Not protected, Partially protected or Fully protected? Please select one: NP/PP/FP
-		

\* Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.

#### 15. Protected Areas

##### 15a. Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

Report on the number of hectares of protected areas that have been created or expanded as a result of CEPF investment.

Name of PA*	Country(s)	# of Hectares	Year of legal declaration or expansion	Longitude**	Latitude**
-					

\* If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.

*\*\* Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).*

**15b. Protected Area Management**

If you have been requested to submit a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), please follow the instructions below. If you have not been requested to submit a METT, please go directly to section 16.

Should you want to know more about the monitoring of protected area management effectiveness and the tracking tool, please click [here](#).

Download the METT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with the protected area authorities to fill it out. Please go to the Protected Planet website [here](#) and search for your protected area in their database to record its associated WDPA ID. Then please fill in the following table:

WDPA ID	PA Official Name	Date of METT*	METT Total Score
-			

*\* Please indicate when the METT was filled by the authorities of the park or provide a best estimate if the exact date is unknown. And please only provide METTs less than 12 months old.*

Please do not forget to submit the completed METT together with this report.

**16. Production landscape**

Please report on the number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity, as a result of CEPF investment. A production landscape is defined as a landscape where agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs. Production landscapes may include KBAs, and therefore hectares counted under the indicator entitled “KBA Management” may also be counted here. Examples of interventions include: best practices and guidelines implemented, incentive schemes introduced, sites/products certified and sustainable harvesting regulations introduced.

**Number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity.**

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention
-				

*\* If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.*

*\*\*Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.*

*\*\*\* Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456).*

## 17. Beneficiaries

CEPF wants to record two types of benefits that are likely to be received by individuals: structured training and increased income. Please report on the number of men and women that have benefited from structured training (such as financial management, beekeeping, horticulture) and/or increased income (such as from tourism, agriculture, medicinal plant harvest/production, fisheries, handicraft production) as a result of CEPF investment. Please provide results since the start of your project to project completion.

### 17a. Number of men and women receiving structured training.

# of men receiving structured training *	# of women receiving structured training *
4	1

*\*Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received structured training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also received structured training in project management, the total number of men who benefited from structured training should be 5.*

### 17b. Number of men and women receiving cash benefits.

# of men receiving cash benefits*	# of women receiving cash benefits*
0	0

*\*Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received cash benefits due to tourism, and 3 of these also received cash benefits from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who received cash benefits should be 5.*

### 18. Benefits to Communities

CEPF wants to record the benefits received by communities, which can differ to those received by individuals because the benefits are available to a group. CEPF also wants to record, to the extent possible, the number of people within each community who are benefiting. Please report on the characteristics of the communities, the type of benefits that have been received during the project, and the number of men/boys and women/girls from these communities that have benefited, as a result of CEPF investment. If exact numbers are not known, please provide an estimate.

18a. Please provide information for all communities that have benefited from project start to project completion.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Type of Benefit (mark with x)								# of Beneficiaries		
	Subsistence economy	Small landowners	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*	Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional knowledge	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services	# of men and boys benefiting	# of women and girls benefiting
East Rennell	x	x	x						x								600	600

\*If you marked "Other" to describe the community characteristic, please explain:



19b. For each law, policy or regulation listed above, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

No.	Country(s)	Date enacted/ amended MM/DD/YYYY	Expected impact	Action that you performed to achieve this change
1	-			
2				
3				

## 20. Sustainable Financing Mechanism

Sustainable financing mechanisms generate financial resources for the long-term (generally five or more years). Examples of sustainable financial mechanisms include conservation trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes, and other revenue, fee or tax schemes that generate long-term funding for conservation.

All CEPF grantees (or sub-grantees) with project activities that pertain to the creation and/or the implementation of a sustainable financing mechanism are requested to provide information on the mechanism and the funds it delivered to conservation projects during the project timeframe, unless another grantee involved with the same mechanism has already been or is expected to be tasked with this.

CEPF requires that all sustainable financing mechanism projects to provide the necessary information at their completion.

### 20a. Details about the mechanism

Fill in this table for as many mechanisms you worked on during your project implementation as needed.

NO.	Name of financing mechanism	Purpose of the mechanism*	Date of Establishment**	Description***	Countries
1	-				
2					
3					

\*Please provide a succinct description of the mission of the mechanism.

\*\*Please indicate when the sustainable financing mechanism was officially created. If you do not know the exact date, provide a best estimate.

\*\*\*Description, such as trust fund, endowment, PES scheme, incentive scheme, etc.

### 20b. Performance of the mechanism

For each Financing Mechanism listed previously, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

NO.	Project intervention*	\$ Amount disbursed to conservation projects**	Period under Review (MM/YYYY -MM/YYYY)***
1	-		
2			
3			

\*List whether the CEPF grant has helped to create a new mechanism (Created a mechanism) or helped to support an existing mechanism (Supported an existing mechanism) or helped to create and then support a new mechanism (Created and supported a new mechanism).

\*\*Please only indicate the USD amount disbursed to conservation projects during the period of implementation of your project and using, when needed, the exchange rate on the day of your report.

\*\*\*Please indicate the period of implementation of your project or the period considered for the amount you indicated.

Please do not forget to submit any relevant document which could provide justification for the amount you stated above.

**21. Biodiversity-friendly Practices**

Please describe any biodiversity-friendly practices that companies have adopted as a result of CEPF investment. A company is defined as a legal entity made up of an association of people, be they natural, legal, or a mixture of both, for carrying on a commercial or industrial enterprise. While companies take various forms, for the purposes of CEPF, a company is defined as a for-profit business entity. A biodiversity-friendly practice is one that conserves or uses biodiversity sustainably.

**Number of companies that adopt biodiversity-friendly practices**

No.	Name of company	Description of biodiversity-friendly practice adopted during the project
1	-	
2		

**22. Networks & Partnerships**

Please report on any new networks or partnerships between civil society groups and across to other sectors that you have established or strengthened as a result of CEPF investment. Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable even if they do not have a Memorandum of Understanding or other type of validation. Examples of networks/partnerships include: an alliance of fisherfolk to promote sustainable fisheries practices, a network of environmental journalists, a partnership between one or more NGOs with one or more private sector partners to improve biodiversity management on private lands, a working group focusing on reptile conservation. Please do not use this tab to list the partners in your project, unless some or all of them are part of such a network / partnership described above.

**Number of networks and/or partnerships created and/or strengthened**

No.	Name of Network	Name of Partnership	Year established	Did project establish this Network/ Partnership? Y/N	Country(s) covered	Purpose
1	Lake Tegano World Heritage Site Association	-	2005	N	Solomon Islands	Oversee & coordinate efforts at the East Rennell World Heritage Site



### **23. Gender**

If you have been requested to submit a Gender Tracking Tool (GTT), please follow the instructions provided in the Excel GTT template. If you have not been requested to submit a GTT, please go directly to Part V.

Should you want to know more about CEPF Gender Policy, please click [here](#).

Download the GTT template which can be found on [this page](#) and then work with your team to fill it out. Please do not forget to submit the completed GTT together with this report.

### **Part V. 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](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

<b>17. Name:</b>	Miliana Ravuso
<b>18. Organization:</b>	BirdLife International - Pacific Secretariat (Regional Office)
<b>19. Mailing address:</b>	GPO Box 18332, Suva, Fiji Islands
<b>20. Telephone number:</b>	+679 3313492
<b>21. E-mail address:</b>	<a href="mailto:miliana.ravuso@birdlife.org">miliana.ravuso@birdlife.org</a>