

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	BirdLife International
Project Title:	Fijians for Fijian Forests - Supporting Community-Driven Protected Area Establishment in Fiji
Date of Report:	
Report Author and Contact Information	Miliana Ravuso, BirdLife International Fiji Programme 10 McGregor Road, Suva, Fiji Phone (679) 3313 492 Fax (679) 3319 658

CEPF Region: Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot

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

Grant Amount: \$155,346

Project Dates: June 1, 2009-May 30, 2011

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

This project was designed and implemented together with the following partners:

* **Fiji Government (national partner)** - Department of Forests (DoF) are involved at both project sites, participate in all community workshops, provide technical advice on sustainable forestry management, levels of forest protection and their limitations under the Fiji Forest Policy. DoF also provided some native tree seedlings to improve degraded forests in Nabukelevu. Other relevant Departments and the Native Land Trust Board provided technical advice on legal processes required for the formal recognition of the two protected areas. Department of Agriculture conducted community training on the poultry project, model farm and methods of sustainable land practices. Department of Co-operatives are involved in the livelihood component of the project, providing training on beekeeping and establishing a monitoring system for the livelihood projects.

* **Cakaudrove and Kadavu Provincial Councils** – provincial councils are an important partner to any community focused project in Fiji. The provincial councils were kept informed of all meetings and workshops conducted at the sites and all reports have been circulated to the respective offices. Executive heads of the councils, called the *Roko Tuis* participated by officiating at some of the community meetings and workshops.

* **NatureFiji-MareqetiViti (NFMV) and other BirdLife Pacific Partners (all national NGOs)** - NFMV is also working with Site Support Groups in Fiji (e.g. in Tomaniivi) and is working closely with BirdLife to learn from BirdLifes experiences in this field. Project activities and outputs will be shared with NFMV as well as with the BirdLife Partner organisations in Palau, Samoa, New Caledonia, French Polynesia, the Cook Islands, Australia and New Zealand. The community conservation work carried out by the BirdLife Fiji Programme is being used by the Pacific Partners as a model for community-based forest conservation and is already being replicated in New Caledonia.

* **Site Support Groups in Nabukelevu and Natewa (local partners)** – Both SSGs were the main vehicles for implementation of this project. SSGs are local conservation groups who work together with BirdLife, on a voluntary basis, to protect and sustainably use their natural resources. SSG representatives are democratically elected and comprised of representatives of each of the land-owning mataqalis at the two sites; they made all key decisions in this project, including facilitating meetings and workshops, presenting project activities and results to village and district meetings and assisting with village livelihood projects.

* Other partners include USP-IAS (biodiversity surveys), training institutes (including SPC), Fiji Protected Area Committee (legal endorsement of 2 community PAs).

Conservation Impacts

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

At the end of the project, two community-managed protected areas have been established and strengthened and are being managed by local conservation groups called Site Support Groups. The SSGs at the 2 project sites are all community representatives that were democratically elected, they have undergone training in IBA monitoring and management and fundraising. The SSGs provide support to the communities within the KBAs in the implementation of a community resource management plan.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

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

The long-term objective of this project is the survival and perpetual conservation of the forests in Nabukelevu/Mt Washington and the Natewa/Tunuloa Important Bird Areas / CEPF priority sites 71 and 76, and the birds and other biodiversity they contain. In this way this project contributes to the strategic objectives of the CEPF Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot Ecosystem Profile/CEPF investment; to the implementation of the Fiji Government National Environment Strategy and NBSAP; and to the implementation of the BirdLife International Regional Pacific Programme 2009-2012, and the MoU between BirdLife and the Government of Fiji.

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed between BirdLife International Fiji Programme and the two communities at Nabukelevu and Natewa Tunuloa IBAs for the protection of a portion of the IBAs for 20 and 10 years respectively. Both community-established PAs are identified as priority areas and have been endorsed as 'existing informal PAs in need of some form of recognition and protection' by the National Protected Area Committee/Forum. The national PAC has since submitted to cabinet a paper "Submission on Development of National Policy and Legislative Framework for Protected Areas" and this will clearly define the long-term protection and management of the two community-based PAs.

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

The short-term impacts of this project include the actual establishment of two community-based, community-monitored and community-managed protected areas where the local people living in and around these areas, organized in two strong Site Support Groups, benefit from sustainable agriculture and income-generating activities that are compatible with forest conservation.

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

Two community-based protected areas have been established and are being managed and monitored by Site Support Groups living in and around the two IBAs. Landowning communities of the two community-based PAs are now implementing and benefiting from forest-based income-generating activities that are being managed by village women and youth groups and supported by the SSGs. Income-generating activities include beekeeping, handicraft, poultry and a bakery in Natewa Tunuloa IBA and pineapple and sustainable agricultural farming and a native tree nursery in Nabukelevu, Kadavu.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: 8029.3696 hectares

Species Conserved: 7 species (globally threatened)

Corridors Created: 0

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

One major challenge faced during the project was getting some members of the communities to agree to protect their forests with no compensation in return, since some communities depend on forest resources for daily sustenance. Stakeholder engagement and communication was very important during this project and involving government departments was crucial in making this process less complicated. A management planning workshop was held to seek community views and input on the forest protection terms and alternative income-generating benefits. Communities were able to identify ways to better protect and manage natural resources and at the same time implement short-term conservation friendly initiatives to generate income.

A huge success of this project was the actual establishment of the community-managed PAs and its recognition with the newly established national Protected Area forum. This move will ensure that the two areas get some form of long-term protection and management. It will also enhance commitment from communities as there are already plans to promote eco-tourism within the IBAs and have birdwatching as a core activity. Another achievement was the development of the two SSGs. Although the SSG registration was delayed, this did not deter the SSGs from carrying out activities at the IBAs. SSGs were involved in the establishment of livelihood projects, IBA monitoring and policing of community-managed PAs and are now at a stage to propose and implement small projects. The Natewa Tunuloa SSG is now implementing a GEF-SGP funded project in partnership with BirdLife International Fiji Programme.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Following the establishment of the Natewa Tunuloa community-managed PA and the establishment of the livelihood projects in the six landowning villages, other villages around the IBA showed interest in joining the SSG and protecting their forests. This was quite unexpected since awareness had been carried out in these villages in the past, but there had been little feedback and interest from them. The SSG and PA landowning clans have agreed to discuss this further, before a recommendation is put to BirdLife and the relevant government authorities.

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: Community-based protected areas at Nabukelevu and Natewa are established

Component 1 Actual at Completion: Community-based protected areas have been established at Nabukelevu and Natewa and both communities have agreed on having the areas designated as community conserved areas or community managed areas. This is being pursued with the national Protected Area forum. Management planning workshops have been conducted at both sites, out of which resource plans have been developed. The plans are in draft form (awaiting comments from stakeholders), however SSGs and communities are already implementing conservation actions (derived from the plan) at the respective sites.

Component 2 Planned: Conservation status and knowledge of the two IBAs/KBAs is improved

Component 2 Actual at Completion: IBA monitoring was carried out from the 6-16 September 2010 in Natewa Tunuloa and 27 September – 6 October 2010 in Nabukelevu. The data has been uploaded on the WBDB and the data shows that there has been some improvement in the conservation status of both IBAs. There were also a greater number of birds recorded than in past research (2009). The SSG will now conduct the monitoring at regular intervals.

Component 3 Planned: Site Support Groups are able to continue activities after the project ends

Component 3 Actual at Completion: There has been a delay in the registration of the SSG due to unforeseen circumstances, but the SSG is pursuing this. All SSG committee members have applied for their TIN registration with the Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority, after which they can formally apply for registration as a community-based organisation. This has not hindered the activity of the SSGs; they are functioning effectively, the committee meets every month with each meeting reported on and all financial transactions recorded (income generated from SSG projects). Both SSGs have increased membership to 14 representatives each, a larger number than 2009. The SSGs monitor IBAs and the livelihood projects implemented by the various villages. Project activities and results will be sustained and can be carried forward after this project. In Nabukelevu, SSG projects are the nursery and the pineapple farm and the Natewa Tunuloa SSG (Sisi Initiative) are now recipients of their 1st grant from GEF-Small Grants Programme, to conduct an ecotourism assessment and to establish sandalwood and a native tree nursery (follow the Nabukelevu model).

Component 4 Planned: Project results and models are widely disseminated

Component 4 Actual at Completion: BirdLife community conservation 'model' has been described in two documents: *Briefing Paper on the Natewa Tunuloa Community-Declared Protected Area* and a *Community Engagement Plan*, which has been derived from case studies of both sites. Project results and 'model' have been shared with local, national and regional targets at the:

- Fiji Islands Conservation Forum August 2009 (national)
- BirdLife Pacific Partnership Meeting September 2009 (regional)
- Cakaudrove Provincial Council Meeting October 2009 (local)
- Kadavu Provincial Council Meeting May 2010 (local)
- Leadership Fiji Seminar September 2010 (national)

Project results have been highlighted by national media: FJ Sun, 21/10/09 (conservation in Natewa Tunuloa); FJ Times 19/05/10 (personal profile and work of BirdLife in communities); FJ Sun 21/05/10 (Nabukelevu Management Planning Workshop); FJ Times 22/05/10 (Nabukelevu Management Planning Workshop); FJ Sun 19/06/10 (birds & pollution); FJ Focus 12/06/10 (birds & pollution) and regional media in the Pacific Women's Information Network <http://lyris.spc.int/read/messages?id=69575>. (personal profile and work of BL in communities)

Project activities and outputs were featured on the BirdLife website:

<http://www.birdlife.org/community/tag/fiji/> (20/05/10, 04/08/10, 13/07/11)

http://www.birdlife.org/regional/pacific/fiji_programme.html (permanent feature)

Project results & outputs have been featured in four editions of the BirdLife Pacific e-bulletin:

1st edition Apr-Jun 2010 (Nabukelevu Management Planning Workshop); 2nd edition July-Sept 2010 (SSG Workshop); 3rd edition Oct-Dec 2010 (IBA Monitoring); 4th edition Jan-Mar 2011 (Nabukelevu reforestation)

Finally 2 site-specific posters has been produced & disseminated: *Conserving Biodiversity & Improving Livelihoods in Natewa Tunuloa IBA* and *Maroroi Kadavu kei Na kena Yaubula*.

In addition, references to the project have been made on several papers, publications & websites: UNEP/ICCA <http://www.iccaregistry.org/en/sites/4>

CEPF http://www.cepf.net/resources/lessons_learned/Pages/BirdLife_Fiji.aspx

BirdLife International (2010) *Partners for sustainability: What BirdLife is doing for people and the planet*. Cambridge, UK

International Institute for Environment and Development (2011) *Poverty, Biodiversity and Local Organisations: Lessons from BirdLife International*. London, UK.

BirdLife International (2011) *An Introduction to Conservation and Human Rights*. In publication.

BirdLife International (2011) *Local Empowerment: BirdLife's Participatory Approach*. DRAFT.

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

No.

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

- 1) Briefing Paper on the Natewa Tunuloa Community-Declared PA
- 2) Community Engagement Plan

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)

An important lesson learnt was the identification of products/deliverables during the project design and proposal writing stage. Working with communities is quite challenging and requires a lot of engagement and communication and one must always take into account that community views and reaction about the project may not always remain the same but can often change. Careful selection of deliverables must be done to ensure that projects are not over-ambitious.

In this project, the total number of SSG representatives for Natewa Tunuloa was expected to increase (target of 25) and this was based on the current membership rate and level of support from the communities. However during the project, few proposals surfaced from industrial stakeholders to carry out developments (including logging) on land bordering the IBA. This required careful dialogue with the landowners and the industrial stakeholders, with the support of the Forestry Department. Because there were a lot of deliberations, more time and effort was put into this consultation process. Thus, although the target was not achieved, what was important is that BirdLife and the SSG had communicated well with the communities and highlighted the established community-managed PA as a model to generate income. At the end of the project, the SSG target membership of 25 was not achieved, but more communities agreed to protect their forests.

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

Constant dialogue and continuous engagement with communities was crucial to building on the already established relationships and trust between BirdLife and communities at the two sites. Participatory forums were encouraged, locally elected representatives formed SSGs and therefore communities gained a sense of ownership of the project.

Almost all communities depend on forests for livelihood and a balance had to be sought between the protection of the forests and their livelihoods and well-being. Again, this required good communication and dialogue and it was vital that communities were made aware of the tangible benefits of conserving their forests. The document on "*Legal Mechanisms for the Establishment and Management of Terrestrial Protected Areas in Fiji*" was presented to communities, and with input from government departments, communities were able to agree on the type of protected area they would like. BirdLife was able to take this and propose it to the national Protected Area forum which will then decide its (long-term) endorsement under a new PA legislation for Fiji. At the same time communities have implemented forest-based income generating projects that are benefiting them.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Working with communities is challenging but unique. Project activities may not all be implemented during the target period due to a variety of reasons, and sometimes project activities have to be altered to ensure that communities understand the conservation message. Project staff need to be both flexible and stern with the implementation of activities, keeping in mind that all activities need to be completed by the end of the project. Activities that are beyond project control are activities such as village meetings, consultations, workshops etc, those that are dependent on communities. Activities that project staff can actually control are any form of development activities and assistance. Project staff need to be uncompromising about completion of development and construction activities at the agreed time. Sometimes communities get too comfortable receiving "hand-outs" and this needs to be addressed at the beginning of the project; communities need to be clear about their commitment over labor costs and in-kind contribution. Having a local conservation group (for e.g. the Site Support Group) is an advantage as they can be very facilitating in getting this message across.

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
Darwin Initiative	B	\$ 9,069	Project ended June 2009. Supporting community-established PAs in Natewa Tunuloa & Mt Washington.
Keidanren Nature Conservation Fund	B	\$13, 000	Project ended March 2011 Kids for Kadavu Project – a community driven schools programme
US Embassy Fiji	B	\$24, 999	Project end July 2011. Forest protection in Fiji and the Pacific - for birds and people (supporting livelihood activities on Natewa Tunuloa & Mt Nabukelevu)
GEF	B	\$43,926	SGP (parallel, CEPF-related project in Nabukelevu/Mt Washington) 2 years end 2012.
Aage V Jensen Charity Foundation	B	\$18,114	Forest conservation project, focus on advocacy and awareness raising; co-funding will mainly cover travel, community meetings, communications and office costs. 3 years.
BirdLife International	A	\$79,532	Staff time (Programme Development Manager, Senior Technical Advisor above budget), additional support from BirdLife headquarters, supervision by Regional Director, use of vehicle, office equipment and

			office facilities, and participation in meetings (especially the BirdLife Pacific Partnership meetings).
Pacific Development Conservation Trust	B	\$17, 071	Kids for Kadavu project – community-driven schools programme. Feb 2011-Feb 2012
GEF	B	\$48, 000	SGP. Implemented & managed by Sisi Initiative (Natewa SSG) to support activities in IBA (ecotourism, nursery and reforestation activities). May 2011-June 2013
CEPF	B	\$194 350	Adopt lessons learned from this 'Fijians for Fijian Forests' and the community based PA approach to the conservation of IBAs/KBAs. Promoting this approach among BirdLife Partners and other NGOs in the Pacific. Jan 2011-Dec 2012.

****Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:***

- A*** *Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B*** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- C*** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

The development of the two Site Support Groups have contributed a lot to the success and planned sustainability of the project, and hence the activities at the IBA. Field trips conducted for the SSGs, site exchange visits, biosecurity, IBA monitoring and fundraising training have all been part of the capacity-building exercise for the SSGs and this has enhanced their knowledge and skills. The SSGs are more aware of their roles and responsibilities and have taken pride and ownership over the project. In Natewa Tunuloa, the Sisi Initiative (SSG) will now implement and manage their first project of reforestation & ecotourism development, with funding from GEF-SGP. BirdLife International will support the SSGs by providing technical expertise and advice, particularly in terms of financial management.

Once the SSGs are registered, the greatest challenge will be to ensure that they continue to develop their skills, are empowered and supported by local organisations and government departments.

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.

Strong emphasis was placed on collaboration with government departments, particularly the respective Provincial Offices. The Provincial offices were notified of all site visits, meetings, trainings and workshops conducted and each report was handed back to them. This ensured total transparency and accountability and safeguarded project activities.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

No additional comments.

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: Miliana Ravuso
Organization name: BirdLife International
Mailing address: G.P.O Box 18332, Suva, Fiji
Tel: (679) 3313 492
Fax: (679) 3319 658
E-mail: milly@birdlifepacific.org.fj

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(1 June 2009 – 30 May 2011)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Yes		6625 ha	Natewa Tunuloa Community Declared PA
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	Yes		1404.3696 ha	Mt Nabukelevu Community-Declared PA
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		20, 500 ha	Natewa Tunuloa IBA 17, 600 ha Mt Nabukelevu IBA 2900 ha
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes		12, 470.63 ha	Strengthen management practices outside the community-declared PAs (inside the IBA) Natewa Tunuloa 10, 975 ha Nabukelevu 1495.63 ha
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	Yes			

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

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

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

Name of Community	Community Characteristics							Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit													
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:				Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
Natewa Tunuloa		X	X						X				X						X	X	
Mt Nabukelevu, Kadavu	X	X	X						X				X		X				X	X	
Total																					

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

