

CEPF LARGE GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Launching the Pacific Invasive Learning Network (PILN): Strengthening and Connecting Invasive Species Management and Demonstration Projects Across the Pacific Islands

Implementation Partners for This Project:

Ten regional and national Pacific island agencies are actively cooperating to establish and support the PILN to help meet the needs of Pacific Island countries and territories:

- Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
- The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
- Conservation International (CI)
- IUCN's Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG)
- National Park of American Samoa (NPSA)
- Palau Office of Environmental Response & Coordination (OERC)
- Pacific Programme of the Cooperative Island Initiative (PII)
- Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
- University of the South Pacific (USP)
- United States Forest Service (USFS).

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): January 1, 2006 - June 30, 2006

Date of Report (month/year): July/2006

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.

The Pacific Invasives Learning Network (PILN) is a new and novel initiative aimed at building capacity in the Pacific region in invasive species management and thereby reducing the impact of invasive species on biodiversity and sustainable development.

III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. Briefly describe the methods used in achieving the objectives of this project.

Experience from other lateral learning networks has noted their effectiveness as instruments for capacity building and indicated the importance of shared, clearly articulated objectives and face-to-face meetings. Pro-active network coordination is essential for their effective operation. The design of PILN is therefore based around the hiring of a full time coordinator, annual meetings for all participants and a series of expert exchanges / thematic meetings to build capacity in technical areas and the development of lessons learned. During this reporting period the main activities which have taken place are: selection of the founding teams, visits to each team, and organisation of the official network launch and first annual meeting, Palau 22 – 26 May 2006, at which capacity building needs were identified.

Founding teams were selected following a recruitment process in March 2006. Teams are multi sectoral and multi agency, to ensure that key stakeholders and actors in invasive species management actions have a voice. The inclusion of different sectors and agencies ensures that awareness is raised of the different interests and concerns. For example, it is common for

collaboration between the agricultural and environment sector to be weak, leading to a lack of coordinated activities and much wasted effort. A total of 6 initial founding teams were selected to participate at the first annual meeting in May 2006: American Samoa, Guam, Niue, Palau, Pohnpei and Samoa. CEPF grantees running invasive species management demonstration projects are recruited in a separate process managed by the Pacific Invasives Initiative and are actively involved in the PILN. Three of the 6 initial founding teams include CEPF grantees (Palau, Pohnpei and Samoa) and those from the Cook Islands and French Polynesia were also invited to the first annual meeting.

Networks tend to lack contact at local level, with the focus being on national actors, a common limitation of networks. PILN overcomes this by using a project focus, and teams plan and present work at both field and strategic level. Field projects are concerned with practical invasive species management activities, involving the local community and developing technical skills. Strategic projects address national / archipelago issues and initiatives, so founding team membership ensures that a combination of agency and sectoral stakeholder interests will be addressed at all levels.

In summary, the methodology used promotes PILN as a mechanism for capacity building in the region, where the network also serves as a model which can be applied to other issues.

2. Describe what was achieved in terms of:

a) capacity development;

At the first annual meeting in Palau, 22 – 26 May 2006, participants analyzed their collective experience to draft develop lessons learned in 4 key thematic areas, identified as being of common concern to all countries: public awareness, strategic planning, weed management and island restoration:

Public awareness

Lessons learned for success are:

- Should be done first to get public support before on-the-ground action
- Define your purpose
- Define your audience – age class, sector, etc.
- Know your audience
- Identify the key messages
- Adapt materials to suit local conditions
- Use Snappy Slogans
- Use advertising strategies
- Use as many different media as possible
- Use cheap/free methods as much as possible
- Find out what worked (or didn't) elsewhere
- Include measures of success (pre/post surveys, useful questions)
- Don't overlook the essential value of success and telling people about it, demonstration projects can show it is possible
- Create a resource library – Global Invasive Species Database?

Strategic planning

It was noted that there are different levels of planning:

- Regional
- National
- Sub-national

Emergency Response Planning can be:

- Generic
- National
- For species / taxa

For Project Plans, lessons learned for success are:

- All partners have the capacity to develop plans
- The planning process is more important than the paper document
- Templates are available
- Guidelines
- Test the Emergency Response Plans
- Have a plan
- Use model plans
- Involve stakeholders (include government)
- Good facilitation of the planning process is important
- Collect & share information
- Review & adapt plans
- Connect strategic plans to annual work plans and budgets, especially helpful to include timeframes, responsibilities, etc.
- Incorporate accounting structure and finance in the plan
- Good levels of communication are important
- Be flexible
- High level support is important
- Have someone responsible for driving the plan
- Have the right resources (people and money)
- Expedient plan process
- Plan in response to need/ demand, don't plan until you need it
- Take environment and weather into account
- Make the plan fit your situation/needs/appropriate scale; still need strategic direction

Weed management

Lessons learned for success are:

- There is a process, follow it
- Initial survey for early detection
- Attack while you can – the longer you wait the more it costs and the harder it gets
- Risk assessment and prioritization
- Pick a species where you can make a difference
- Community consultation/ stakeholder involvement – what's in it for them?
- Act: make commitments to resources – people/money/training
- Don't stop until you are done - "FAILURE IS NOT AN OPTION"
- Monitor and feedback/evaluate

Avoid the following:

- Poorly planned projects e.g. wrong/sloppy methods
- Unsafe practices
- Inadequate consultation
- Skipping evaluations
- Inflexible plans/ Inflexible leaders
- Rigid planning

Island restoration

Lessons learned for success are:

- Plan!
 - Agree on a good goal / S.M.A.R.T Objectives (start, small/realistic = SUCCESS)
- Understand social, economic and ecological issues
- Be prepared to adapt
- Social Marketing
- Include good science
- Include Traditional Ecological Knowledge

- Engage technical assistance
- Identify and empower a project manager (local)
- Stakeholder involvement from the onset - Stakeholders are particular people with interests
- Really need to focus on the decision-makers immediately above you
- Take bureaucrats to an island for a day and show them what you are doing; success is often overlooked
- The Global Invasive Species Database is an ideal repository for info on technical inputs for a particular species

Capacity was also developed in project planning. Each PILN founding team drafted an Action Plan for one of their priority projects and identified the next steps required:

- American Samoa: Eradicate Strawberry Guava from American Samoa by the end of 2008.
- Guam: Control bud rot *Phytophthora palmivora* on Betelnut in Guam.
- Niue: To contain the *Wedelia* (a weed) affected sites within Niue to 0.7 hectares.
- Palau: By the end of 2008, no more trees of the forest margin along the compact road are covered with Kebeas (*Merremia peltata*).
- Pohnpei: Eradicate 100% of the following: False Kava, Mile-a-Minute, ivy Gourd, and Chain of Love by 2008
- Samoa: To secure funding to carry out activities to manage and prevent invasive species in Samoa.

b) developing partnerships;

The first annual meeting provided a venue for invasive species workers in the Pacific to meet and develop professional relationships for the first time. It was particularly valuable in bringing together people from both island nations and US territories, and both donor agencies and invasive species workers. In total 42 people from 11 countries participated (American Samoa, Cook Islands, Fiji, French Polynesia, Guam, Hawaii, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Pohnpei and Samoa).

Thirty four participants completed an evaluation form at the end of the Palau meeting, 8 expressed themselves as “satisfied”, 25 “very satisfied” and 1 as “very very satisfied” with the meeting; no-one was dissatisfied. Participants expressed that their expectations were exceeded in the following:

- Feeling of camaraderie, new friendships. Togetherness, harmonies, love and care.
- Degree of engagement by the participants and their enthusiasm.
- Networking opportunities and the fruitfulness of the interactions.
- The organisation and attention to detail – especially ensuring that financial benefits were shared locally.
- Realising that more existed in the region than known before, seeing how much work is being done and how dedicated people are.
- Quality of facilitation.
- The presence of potential funders.
- Meeting and sharing common problems and interests.
- Distribution of participants that represented different aspects of society.

c) raising awareness of invasive species and generating community support for their management;

The first annual meeting was given a high profile and widely publicized as part of the awareness raising process. The Honorable Elias Camsek Chin, Vice President of the Republic of Palau, officially launched the network on 22 May 2006 at the opening ceremony in Palau which was broadcast live on local television. His concluding remark, “Failure is not an option”, was adopted as a slogan for the meeting. Public awareness was raised as one of the key areas of concern for effective invasive species management (see (a) above), recognizing the importance of community involvement, and capacity building in this area is one of the main network activities being addressed post-meeting.

Raising awareness of invasive species issues is closely related to promotion of the project, so please see the response to question 3 below.

d) involving the local community and other stakeholders:

Founding teams are multi sectoral and multi agency, to ensure that key stakeholders and actors in invasive species management actions have a voice. The inclusion of different sectors and agencies ensures that awareness is raised of the different interests and concerns. The local community is involved through the medium of the field projects, both those run by CEPF grantees (where involvement of the local community is one of the criteria for selection) and those planned by founding teams.

e) providing benefits to the local community and other stakeholders.

Benefits to stakeholders arise from the formation of the partnership, as outlined in (b) above. Participants expressed the following specific benefits from the first annual meeting:

- Making contacts, new connections which may lead to new projects, establishing ties. Put faces to names. New contacts to share ideas.
- Huge potential to follow up on a lot of issues.
- Improved understanding of PILN and PII and how they work together.
- A sense of momentum that urgently needs building on.
- Draft project plan. Constructive comments and ideas for drafting action plans.
- Stronger team.
- Shared hardships and obstacles, possibility to learn from other countries who have already done a similar project, etc. Able to follow examples from other countries.
- Clarification of local projects and new potential research projects, new project ideas.
- Face to face networking, forming partnerships directly will be mutually beneficial.
- Increased awareness.
- Contacts for specific expertise, knowing who is working in the same areas or similar species, etc. Technical information. Know who is doing what, where.
- Sharing (of knowledge, skills and success stories) and learning.
- Sparking ideas for programmes at home, to modify and advance invasive species issues.
- Exposure to the Global Invasive Species Database and the chance to show practitioners what it can do for them.

3. How has the project been promoted? (Please enclose/attach press clippings, brochures, publications, videos, websites, photos, etc). Please describe the products developed during the project and how and to whom these were disseminated.

The project has been widely promoted to the general public in the Pacific and globally;

The PILN Memorandum of Understanding is submitted separately with this report.

The PILN website was launched on-line in January 2006 and updated in March and June (www.sprep.org/piln), it includes basic information on the network and its activities, together with network documents.

A presentation was made by the coordinator on PILN at The Nature Conservancy Conservation Strategies conference, Austin Texas, 3 - 5 April, 2006.

An article was published on PILN in the March – April 2006 edition of the Pacific Magazine and is available at www.sprep.org/piln/pdfs/PILN-PacMag2006w.pdf

A powerpoint presentation of PILN is available at <http://www.sprep.org/PILN/ppts/PILN-overview.ppt>

An overview of the PILN is available at <http://www.sprep.org/PILN/pdfs/PILN-overview-nov05.pdf>.

The full first annual meeting report is available at <http://www.sprep.org/PILN/topics/PILN-f-meeting.htm>

The opening and closing ceremonies of the meeting were broadcast live on local television in Palau on 22nd and 26th May.

A leaflet on PILN is submitted separately with this report as a Microsoft Publisher document.

IV. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: Effective invasive species management by multi-agency Invasive Alien Species teams across the Pacific Island region.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
Lateral learning network established, with a minimum of 5 founding teams.	Lateral learning network established with 5 initial founding teams (American Samoa, Guam, Niue, Palau, Pohnpei and Samoa), also including CEPF grantees from the Cook Islands and French Polynesia.

4. Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators at the local and/or the national/regional level.

Targeted outcomes and achievements realised are as follows:

1) Invasive species management improved, especially in Key Biodiversity Areas

On-track, through sharing of collective expertise to produce lessons learned in 4 key areas (public awareness, strategic planning, weeds management and island restoration) and drafting of action plans to address priority invasive species issues. Six CEPF grantees running demonstration projects participated at the first annual meeting, three of which are also members of founding teams, ensuring a close collaboration between these groups.

2) Effective multi-agency IAS teams established and/or strengthened in Pacific island countries and territories

Achieved, 6 initial founding teams (American Samoa, Guam, Niue, Palau, Pohnpei and Samoa) are currently actively involved in network activities having participated at the first annual meeting. A second group of 6 founding teams (Fiji, Hawaii, Kiribati, Kosrae, Marshall Islands and New Caledonia) will be incorporated into the network over the coming year.

3) Collaboration and coordination on invasive species issues increased across Pacific island countries and territories.

Achieved, though the interaction of participants at the first annual meeting, where team members defined areas where expert exchanges would be of mutual benefit.

4) Prevention and management of invasive species improved at the national and regional levels.

On-track, through sharing of collective expertise to produce lessons learned in 4 key areas (public awareness, strategic planning, weeds management and island restoration) and drafting of action plans to address priority invasive species issues. Founding teams are multi-sector and multi-agency, ensuring that national needs are addressed for all key sectors. Regionally, marine invasive species were identified as being of general concern for priority action post-meeting.

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

The very high level of enthusiasm shown by participants at the meeting was unexpected, the opportunity to put faces to names and realize just how much was going on in the Pacific was extremely stimulating. Participation in the activities of the first annual meeting also served an important and unexpected role in team building and strengthening for the 6 initial founding teams.

6. Describe the key positive and negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.

1. **Partner involvement in PILN progress is a valuable resource and has to be carefully shepherded to maximize the time they are able to dedicate to PILN activities.** One-to-one interviews were held with each Partner in November / December 2005 and from then on partner teleconferences were held on a monthly basis. Two close collaborators are recognised, the Pacific Invasives Initiative and the National Park of American Samoa, and both are actively involved in PILN. Partners and collaborator support was formalized by the formation of small sub-groups to help develop specific themes.
2. **An active and enthusiastic contact point in countries / territories ensures a rapid and positive response.** The presence of “spark plugs” or “champions” makes a big difference.
3. **Consistent communication between partners and members, with rapid response and follow-up to queries, is highly valued – in order of priority: in person, telephone, email.**
4. **An effective network has to be marketed and institutionalizing the network early on in its establishment is vital.** For example, define a vision and create a logo.
5. **The enthusiasm of Partners at the launch of the network needs to be maintained by early evidence of concrete actions and forward progress.**
6. **Baseline data and evaluation criteria need to be defined early on, so that the right questions can be asked from the start.**
7. **A broad-brush approach is appropriate for the selection of founding teams.** An extensive or overly detailed selection process is not necessary; setting a simple obstacle quickly distinguishes potential founding teams from those not yet in a position to benefit from PILN.
8. **Good communication and a quick response to emails and phone calls is highly valued by the participants.** This is particularly important at the beginning of the project when the coordinator is not well known by the members. A quick response and signs of good organisation gives members the feeling of being part of something large and active and generates confidence in the networks ability to assist them.
9. **Meetings are essential between coordinator and teams in order to understand the issues and specific capacity building needs for the team.** Contact by email and telephone only go so far and the coordinator needs to spend time with team members, ideally in the field, in order to develop a relationship and identify real capacity building needs.
10. **The MOU should be self-sufficient and not require additional letters of contribution from the Partners.**
11. **Core funding for coordinator hire is essential, the rest is a bonus.** Fund raising takes a lot of time and, while it is reasonable to expect the coordinator to seek support for annual meetings and expert exchanges (encouraging innovative ideas and members to source their own funding), seeking core funding is an intensive activity which distracts overmuch from network building activities.
12. **The short-term coordinators contract gives a strong incentive to over-achieve but makes the network vulnerable.** If the coordinator leaves at the end of a short-term contract PILN

is in danger of falling into the trap of a “typical project”, one which raises expectations and then stops abruptly. A 3-year horizon provides more realistic security for network establishment and development.

13. **Full funding is not necessary – or desirable – for subsequent annual meetings.** Many team members have access to sources of funding which could be used to attend annual meetings and encouraging them to find their own funding makes the network more sustainable in the long-term. It is reasonable to seek full funding for the first meeting as the network has not yet proved itself and has so far little to offer but participants should be expected to self-fund attendance at future annual meetings (with a small float for the inevitable few who have no funds, available through an application process).
14. **It is important to create a feeling of ownership of the network by the members as early as possible.** Involve members in defining meeting outcomes and the agenda. Keep them informed of what is going on.
15. **Be opportunistic in seeking expert exchange possibilities to make the best use of limited funding and effective expert exchanges can be quite simple.**
16. **Good preparation is vital for effective meetings.** This includes not only things like logistics and agenda content, but also participant preparation beforehand, to ensure that expectations are realistic – and met.
17. **Putting a group of people around a table does not make them a team.** People have to be taught how to be effective team members, and team formation is a gradual process.

V. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Strong regional partnership established to support the PILN under a formal MOU	
1.1. MOU signed by all Partners by March 2006.	Achieved. The 8 partners being the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Conservation International (CI), IUCN's Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG), Palau Office of Environmental Response & Coordination (OERC), the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the University of the South Pacific (USP), the United States Forest Service (USFS). In addition, there are two formally recognised close collaborators, the Pacific Programme of the Cooperative Island Initiative (PII) and the National Park of American Samoa (NPSA)
<i>Indicator from Logical Framework</i>	

Output 2: PILN Coordinator and Secretariat established to support IAS teams throughout the Pacific	
2.1. PILN Secretariat and full-time coordinator position established at SPREP by May 2006.	Achieved. The PILN coordinator was hired in November 2005, and the secretariat established at SPREP at the same time.
2.2. PILN Coordinator in regular contact with all PILN teams and partners by March 2006	Achieved. Monthly teleconferences are held with the Partners and close collaborators. The 6 initial founding teams receive regular emails and visits.
Output 3: First PILN meeting successfully designed and completed	.
3.1. 70% of participants evaluate PILN meeting as good or very good.	Achieved. The first annual meeting was held 22 – 26 May 2006. 100% of meeting participants expressed themselves as satisfied, very satisfied or very very satisfied.
Output 4. Pacific IAS teams actively using the PILN to meet priority needs and advance priority IAS projects	
4.1. Baseline and effective targets or milestones set in at least 50% of the priority projects initiated by June 2006	Achieved. At the first annual meeting, each founding team identified a priority project and produced an action plan with identified targets and milestones.
Output 5. Effective systems and tools in place to share information and expertise among PILN members and others IAS practitioners in the Pacific	
5.1. At least two learning exchanges identified by June 2006	Achieved. The Palau team will assist the Pohnpei team with their tilapia eradication; The Palau team request assistance to develop guidelines for road construction; all teams identified a need for capacity building in social marketing and tropical rodent eradication.
5.2. Effective electronic communications set up for PILN members by June 2006	Achieved. Email groups have been set up for each country team, for PILN Partners; for PILN friends, and for the entire PILN network.
Output 6. PILN's Measures of Success agreed and baseline initiated	
6.1. PILN "Measures of Success" indicators and measurement methods identified by May 2006	Achieved. At the first annual meeting a working group reviewed this topic and agreed that the benchmarks defined in the PILN Work Plan are suitable measures of success.
6.2. PILN baseline established by June 2006	Achieved. At the first annual meeting a working group reviewed this topic and agreed that the benchmarks defined in the PILN Work Plan provide a suitable baseline.
Output 7. Funding secured or pledged for first two years of PILN activities	
7.1. Full funding secured for first year of PILN activities before first PILN meeting. (ca April	Partly achieved. Core funding has been secured for the first year of the pilot programme, June 2006 – May 2007. This covers coordinator hire, but does not include

2006)	support for network activities and the second annual meeting.
-------	---

7. Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.

The project has successfully achieved the target outputs, as indicated above.

8. Were any outputs unrealized? If so, why and how did you address these?

All outputs were realized. The one output which was only partly achieved, that of securing full funding, is currently being addressed by fund raising.

9. How did the lack of achievement of these outputs affect the overall impact of the project?

Not appropriate.

VI. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
The Nature Conservancy	Co-financing	\$20,819	
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	Co-financing	\$50,000	
SPREP	Co-financing	\$22,000	
Mobil Oil Micronesia	Co-financing	\$2,100	

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

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

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

The project will continue for a two-year pilot period, from June 2006 to May 2008 and funds are currently being raised to support this. Core funding (for coordinator hire) has been secured for the first year, from June 2006 to May 2007. For core funds for the second year, and network activities and annual meeting costs for both years, an application has been submitted to the Pacific Development and conservation Trust and a second application is being submitted to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. A second proposal will also be submitted to the CEPF as soon as the new funding cycle is announced.

An application for a GEF Medium Size Project is being prepared for a three year period post-pilot, to consolidate the network and extend it to the culturally and ecologically more complex countries in the West Pacific.

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Please provide any additional information you think may assist CEPF in understanding any other aspects of your completed project.

Describe any follow-up activities you wish to implement and how you intend to do so (eg other invasive species management actions you wish to pursue, or how you plan to scale up the project to a broader area).

Activities are currently focused on follow-up from the first annual meeting, specifically addressing the priority issues identified by the participants: capacity building on social marketing and tropical rodent eradication. In addition, follow-up and support is being given to each team with regards their priority project Action Plans.

Work over the two years of the pilot programme will build on this and comes under 3 headings: network consolidation and expansion, realization of the second annual meeting, and network activities focused on priority capacity building needs.

Network consolidation and expansion.

The 6 initial founding teams who participated at the first annual meeting in May 2006 represent American Samoa, Guam, Niue, Palau, Pohnpei and Samoa. A further 6 teams also applied for network membership but were not ready to become fully involved in May 2006, the coordinator will work with them to strengthen them and bring them into full involvement by year 2. These teams are: Fiji, New Caledonia, Hawaii, Kiribati, Kosrae and the Marshall Islands. In addition, CEPF-grantees running invasive species management demonstration projects in French Polynesia and the Cook Islands will act as focal points in these two countries / territories for building effective in-country invasive species teams. By this means the network will gradually expand from 6 to 14 countries / states / territories actively participating by the end of the pilot programme.

Second annual meeting

Participant satisfaction with the first annual meeting was high and among the benefits gained from attending were: sharing and learning, a stronger team, awareness of just how much is going on in the region, and a sense of momentum that urgently needs building on.

The second annual meeting, to be held in American Samoa in August 2007, will continue to strengthen professional relationships and ensure that the network is cohesive and effective; it is expected that at least 12 founding teams will be present. The priorities and the work programme defined in the first year will be reviewed and redefined by the participants. The coordinator is proactive in providing logical support for meetings and exchanges, helps identify new links and alliances, fosters existing ones and encourages invasive species workers and the implementation of best practices.

Lessons learned and best practice procedures in key areas will be developed and reviewed from the collective experience of the group. PILN will also develop a regional level project and design a strategy to address it, identifying key stakeholders and actors. Current interests lie in the areas of invasive species in the marine environment and regional emergency response planning.

Network activities

The participants themselves drive the network; they define the priorities and the work programme. Network activities over the pilot programme will be focused on capacity building needs identified at the annual meetings and during country visits, and will include peer-learning activities such as thematic workshops, expert exchanges and training attachments within and between PILN teams, and also

outside the network in cases where the required expertise is available, taking this opportunity to broaden and expand the network further. One of the main outputs of these activities is the production of best practice procedures and other mechanisms for upscaling lessons learned in technical areas.

Synergies will be actively developed with other regional programmes working on IAS, such as PII and PISM.

This project is supported by the Australian government's Regional Natural Heritage Program through the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund.

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund is a joint initiative of Conservation International, the Global Environment Facility, the Government of Japan, the MacArthur Foundation and the World Bank. A fundamental goal is to ensure civil society is engaged in biodiversity conservation.

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate with a tick whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:

Name: Dr Jill Key

Mailing address: SPREP, PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa

Tel: +685 21929 ext 280

Fax: +685 20231

E-mail: jillk@sprep.org