



## Darwin Initiative Annual Report



Department  
for Environment  
Food & Rural Affairs

**Important note:** *To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders:*

*it is expected that this report will be about 10 pages in length, excluding annexes*

**Submission Deadline: 30 April**

### Darwin Project Information

Project Reference	20-024
Project Title	Delivering Sustainable Forest Management for Fiji's People and Wildlife.
Host Country/ies	Fiji
Contract Holder Institution	BirdLife International
Partner institutions	NatureFiji-MareqetiViti, Department of Forests Fiji Government, Fiji Protected Area Committee
Darwin Grant Value	£309,407
Start/end dates of project	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016
Reporting period (eg Apr 2013 – Mar 2014) and number (eg Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	April 2013 to Mar 2014. Annual Report 1.
Project Leader name	Mark O'Brien
Project website	
Report author(s) and date	Nunia Thomas and Mark O'Brien, May 2014

## 1. Project Rationale

Located in the South Pacific, the Fiji Islands is an archipelago of more than 300 islands of oceanic origin. Ranging from high volcanic islands to atolls and sand cays, the Fiji Islands is home to a wide variety of plants and animals.

More than 80% of Fiji's land mass belongs to indigenous landowners (iTaukei), whose land outside of the village area is under Native Reserve and is administered by the iTaukei Lands Trust Board (TLTB) on their behalf. Through the TLTB administration, iTaukei land can be leased for commercial development such as agriculture (under the Agriculture Landlord and Tenant Act), for water catchment and forestry purposes (under the Fiji Forest Decree), infrastructural development, resource extraction, and residential.

Fiji's total land mass is 1.827 million hectares, of which, in 2005, 62% is forested/wooded land (177,000 ha, 10%, of Fiji's total land mass is primary forest) (FAO 2010). Ninety-nine percent of Fiji's endemic species live in Fiji's forests; and play a key role in maintaining the ecological functions of each island in the archipelago.

Fiji's economy is dependent on its natural resources, and, despite their close proximity to natural resources, 43% of the population living in poverty are from the rural area (Fiji Bureau of Statistics, 2011).

In 2007, the Fiji government launched a new Fiji Forest Policy that shifted focus from clear-fell logging toward integrated resource management, requires the involvement of indigenous landowners, the relevant government ministries (Fiji Department of Forests, Agriculture, iTaukei

[Indigenous] Affairs), as well as relevant market bodies; and aims to deliver increased and sustainable livelihoods for rural communities.

From 2009 to 2012, NatureFiji-MareqetiViti (through BirdLife International and the Aage V. Jensen Charity Foundation), with the Fiji Department of Forests spoke with 259 mataqali about the concept of establishing Permanent Forest Estates – a key mechanism within the Fiji Forest Policy (2007) - that would enable landowner participation in managing their forest resources. Through these consultation mediums, it became quite clear that rural indigenous communities were interested in better managing their resources, but were not able to identify the way forward.

Some key lessons learnt from these fora were:

1. The need to raise awareness on the value of the ecosystem services that the forests provide for rural communities;
2. The better livelihood options under sustainably-managed forests and agricultural areas;
3. The existence of good environment policies with sound scientific and technical information, but the inaccessibility of this information to rural communities because of the lack of capacity on the part of the government representatives to pass on this information.

With the increasing migration of individuals from Fiji's rural areas, and increasing demand for agricultural expansion, there is an even more pressing need to raise awareness and capacity for the sustainable use of Fiji's natural resources, and for integrated resource management.

The Fiji government is committed to creating an enabling environment for the better management of Fiji's natural resources, but needs assistance in the translation and transfer of technical information to rural communities, particularly to resource owners.

This project serves this purpose – to create an enabling environment for resource owners and rural communities so that they can address development with a holistic approach – not just extraction, but to recognise the other non-economic values and ecosystem services that sustainably-managed forests provide.

## **2. Project Partnerships**

Birdlife international, the lead institution on this project liaised closely with NatureFiji-MareqetiViti during the project proposal. NFMV are the primary implementing partner for this project within Fiji.

NFMV are working very closely with the government's Department of Forests – a relationship that has progressed over the last 5 years, i.e. has been cultivated for some time. In 2013 the Forestry Department focussed primarily on the establishment of 2 trial REDD PLUS plots – working in conjunction with GIZ and the German government. While somewhat frustrating for Birdlife and NFMV – this has provided considerable information regarding issues related to the relationships between forest units, local communities, mataqali and government officers. NFMV have cultivated a relationship with GIZ, to the extent that one of the, initially-planned, pilot areas for the current project was made available to GIZ to undertake as part of the REDD PLUS project. NFMV have been co-opted onto the REDD PLUS committee which will provide access to considerably more expertise regarding forestry issues (Annexe 8b).

NFMV have continued to play a role in the Protected Area Committee. Here, aspects of the Governments Permanent Forest Estate policy provide facility for Protection Forests (forests to be maintained as they are in watershed areas, on steep slopes or at high altitudes) and Conservation Forests (land managed as conservation forest by local communities). The relationship and legal status of these sites compared with the Protected Area Priority Sites, proposed by the PAC, continue to cause discussion (Annex 5).

## **3. Project Progress**

### 3.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

#### **Activity 1.1: Establish Project Steering Committee to oversee project implementation**

This was achieved in the first quarter of 2014 after extensive consultation and advocacy in the last two quarters of 2013. (See section 2, above, and Annex 5: Summary of Activities in Year 1). Because of the existence of many government committees on natural resource management, and the limited personnel (at both NGO and government levels) in each of these, the Fiji Forestry Board – the key decision maker and advisor to the Minister of Forests - has recommended that rather than creating a whole new group, the existing Fiji REDD plus Steering Committee should become the main body through which this project reports. See Annexes 8a, 8b.

The project team had been engaging Department of Forests since 2010, and presented a review of progress in July 2012 as part of our efforts to:

1. understand and objectively critique government's process in dealing with Fiji's native forest resources, particularly in relation to community participation in the management of natural resources, and the implementation of the Fiji Forest Policy (2007);
2. recommend to the Department of Forests on the best way forward in making Permanent Forest Estates a reality for Fiji.
3. Learn from the process undertaken to implement the REDD-plus policy in Fiji.

While the Department of Forests has been fully supportive of our project, they have been trying to understand how

- NFMV and Department of Forests can, together, operationalise the Permanent Forest Estates and Sustainable Forest Management programmes,
- how these relate to REDD-plus and the extent to which they contribute beyond the REDD-plus pilot sites at a bigger scale across Fiji.

In order to progress this, NFMV were given approval to present to the Forestry Board in February 2014 (see a copy of the presentation in Annex 9c) and have subsequently been invited to sit on the REDD-plus Steering Committee in recognition of the contribution of this project "towards the sustainable management of Fiji's forests", and in particular, in engaging communities to become involved in the process. The REDD-plus Steering Committee consists of individuals of technical expertise from a wide range of sectors, all committed to ensuring the sustainable management of Fiji's native forest.

#### **Activity 1.2 Implement TESSA - devised under Darwin Initiative Project 18-005 - for the first time in the Pacific region at sites in Fiji through community consultation workshops and modification as needed.**

This component is intended to empower communities to help collect information to enable them to conduct assessments for their own decision-making process. We recognise that the figures generated are site-specific – but consider this to be a strength in itself because it builds mataqali understanding of the services provided by their forests. This contrasts with other ecosystem service assessments undertaken in Fiji which are rather more detailed, expensive and are targeted at bigger scales than the sites included in the TESSA surveys and tend to import experts to undertake the data collection, rather than local community representatives.. The TESSA project has been trialled at three sites, and is showing potential to be used as a tool to generate:

1. discussions amongst mataqali on their land use options;
2. case studies for the Fiji Department of Forests on mataqali participation in the management of their resources – in lead up towards the establishment of the PFE framework; and
3. exchange programmes between sites,

Jenny Birch, from Birdlife International headquarters, provided on-site training for various aspects of the TESSA programme in July 2013. Prior to site visits, Jenny B, and the project team presented on TESSA to the National Protected Areas Committee in 2013 at which

representatives of Department of Forestry were present. The meeting recommended that the project team worked closely with the Department of Forests Colo-i-Suva team on the carbon assessment component of TESSA. Staff from this office had previous knowledge of carbon assessments, and were particularly skilled at tree identification - an essential requirement. Colo-i-Suva staff have, to date, assisted with all carbon assessments around Fiji

Other aspects of the TESSA method has been modified to suit the Fijian target audience. (See Annex 6 – Fiji modified TESSA questionnaire).

### **Activity 1.3: Document traditional cultural values of Fiji's forests from mataqali elders, and incorporate into TESSA**

This component has been incorporated into the modified TESSA for Fiji as above.

### **Activity 1.4: Undertake biodiversity surveys at project sites to establish project baselines and evaluate progress.**

Biodiversity assessments, using standard point counts have been conducted at three sites (Colo-i-Suva, Southern Highlands (Wainawa and Namosi Road), and Natewa) to monitor forest bird populations.

In addition, NFMV has contributed to national biodiversity assessments at two REDD plus sites (Emalu and Vunivia Catchment); and at one National Protected Area site (Greater Delaikoro Proposed Protected Area). Biodiversity assessments are expensive exercises that require multi-stakeholder support and expertise participation.

Our continued active participation in the two committees (REDD plus and National Protected Areas Committee) gives us access to these baseline assessment, and the opportunity to conduct analysis of the baseline information.

### **Activity 1.5: Promote results of ecosystem service valuations to all forest-owning mataqali through awareness materials produced in the vernacular and distributed via provincial council meetings and mataqali (through workshops) and national decision makers (through media, communications and meetings)**

The results of the eco-service valuations are currently still being assessed. Preliminary findings have been presented at several meetings:

1. BirdLife International World Congress in 2013;
2. Fiji Government and UNDP – Carbon stock analysis for the Ridge to Reef proposal on January 08<sup>th</sup> 2014: "Ecosystem Services, Preliminary Assessments from TESSA." Annex 9a.
3. Fiji Government and UNDP –Sustain livelihoods through a ridge-to-reef management of priority watersheds in the two main islands of Fiji. Part of the Ridge to Reef proposal, on January 10<sup>th</sup> 2014: "Conserving biodiversity and improving livelihoods in the Natewa Tunuloa Peninsula, Fiji". Annex 9b.

The initial communications have been valuable in generating critique and comments from stakeholders. The team is revising methods and analysis, and continuing assessments in the next quarter.

### **Activity 1.6: Promote site monitoring biodiversity data – and wider project outcomes – to Department of Environment, Department of Forests, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, iTaukei Lands Trust Board (TLTB), Ministry of Foreign Affairs & International Co-operation and Protected Areas Committee in support of Fiji's NBSAP Commitments and development of new PA legislation respectively.**

This is an on-going component of the project. Bird monitoring has been undertaken at a number of forestry, and associated, habitats in Fiji, including two of the three trial sites (Wainawa and Natewa). See Annex 7: Summary table on the progress of TESSA Baseline data.

The project team has become aware of, and discussed, an MSc project at University of South Pacific, related to the impact of forest type on moth communities. While not a part of the initial project this is likely to indicate useful collaborative information on the impact of different types of forest management on biodiversity.

In 2013, the Fiji government secured a grant (Global Environment Facility – Protected Areas Systems through the FAO) to develop Fiji's Protected Areas legislation, in support of the Aichi targets. In addition the government's Environment Department proposed a ridge to reef programme GEF funded through UNDP. This was established in July 2013, and has been undertaking a number of stakeholder workshops on a range of subjects, including ecosystem services, forest management, etc. Representatives from government departments including Forestry, iTaukei Affairs, Agriculture, Planning, Finance and Youth have all taken part. This has provided the project with a ready audience for a number of the issues that need to be addressed. Members of the project team chair the Fiji Governments species working group, and sit on the National Protected Areas Committee, National Wetlands Steering Committee and the REDD+ Steering Committee.

## OUTPUT 2

### **Activity 2.1: A working framework for the establishment of PFEs, drafted in consultation with key national and local (mataqali) stakeholders prepared.**

This component has been delayed. This project is co-funded by the Aage. V. Jensen Charity Foundation – for whom this is a major output. The circumstances that contributed to the delay of setting up of the steering committee are mentioned in Activity 1.1. It is anticipated that the PFE framework will be trialled by October 2014.

### **Activity 2.2: Research and produce Code of Practice for Managing Plantations for Biodiversity within PFEs, and integrate into wider Framework for Establishment of PFE.**

Fiji launched a new Forest Harvesting Code of practice in 2013. The Plantation industries follow this code, with added elements in relation to the Forest Certification Standards. The new Mahogany Decree (2010) refers to establishing a scheme for the certification of felled mahogany timber; and Fiji Pine Limited is undergoing Forest Certification Standards process.

While the two major plantations (Mahogany and Pine) contain elements of the National code of harvesting, their implementation is at the discretion of the Fiji Hardwood Corporation Limited and the Fiji Pine Limited respectively. By contrast, all native timber harvesting requires compliance with the national code.

Activities in the next few months will focus on producing a technical review that compares the code of practice for plantations and native forests, and to discuss this with the two timber industries in Fiji for their support towards better harvesting practice in their plantations. Field visits to their sites by previous researchers and landowners have in the past revealed poor site management practices.

### **Activity 2.3: Publish and promote to all forest-owning landowners, including *mataqali* and plantation owners, the new Framework for Establishment of PFE in English and Fijian.**

This activity will be conducted in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2014 as mentioned in Activity 2.1 above.

### **Activity 2.4: Trial Working Framework for Establishment of PFE at eight project sites covering at least 26,000 ha and feedback lessons learned to further improve the Framework.**

The establishment of an effective Permanent Forest Estate requires collaboration between several adjacent mataqali and therefore requires collaboration with stakeholders leading in potential PFE sites outside of sites with NFMV presence. For this project, NFMV is specifically targeting sites on three islands: Viti Levu (Wainawa, Nabukelevu, Culanuku); Vanua Levu (Natewa peninsula); and Taveuni Island. In addition, we are contributing to other sites in collaboration with other stakeholders in the National Protected Areas Committee (the Greater Tomaniivi Area) and the REDD+ Steering Committee (Emalu Forest and Vunivia Catchment).

### **Activity 2.5: Prepare case studies/Lessons Learned from each of the project sites.**

These are being captured as the project is being implemented. The progress to date has been on preliminary consultations and requests to landowners to participate (See Annexes 8c, 8d, 8e). We anticipate that progress on this will develop rapidly from the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2014 when we will have analysed and reported on the Ecosystem Services assessments for each site.

### **Activity 2.6: Translate national Code of Forest Harvesting into Fijian**

Fiji's new forest harvesting code of practice was launched in July 2013. In February 2014, NFMV participated in an exercise to conduct a pre-harvesting biodiversity monitoring review of Fiji's first Sustainable Forest Management Site – Nakavu Research Site on Viti Levu.

This was the first time that the Department of Forests had re-harvested the site since the first harvest 15 years ago. A number of issues on the ability of the Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of practice to capture important biodiversity areas were raised by the above exercise which will need to be re-assessed. The extent to which a formal Environmental Impact Assessment will need to be undertaken in order to address these failings needs to be considered.

The Fiji Department of Forests is conducting capacity training for their Timber Production Officers to enhance their understanding of the Forest Harvesting Code of Practice. NatureFiji-MareqetiViti will use this opportunity to translate the language of the code from technical into layman's terms before then translating into Fijian for the benefit of the rural communities who will have the opportunity to become involved in the forest harvesting industry.

NFMV's role in establishing the link between the landowners/communities and the Department of Forests beat officers is becoming clear here and we anticipate beginning with one forest harvesting mataqali (Nabukelevu site) to trial the translated code.

### **Activity 2.7: Develop and test training module for forest-owning *mataqali* in skills for implementing Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting.**

See Activity 2.6.

### **Activity 2.8: Develop communication systems to enable *mataqali* to report incidents of unsustainable logging to Department of Forests, and monitor report submissions.**

This will be addressed with activities 2.6 and 2.7.

## **Output 3**

### **Activity 3.1: Use Participative Management Planning methods – devised under Darwin Initiative project 19-022 – to identify ecosystem-based sustainable livelihood interventions for *mataqali* from the harvesting of forest products.**

The organisation has personnel who have conducted Participative Management Planning methods. These methods will be employed at the sites selected. It is important to note here that the REDD plus sites will have their methods that are specific to REDD plus needs. These will be captured and noted for the purpose of capturing lessons learnt for the project.

### **Activity 3.2: Implement selected livelihood activities at project sites**

The project team has identified a number of potential livelihood opportunities for rural communities at the project sites. We are working closely with the communities to identify the particular options that they would wish to pursue, and also with the relevant government departments to help develop training programmes. We anticipate that there will be a series of case studies highlighting the strengths, and challenges, of the various livelihood opportunities that have been undertaken to date in Fiji through Darwin, and other programmes.

### **Activity 3.3: Undertake socio-economic surveys to assess both changes as a result of livelihood interventions, and long-term benefits recognised by the forest-owning *mataqali*.**

The project team is behind on this activity due to the delay in the consultative selection of sites which was only confirmed in the first quarter of 2014. To date, the socio-economic survey questionnaire is not specific to the needs of the project, but one that incorporates elements of

lessons learnt from other sites in Fiji has been drafted and undergone a review (Annex 10). The project has noted that there is already good existing data from the Fiji Bureau of Statistics for certain aspects of the questionnaire and we will ensure that we do not repeat the same questions as other bodies, rather target areas where we can find no additional information.

Initial socio-economic surveys will be undertaken in the second quarter of 2014; with monitoring designed to be undertaken in the last quarter of 2015. This will give the site 18 months to have undergone capacity building and alternative livelihoods implementation.

**Activity 3.4: Analyse results of ecosystem service, biodiversity and socio-economic studies to assess impacts of PFE establishment.**

This activity will be part of the monitoring and evaluation in the third quarter of 2015.

**Output 4**

**Activity 4.1: Establish a Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) within Fiji, which can in turn link with other groups from across the BirdLife global Partnership, to support replication of good practice, improve knowledge-exchange and increase sustainability.**

Through our other projects and the former BirdLife International Fiji Programme, we informally coordinate a network of community conservation groups, some of whom have undergone previous livelihoods and capacity building programmes. One such group, the Sisi Initiative, based in Natewa, have provided considerable support with the community questionnaires and have shown the benefits of using peer-to-peer learning in these situations.

The formal ecosystem assessments have already been pre-empted at the local community level by much of this peer-to-peer discussion. Community groups are quick to identify the implications of the findings and apply to their particular situation. This highlights the benefits of involving the local community in collecting the information.

Through this project, we are maintaining our contact with these communities, and have begun an exchange programme between sites – to allow site members to learn from each other (peer learning). In addition the Sisi Initiative have participated in the carbon assessment surveys, alongside the Forestry Colo-i-Suva team, in both Natewa and Wainawa in July 2013. In 2013, the BirdLife International Pacific Secretariat secured for the Pacific Partnership, a grant for the Local Empowerment Programme that would link up local communities nationally and regionally.

Over the next year, we will be using these two projects to strengthen the Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN). We believe that in the long term, this network can strengthen the monitoring and maintenance of Fiji's native forest, and provide a groundswell of local community interest and ownership of this issue – realistically the only option for preserving Fiji's remaining native forests.

**Activity 4.2: Integrate site monitoring biodiversity data with global datasets – IUCN Red List™ – to inform the monitoring of 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets under the CBD.**

NatureFiji-MareqetiViti staff are technical advisors and/or chair persons on five of Fiji's seven thematic areas for the Fiji Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. Fiji is reviewing the NBSAP this year (2014), and the Fiji Department of Environment is specifically aligning the NBSAP targets to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. NFMV staff are playing a key role in this process. The bird survey information is being archived via the Global Biodiversity Information Forum and Avian Knowledge Network. The data is available to the public through the Ebird portal. While the ecosystem services information appears not to fit national reporting requirements, we will investigate whether it can be archived through IPBES, the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.

### **3.2 Progress towards project outputs**

This project has four outputs, each with their own set of indicators. These are described below.

**Output 1: The multi-dimensional values (ecological, socio-economic and cultural) of Sustainable Forest Management understood and resulting in increased update by foresters and mataqali thereby benefiting biodiversity conservation.**

This output has four indicators:

**Indicator 1: At least 20 foresters and 50 forest-owning *mataqali* (in addition to the 30 that have registered to become involved in PFE) understand the benefits of environmental sustainability, as measured using interviews at the outset, and again at the conclusion of the project.**

Foresters involved to date (13 personnel): Eight Timber Production Officers, four Parks and Reserves officers, one GIS personnel from the Management Services Division. These individuals' understanding will be monitored throughout the project.

Mataqali involvement to date (15 mataqali):

Wainawa village – one mataqali; Natewa/ Tunuloa – five mataqali; Greater Tomaniivi Area – nine mataqali.

**Indicator 2: Six additional *mataqali* aware of the ecological, socio-economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests by end of year one, and all 250 forest-owning *mataqali* across Fiji by end of project.**

Wainawa village – one mataqali; Natewa/ Tunuloa – five mataqali; Greater Tomaniivi Area – nine mataqali.

**Indicator 3: At least five Fijian government departments recognise the ecological, socio-economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests during their decision-making processes (mainstreaming) by end of project.**

More than five government departments (in addition to the Department of Forests and Department of Environment) have been represented at meetings where the project programme and objectives have been discussed. These government departments are members of the Species Working Group, National Protected Areas committee, National Wetlands Steering Committee, REDD plus Steering Committee, and the Fiji Invasive Species Task Force.

Through the above committees, recognition of the economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests has also reached non-environment focussed departments such as the Fiji National Planning and Finance Division and the Ministry of iTaukei affairs. These are highlighted in communication records in Annexes 8a, 8b and 8f.

**Indicator 4: Eighty forest-owning *mataqali* (ca. 35% of total) formally written to Department of Forestry, to express interest in planning to create or expand PFE (SMF or PA) by end of project (currently stands at 30).**

This is currently at consultation stage and will be implemented in the next year.

**Output 2: The first PFE established under Forest Policy (2007), with locally trained *mataqali* effectively monitoring logging activities on their land.**

This output has three indicators:

**Indicator 1: First framework for Establishment of PFE (including Code of Practice for Managing Plantations for Biodiversity within SMFs) published by end of year two.**

New Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice launched in 2013. PFE framework development has been approved by the Fiji Forestry Board in February 2014.

GIS layers for the mapping of Potential Forest Management Unit is currently being developed by the Department of Forests for the prioritisation of mataqali with whom PFE establishment can be trialled.

REDD plus strategy is currently being developed and is providing key lessons for the PFE framework.

**Indicator 2: The first eight sites registered under PFE with Fiji's Department of Forestry by end of year two.**



Two mataqali who were interested in PFE establishment on Vanua Levu and one mataqali on Viti Levu have become part of the REDD plus programme (Vunivia catchment and Emalu Forest respectively).

Wainawa village has shown that they are serious about PFE establishment, and have registered a tour company, (Sovi Tours) and independently engaged the iTaukei Lands Trust Board and the Ministry of Agriculture to advise them on their options for land use. They have used the information gathered through this project to guide them in their discussions. See Annex 8g.

**Indicator 3: Between three and five representatives from communities in each forest site, who are planning to establish their site under PFE, to be certified in skills to monitor logging in accordance with Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting by end of project.**

A pilot pre-harvest assessment in early 2014 has shown that there is a need to re-assess and provide training for Timber Production officers on:

1. Their knowledge of the Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice
2. Their knowledge and ability to identify the biodiversity in the target area; and
3. Their ability to implement the FFHCOP.

The project will look to the community of Nakavu – the SFM pilot site for Fiji – whom have been trained and have participated in implementing the FFHCOP to lead and be the peer trainer in this regard. The training of representatives from communities may have to be co-implemented between the Department of Forests and the Nakavu community.

**Output 3: Locally appropriate ecosystem-based sustainable livelihoods established for forest-owning *mataqali* which reduce poverty and conserve forest ecosystems.**

This output has three indicators:

**Indicator 1: Detailed assessment of ecosystem services in areas under Permanent Forest Estate management (PA and SMF covering a minimum of 26,000 ha) show no net loss across the following metrics by year 3 compared to baseline established in first half of year 1 for Forest carbon storage [tonnes carbon per ha]; Water services [cubic meters of water per household per year].**

Baseline surveys currently being collated. See Annex 7.

**Indicator 2: The proportion of annual (regular) household income (currently FJ\$11,608 for rural community households) accrued from non-timber forest products anticipated to increase by at least 15% (FJ\$1,750) for each of the 25 households involved in the trials by end of project compared to baseline**

The socio-economic survey sheet incorporates this indicator. See Annex 10.

**Indicator 3: Average bird encounter rate [birds recorded per hour during survey transects] for key forest bird indicator species (30 species of forest bird on Vanua Levu and Taveuni, 34 on Viti Levu) in areas under Permanent Forest Estate management (PA and SMF covering a minimum of 26,000 ha) show no net loss by year 3 compared to baseline established in first half of year 1.**

This has been incorporated into the bird monitoring techniques employed for each site.

**Output 4: Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) established and increasing project impact and sustainability and facilitating the dissemination of monitoring data for national and international advocacy.**

This output has three indicators:

**Indicator 1: Number and geographic distribution of active users of Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) as recorded by Google Analytics and minutes from CCLN meetings.**

This indicator has been incorporated into the data collection method, with communities in the project highlighted. This project is strengthening the identity of these communities, particularly

by labelling them, 'empowered communities' and developing them as case studies for wider distribution as the project progresses.

**Indicator 2: Data from project sites: recorded in BirdLife's World Bird Database (WBDB): referenced in Fiji NBSAP updates; recorded in minutes for PAC.**

Through the project team's involvement in the NBSAP thematic areas or working groups, data from the sites is being added to strengthen and improve Fiji's reporting mechanism towards the CBD.

**Indicator 3: Records of CCLN members at key meetings**

The development of this indicator is in progress, as the capacity of CCLN to participate actively in key meetings is being strengthened.

### **3.3 Progress towards the project Purpose/Outcome**

**Project Outcome:**

**At the end of the project, a minimum total area of 26,000 ha of natural forest in Fiji will be designated as Permanent Forest Estates – consisting of Protected Areas and Sustainably Managed Forests - under the terms of Fiji's Forest Policy (2007). At these designated sites, there will be measurable improvements in the sustainability of livelihoods for participating forest-owning mataqali, from the harvesting of forest products, coupled with a reduced pressure on the forest ecosystems. These outcomes will be sustained through the development and implementation of new tools and materials, and by building local capacity through targeted training and support.**

This past year has taught the project team that the stakeholders of conservation in Fiji are committed to the purpose of the project, but that, at the current time, this is not captured holistically. The project brings together a number of groups in Fiji (Fiji REDD plus, Fiji NBSAP thematic areas, UNDP/GEF grant projects, Government-led Green-growth framework). The stakeholders in each of these groups are now aware that they have a common goal by always highlighting and capturing how aspects of these existing projects each contribute to establishing Permanent Forest Estates.

In the past year, the project has identified other means of capturing or indicating positive project progress, through:

1. Annual and technical reports of the Fiji Department of Forests on their Annual Corporate Plan;
2. Provincial Council meetings – Fiji has 14 Provincial councils, each of which meets twice a year. These meetings are attended by the respective government officers and the representatives of landowners from the respective districts within the province. This project will ensure that those who are responsible for this reporting are aware of and have ownership of the objectives of the project, through their direct involvement.
3. NBSAP thematic areas or working groups – these are already in existence and the project team members are already involved in these groups. The goal for the remainder of the project is to ensure that the project purpose is reported to these technical groups.

Each Ministry in Fiji has an Annual Corporate Plan that has certain targets that it needs to achieve in any given year. The corporate plan of the Fiji Department of Forests clearly provides a good indicator regarding the delivery of Permanent Forest Estates to which this project can contribute substantially. We are still considering other Government Corporate Plans to identify mechanisms whereby PFE development can deliver substantially to the outcomes of the Plans.

The past year has focussed on understanding the existing mechanisms that will facilitate the achievement of the Project purpose and outcomes, and the approach that the project must take to make this happen, both in the short term and so that the achievements are long-lasting and embedded in Civil Society.. The next 12 months will be key in implementing, and delivering these approaches for the benefit of the project, for forest systems and for the rural communities that co-exist with these forest systems..

### **3.4 Goal/ Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation**

The ecological, socio-economic and cultural values that Fiji's forests provide will be maintained by the establishment of a network of Permanent Forest Estates – consisting of both Protected Areas and Sustainably-managed Forests. This is in accordance with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (under the Convention on Biological Diversity) and Fiji's Forest Policy (2007). The Permanent Forest Estates will promote local empowerment and support improved, more sustainable, livelihoods for the forest-owning mataqali contributing to long-term poverty alleviation within forest communities.

- **What contribution is your project making to this higher goal?**

As mentioned in 3.3 above, the stakeholders in Fiji's conservation sector are committed to achieving the project outcomes. It is the holistic approach to communicating this that is currently lacking. The project team's involvement in existing committees for both sustainable forest management and the NBSAP thematic areas brings together aspects of the various groups.

Through this project, NFMV has been identified by government as a key stakeholder in both sustainable forest management (because of the project objectives to take the concept to community level understanding and participation) and the NBSAP thematic areas. The very fact that responsible implementing agencies continue to seek our participation in their consultation meetings is indicative of NFMV's role (see Annex 5). In the next year, the project will allow NFMV to contribute realistic case studies to the existing fora, and thereby contribute to Fiji's understanding of how to capture and communicate about the ecological, socio-economic and cultural values of Fiji's forests.

- **For all projects, what if any contribution is your project making to human development (poverty alleviation) and welfare?**

Through the implementation of the TESSA and alternative livelihood options for the target communities, this project will contribute towards human development (poverty alleviation) and welfare. The first year has helped the project identify existing initiatives to which data from the project can be supportive towards improving livelihoods of local communities. The next year of implementation will be able to capture this holistically.

Whilst being involved in key technical groups relating to biodiversity and sustainable forest management, the concept of measuring community livelihoods change and perception of the ecological, socio-economic and cultural values of Fiji's forests has taught the project team about how this project can contribute to gaps in the technical groups in relation to human development and welfare.

## **4. Project support to the Conventions (CBD, CMS and/or CITES)**

This is reported in Activity 4.2 and Output 1, Indicator 3. The project team are technical advisors to five of the seven Fiji NBSAP thematic areas.

This project binds the overall objectives of the CBD within Fiji and directly contributes to Fiji's review of the NBSAP and its alignment to the Aichi targets. This has not been captured in this reporting period as it only began in late March of this year; but will be highlighted in the next reporting period.

- **Has the project had any interaction with any host-country convention focal points, via host country or UK partners in the last 12 months? Please give details.**

The country coordinating body is the Fiji Department of Environment, who provide secretariat duties to the Fiji NBSAP thematic working groups. The project team plays a direct advisory role to the Fiji Department of Environment not only through the Fiji NBSAP thematic working groups but also to individual officers within the department who seek to know more about Fiji's biodiversity and local examples that they need to assist them in achieving their annual targets. (See Annex 5).

## **5. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons**

This past year has focussed on developing internal organisational systems to monitor the project and to develop indicators of the achievements. The project team have met three times in the past year to:

1. incorporate the project activities into the annual work plan of the organisation, and individual staff work plans (May 2013, September, 2013 and January 2014);
2. clarify roles within the project team;
3. strengthen the deposit of indicator documents (technical reports and communication records).

A major lesson learnt from the compiling of this year's report is the need to strengthen 2 and 3 above. The past year has clarified the roles of each project team member, based on our individual strengths and background knowledge.

Internally the organisation is strengthening reporting and indicator/ verification document depository through improving administrative processes (organisational server, filing system and recording of communication records). Each project officer is required to produce a communication record (with a communication reference number – see Annex 8 a-g) for meetings attended. Field surveys are reported through internal technical reports (For example, Annex 11).

Regular updates with the BirdLife International focal point (Mark O'Brien) has greatly helped the project team in understanding the requirements needed to quantitatively indicate project progress. The project team has seen that this needs to be held on a regular basis (once a quarter), and has incorporated this into the project annual work plan.

## **6. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)**

Not applicable yet. This will be reported in the next year.

## **7. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere**

The main challenge in the past year has been in coming to appreciate the value of Fiji's existing groups within the conservation sector – particularly at national and policy level. It was initially viewed with frustration because it was 'slow', but our patience and consistent advocacy on the project objectives has borne fruit in the first quarter of the year – this is evident in NFMV's recognition as a key stakeholder in the REDD plus and NBSAP thematic areas. NFMV's strength in this regard has been in our knowledge and advocacy for Fiji's biodiversity and its monitoring.

The project team has always appreciated that stakeholders are a key part in project implementation – and our strategy of advocating about the project nationally and locally through existing networks is indicating that this is the way to approach the project – to embed it in the objectives of existing groups, rather than create a whole new committee and programme.

The only major risk that the project faces is environmental – Fiji is coming up for an El Nino period, and how this affects community livelihoods, biodiversity and forest programmes will be interesting. On a positive note, discussions on the fact that we are coming into an El Nino period have begun at the REDD plus steering committee level. The project team is keeping this in mind as we communicate and design alternative livelihood options with local communities – who at the end of the day will be the most affected.

## **8. Sustainability**

As mentioned above – while the project progress in the past year has been seemingly slow and frustrating, the value of informing and engaging stakeholders to take ownership of the objectives of the project are now beginning to bear fruit. The incorporation of the project purpose and activities into existing fora – Fiji REDD plus programme, Fiji NBSAP thematic areas; and the reporting into the Provincial Council is a strength that this next year will build

upon. Using these fora ensures that the concepts and project outputs are sustained beyond the lifetime of the project.

## 9. Darwin Identity

The project team ensures that all communication on the project refers to the Darwin Initiative. Communication records to be produced in the next year will increase the visibility of Darwin at both national and local levels; especially as this next year will focus on mobilising communities to achieve the project outcomes.

## 10. Project Expenditure

**Table 1 project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2013 – 31 March 2014)**

Project spend since last annual report	2013/14 Grant (£)	2013/14 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)			107%	
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs			110%	
Travel and subsistence			91%	Initial plan to trial the TESSA at Natewa, in Vanua Levu, switched to Wainawa, near Suva, saved flight and accommodation costs for 3 staff members.
Operating Costs			69%	Anticipated funding the launch of the project to ensure that all stakeholders were on board. Ultimately, the cost of this was covered by UK High Commission in Suva.
Capital items (see below)			107%	
Others (see below)			99%	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>0</b>	

## 11. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes

I agree for the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here)

**Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2013-2014**

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2013 - March 2014	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Goal/Impact</b></p> <p>The ecological, socio-economic and cultural values that Fiji's forests provide will be maintained by the establishment of a network of Permanent Forest Estates – consisting of both Protected Areas and Sustainably-managed Forests. This is in accordance with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (under the Convention on Biological Diversity) and Fiji's Forest Policy (2007). The Permanent Forest Estates will promote local empowerment and support improved, more sustainable, livelihoods for the forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> contributing to long-term poverty alleviation within forest communities.</p>		<p>(report on any contribution towards positive impact on biodiversity or positive changes in the conditions of human communities associated with biodiversity e.g. steps towards sustainable use or equitable sharing of costs or benefits)</p> <p>(report on progress towards achieving the project purpose/outcome, i.e. the sum of the outputs and assumptions )</p>	
<p><b>Purpose/Outcome</b></p> <p>At the end of the project, a minimum total area of 26,000 ha of natural forest in Fiji will be designated as Permanent Forest Estates – consisting of Protected Areas and Sustainably Managed Forests - under the terms of Fiji's Forest Policy (2007). At these designated sites, there will be measurable improvements in the sustainability of livelihoods for participating forest-owning <i>mataqali</i>, from the harvesting of forest products, coupled with a reduced pressure on the forest ecosystems. These outcomes will be sustained through the development and implementation of new tools and materials, and by</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b></p> <p>1.1 A minimum total area of 26,000 ha (currently 0 ha) designated as either Protected Area (PA) or Sustainably Managed Forest (SMF) under the Permanent Forest Estate, the Fiji Forest Policy (2007) by year 3.</p>	<p>1.1 Framework to incorporate SMF into discussions on Protected Areas began this year. In 2013, the Fiji National Environment Council endorsed the Proposed Priority Terrestrial Protected Areas map for Fiji. This was a collaborative effort between all members of the Protected Areas Committee (PAC). <b>The proposed PA network accounts for 16% of Fiji's land area; the national target for Aichi Biodiversity target is 17%.</b></p> <p>The PAC is aware of the objectives Darwin project and how SMF can support biodiversity and landowners.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complete analysis for final map layer needed for complete overview of Fiji's forest management: the Forest Management Unit Layer.</li> <li>2. Produce map showing priority PFE areas.</li> </ol>

<p>building local capacity through targeted training and support</p>	<p>1.2 Increased motivation to enter into forest management agreements as a result of the projects influence as measured by novel official requests for inclusion in the Permanent Forest Estate by 50 <i>mataqali</i> (not directly targeted by this project) by year 3.</p> <p><b>Indicator 2:</b></p> <p>2.1 Household income in a minimum of 25 households from at least eight communities see a 15% increase in income (baseline is FJ\$1750 pa) by year 3 through adoption of alternative livelihoods promoted by the project.</p> <p>2.2 Increased voice and participation of 30 <i>mataqali</i> targeted by the project to engage in forest governance and decision making as</p>	<p>This project is providing the opportunity for an exchange on how landowners who wish to harvest the forest in their land can still participate in conservation, through Permanent Forest Estates.</p> <p>1.2 Awareness campaigns this year have shown that landowners and the Department of Forests are interested in Permanent Forest Estates management – because it is not restricted to conservation and protection. This alone is motivation for landowners – to know that forest harvesting and conservation are one of the many ways that a forest can be used to earn a living.</p> <p>3.1 Initial consultations have begun, the questionnaire for the baseline study has been reviewed.</p> <p>2.2. This is being incorporated into the project consultations – the mechanism by which <i>mataqali</i> can participate and engage in forest</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contribute towards the formalisation of <b>priority</b> Protected Areas by promoting SMF non-priority areas within the <i>mataqali</i> land as a source of livelihood for interested <i>mataqali</i> (Greater Tomaniivi Area, Taveuni).</li> <li>2. Capture case studies to be communicated nationally within the project life time and beyond.</li> <li>3. Continue site exchange programmes amongst participating landowners.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continue collection of baseline data.</li> <li>2. Collaborate with organisations participating in priority PAs and REDD plus sites to include their <i>mataqali</i> in the assessment.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strengthen <i>mataqali</i> to government communications and vice versa through the newly</li> </ol>
--	---	---	--

	<p>demonstrated (measured) by their membership and continuing engagement in the Permanent Forest Estate Framework Working Group by year 3.</p> <p>2.3 A survey of 30 <i>mataqali</i> targeted by the project shows that they feel that their voice is being heard and that participation in the Permanent Forest Estate Framework Working Group brings positive benefits to their communities by year 3.</p>	<p>governance. It is important and integral component of any resource management in Fiji. Fiji is developing the national guidelines for Free, Prior and Informed Consent under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. These guidelines will assist in ensuring that the mechanisms developed are effective for all stakeholders.</p> <p>Discussions on forest governance have revealed that report writing capacity within the Fiji Department of Forests needs to be strengthened to ensure transparency and effective delivery of decisions; and to make this indicator a reality.</p> <p>2.3 The Permanent Forest Estates Framework Working Group report to the Fiji REDD plus committee who serve as the steering committee. The Steering committee has in its membership, bodies who represent landowners (iTaukei Lands Trust Board and the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs).</p> <p>Institutionally, these two bodies are tasked to raise concerns of the landowners and to act in the best interests of the landowners. The approach taken by this project is to strengthen and build landowner capacity to voice their concerns to these two mandated bodies. .</p>	<p>established Provincial Environment Officers within the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Strengthen Beat officers and Timber Production officers ability to write reports.</li> <li>1. Strengthen mataqali understanding and ability to effectively communicate to government using existing effective networks (Beat officers, Provincial Environment Officers).</li> </ol>
--	--	---	--



	<p>2.4 Novel requests for assistance to develop alternative livelihoods from one hundred households not already engaged in the pilots by year 3.</p> <p><b>Indicator 3:</b></p> <p>3.1 Ecosystem services in areas under Permanent Forest Estate management (PA and SMF covering a minimum of 26,000 ha) show no net loss across the following metrics by year 3 compared to baseline established in first half of year 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest carbon storage [tonnes carbon per ha].</li> <li>• Water services [cubic meters of water per household per year].</li> <li>• Average bird encounter rate [birds recorded per hour during survey transects] for key forest bird indicator species (30 species of forest bird on Vanua Levu and Taveuni, 34 on Viti Levu)].</li> </ul>	<p>2.4. The project team has incorporated this into the project implementation – to allow for newly interested households to be able to effectively communicate their requests.</p> <p>3.1. Baseline information has been and is currently being collated for three sites: (see Annex 7, 11)</p>	<p>1. Record novel requests following media releases on the project.</p> <p>1. Continue to collect baseline data.</p>
<p><b>Output 1. The multi-dimensional values (ecological, socio-economic and cultural) of Sustainable Forest Management understood and resulting in increased uptake by foresters and <i>mataqali</i> thereby benefiting biodiversity conservation.</b></p>	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b></p> <p>At least 20 foresters and 50 forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> (in addition to the 30 that have registered to become involved in PFE) understand the benefits of environmental sustainability, as measured using interviews at the outset, and again</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b></p> <p>This is an appropriate indicator for the ownership of the concept by those directly involvement in the use and management of natural resources; and those in management in government, non-government and business.</p> <p>Pre-awareness and pre-discussion questions to gauge participants' awareness of environmental sustainability have been incorporated into workshop design. (See Annex 5, 8f).</p>	

	<p>at the conclusion of the project.</p> <p><b>Indicator 2:</b></p> <p>Six additional <i>mataqali</i> aware of the ecological, socio-economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests by end of year one, and all 250 forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> across Fiji by end of project.</p> <p><b>Indicator 3:</b></p> <p>At least five Fijian government departments recognise the ecological, socio-economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests during their decision-making processes (mainstreaming) by end of project.</p>	<p><b>Indicator 2:</b></p> <p>In addition to the 30 <i>mataqali</i> from Vanua Levu registered to participate in PFE, the project has reached out to six more <i>mataqali</i> in Natewa/ Tunuloa, 16 <i>mataqali</i> on Taveuni Island through their participation in the TESSA questionnaire. Baseline data on their current level of knowledge is to be collected properly through targeted workshops. There are more <i>mataqali</i> anticipated to participate in 2014 on Viti Levu (see indicator 4 below).</p> <p><b>Indicator 3:</b></p> <p>Progress in the past year has shown that to make an impact, the project also needs to look at how the Ministry of Finance views Forests. The Fiji government's response to valuing Fiji's forests will be largely influenced by the international multi-lateral commitments.</p> <p>In the past year, NatureFiji-MareqetiViti has presented on PFE and SMF in several fora:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National Protected Areas Committee (includes the following government departments: National Trust of Fiji, Department of Environment, Department of Forests, Ministry of iTaukei Affairs);</li> <li>2. REDD PLUS steering committee (in addition to the above include: the Department of Agriculture, Fiji Hardwood Corporation, Fiji Climate Change Unit within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs),</li> <li>3. Fiji Forestry Board (in addition to the above include: Business sectors in Forestry);</li> <li>4. Ministry of Strategic Planning, National Development and Statistics.</li> </ol> <p>The REDD PLUS steering committee will be including more stakeholders (such as the Ministry for Women) to have a diverse membership. This is the main body through which the progress updates will be made to the Fiji government, and is a strategic point for delivery of the outcomes and recommendations to other government departments.</p>
--	---	---

	<p><b>Indicator 4:</b></p> <p>Eighty forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> (ca. 35% of total) formally written to Department of Forestry, to express interest in planning to create or expand PFE (SMF or PA) by end of project (currently stands at 30).</p>	<p>See Annex 5.</p> <p><b>Indicator 4:</b></p> <p>This is still in progress for the additional <i>mataqali</i>. Discussions have begun with 15 <i>mataqali</i> (five from Natewa/ Tunuloa; nine from the Greater Tomaniivi Area).</p> <p>Discussions have begun with the Department of Forests to target <i>mataqali</i> who are currently logging or have applied to harvest their native timber.</p>
Activity 1.1 Establish Project Steering Committee to oversee programme implementation		<p>Presentation made to Fiji Forestry Board.</p> <p>Steering Committee established – Fiji REDD PLUS steering Committee (as recommended by Forestry Board)</p> <p>The committee meets bimonthly.</p> <p>NFMV to report to the committee on progress of the programme.</p>
Activity 1.2. Implement TESSA – devised under Darwin Initiative Project 18-005 – for the first time in the Pacific region at sites in Fiji through community consultation workshops and modification as needed.		<p>Implementation begun. In the next year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complete data collection;</li> <li>2. Use data to devise ecosystem based livelihood options;</li> <li>3. Communicate about the results of the data.</li> <li>4. Implement TESSA in new sites confirmed by the Department of Forests.</li> </ol>
Activity 1.3. Document traditional cultural values of Fiji's forests, from <i>mataqali</i> elders, and incorporate into TESSA.		<p>These have been incorporated into the Fiji modified questionnaire. See Annex 10.</p>
Activity 1.4. Undertake biodiversity surveys at project sites to establish project baselines and evaluate progress.		<p>This is in progress with Wainawa and Natewa/ Tunuloa. Taveuni Island is undergoing a literature review on all biodiversity surveys that have been undertaken there before a biodiversity assessment is conducted. See Annex 7</p>
Activity 1.5. Promote results of ecosystem service valuations to all forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> through awareness material produced in the vernacular and distributed via provincial council meetings and <i>mataqali</i> (through workshops) and national decision-makers (through media, communications and meetings).		<p>This will be done in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2014.</p>

<p>Activity 1.6. Promote site monitoring biodiversity data – and wider project outcomes – to Department of Environment, Department of Forests, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, iTaukei Land Trust Board (TLTB), Ministry of Foreign Affairs &amp; International Co-operation and Protected Areas Committee in support of Fiji’s NBSAP commitments and development of new PA Legislation respectively.</p>	<p>The National Protected Areas committee meets once a quarter – NatureFiji-MareqetiViti presented on TESSA on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2013.</p> <p>The review of existing legislations and the consultation for the development of a specific PA legislation is being led by the Fiji Environment Law Association, who in turn, report to the National Protected Areas Committee. As a member of the NPAC, NFMV is contributing to the greater understanding of the PA legislations through our case studies.</p> <p>The Fiji government is reviewing the Fiji National Biodiversity Strategy and Action plan this year. Four NatureFiji-MareqetiViti staff sit on five of the seven thematic areas working groups of the Fiji NBSAP as chair and/or as a technical advisor. NFMV will continue to be involved in the next year, and is directly contributing to more measurable quantitative data for the NBSAP.</p>	
<p><b>Output 2.</b> The first PFE established under Forest Policy (2007), with locally trained <i>mataqali</i> effectively monitoring logging activities on their land.</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> First framework for Establishment of PFE (including Code of Practice for Managing Plantations for Biodiversity within SMFs) published by end of year two.</p> <p><b>Indicator 2:</b> The first eight sites registered under PFE with Fiji’s Department of Forestry by end of year two.</p> <p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Between three and five representatives from communities</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> This is in progress. The Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice was launched on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2013 (see Annex 5,8h).</p> <p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Three sites have been identified and are undergoing field assessments (for TESSA) to date (Wainawa, Taveuni and Natewa/ Tunuloa unlogged area). Additional sites have undergone discussions (Greater Tomaniivi Area, Natewa/Tunuloa logged area and Nabukelevu). Official registration process will be included in the PFE framework as shown in Indicator 1 above. See Annex 7.</p> <p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice translation is underway with Fiji’s</p>

	in each forest site, who are planning to establish their site under PFE, to be certified in skills to monitor logging in accordance with Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting by end of project.	pilot SFM site: Nakavu Village. Initial discussions have begun at Steering Committee level.
Activity 2.1. A working Framework for the Establishment of PFEs, drafted in consultation with key national and local ( <i>mataqali</i> ) stakeholders, prepared.		In progress. Presentation made to the Fiji Forestry Board on February 18 <sup>th</sup> 2014 for their approval of the process.
Activity 2.2. Research and produce Code of Practice for Managing Plantations for Biodiversity within PFEs, and integrate into wider Framework for Establishment of PFE.		In progress. Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice training has been organised for the Timber Production Officers (by the Fiji Department of Forests) Progress to the reported to the Fiji REDD plus steering committee for their comments.
Activity 2.3. Publish and promote to all forest-owning landowners, including <i>mataqali</i> and plantation owners, the new Framework for Establishment of PFE in English and Fijian.		In progress.
Activity 2.4. Trial Working Framework for Establishment of PFE at eight project sites covering at least 26,000 ha and feedback lessons learned to further improve the Framework.		In progress. See Activity 2.1.
Activity 2.5. Prepare case studies/Lessons Learned from each of the project sites.		In progress.
Activity 2.6. Translate national Code of Forest Harvesting into Fijian.		In progress. See Indicator 1.
Activity 2.7. Develop and test training module for forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> in skills for implementing Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting.		See Activity 2.2
Activity 2.8. Develop communication systems to enable <i>mataqali</i> to report incidents of unsustainable logging to Department of Forests, and monitor report submissions.		Communication system will be incorporated into PFE framework. This is also being discussed at Steering Committee Level.
<b>Output 3.</b> Locally appropriate ecosystem-based sustainable livelihoods established for forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> which reduce poverty and conserve forest	<b>Indicator 1:</b> Detailed assessment of ecosystem services in areas under Permanent Forest Estate management (PA and SMF covering a minimum of 26,000	<b>Indicator 1:</b> Baseline data being collected. See Annex 7.

ecosystems.	<p>ha) show no net loss across the following metrics by year 3 compared to baseline established in first half of year 1 for Forest carbon storage [tonnes carbon per ha]; Water services [cubic meters of water per household per year].</p> <p><b>Indicator 2:</b></p> <p>The proportion of annual (regular) household income (currently FJ\$11,608 for rural community households) accrued from non-timber forest products anticipated to increase by at least 15% (FJ\$1,750) for each of the 25 households involved in the trials by end of project compared to baseline.</p>	<p><b>Indicator 2:</b></p> <p>Questionnaire (See Annex 10) includes data collection methods to allow this comparison.</p>
Activity 3.1. Use Participative Management Planning methods – devised under Darwin Initiative project 19-022 – to identify ecosystem-based sustainable livelihood interventions for <i>mataqali</i> from the harvesting of forest products.		Consultations for community participation conducted in year 1. To be delivered in year 2.
Activity 3.2. Implement selected livelihood activities at project sites.		See Activity 3.1.
Activity 3.3. Undertake socio-economic surveys to assess both changes as a result of livelihood interventions, and long-term benefits recognised by the forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> .		See Activity 3.1.
Activity 3.4. Analyse results of ecosystem service, biodiversity and socio-economic studies to assess impacts of PFE establishment.		Questionnaires and data are collected quantitatively to allow for this analysis. See Annex 10.
<p><b>Output 4:</b> Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) established and increasing project impact and sustainability and facilitating the dissemination of monitoring data for national and international advocacy</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b></p> <p>At least ten communities involved in PFE in Fiji actively sharing their project experiences and ideas with other Site Support Groups within Fiji and across the BirdLife Global network for the first time.</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b></p> <p>Natewa/ Tunuloa site members have participated in the TESSA training and data collection at Wainawa in June 2013 (See Annex 11).</p> <p>More site exchange programmes are planned for year 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Mataqali visit to Fiji SFM site (Nakavu) which is currently undergoing reharvesting of native timber.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Indicator 2:</b></p> <p>An increase (from a baseline of zero) in the use of site monitoring data to report against performance of national (CBD NBSAP) and global policies (CBD 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets) by end of project.</p>	<p><b>Indicator 2:</b></p> <p>NFMV is chair of Species Working Group of the Fiji NBSAP;</p> <p>Fiji is currently undergoing NBSAP review and is aligning NBSAP targets to Aichi Biodiversity Targets – NFMV sits on NBSAP thematic areas and will be contributing to this process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Species Working Group (chair, includes CITES management authority and CITES scientific Council)</li> <li>2. National Wetlands Steering Committee (and Ramsar Working Group)</li> <li>3. National Protected Areas Committee</li> <li>4. Fiji Invasive Species Task Force</li> <li>5. Forest Conversion Management.</li> </ol> <p>NFMV is member of REDD plus established sub-committee that will develop “Biodiversity Indicators for REDD plus”.</p>
<p>Activity 4.1 Establish a Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) within Fiji, which can in turn link with other groups from across the BirdLife global Partnership, to support replication of good practice, improve knowledge-exchange and increase sustainability.</p>		<p>In progress.</p>
<p>Activity 4.2 Integrate site monitoring biodiversity data with global datasets – IUCN Red List™ – to inform the monitoring of 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets under the CBD.</p>		<p>See Indicator 2 above.</p>

## Annex 2 Project's full current logframe



**Annex 3 Standard Measures** (note that the project team are focussing on this at our next meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> May. We may decide to revise some of these figures at that stage).

**Table 1 Project Standard Output Measures**

Code No.	Description	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Year 4 Total	Total to date	Number planned for reporting period	Total planned during the project
4a	Training for undergraduate students	1				1	1	5
4b	Number of training weeks provided	6				6	6	26
4c	Training for postgraduate students							2
4d	Number of training weeks provided							10
6a	Sustainable forest management training for Forest Beat Officers, Communities, and iTaukei Regional Conservation Officers							30
6b	Weeks training for above							30
7	Training Materials							8
14b	Conferences/seminars/workshops attended (see Annex 5 for details in Yr 1)	12				12	10	30
15a	Press releases	15				15	12	55
17a	Dissemination networks established		1					1
22	Permanent Field Plots (6 sites, 8 plots per site)	26				26	48	48
New - Project specific measures								

In Table 2, provide full details of all publications and material produced over the last year that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Mark (\*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report.

**Table 2 Publications**

Type (eg journals,	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address,	Cost £
-----------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------	--	--------

manual, CDs)			website)	

#### **Annex 4 Onwards – supplementary material (optional but encouraged as evidence of project achievement)**

In this past year, the project has focussed on communicating to key stakeholders on the project objectives (through powerpoint presentations). The production of communication materials, and media releases to this effect will happen in year 2 of the project.

- Annex 5: Summary of Activities in Year 1
- Annex 6: Fiji modified TESSA questionnaire
- Annex 7: Summary table on the progress of TESSA Baseline data.
- Annex 8: Communication records from meetings.
  - Annex 8a: MV40/002/NTT – Green Growth Thematic Area meeting
  - Annex 8b: MV40/003/NTT – REDD + SC Special meeting.
  - Annex 8c: MV40/001/MV – Natewa Village consultation
  - Annex 8d: MV40/002/MV – Vusaratu Village consultation
  - Annex 8e: MV40/003/MV – Dawa Village consultation
  - Annex 8f: MV40/004/NTT – REDD+, SFM presentation on Nakavu project
  - Annex 8g: MV40/001/NTT – Wainawa village planning meeting
  - Annex 8h: MV30/006/NTT – Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice Launch – Panel speech.
- Annex 9: Presentations.
  - Annex 9a: Presentation to the Gov't/UNDP on Carbon assessment
  - Annex 9b: Presentation to the Gov't/UNDP on Biodiversity and Livelihoods.
  - Annex 9c: Presentation to the Forestry Board 18<sup>th</sup> February 2014
- Annex 10: Socio-economic survey questionnaire Version 1
- Annex 11: NFMV Technical Report 2014/05 – Preliminary findings on harvested wild goods (Firewood) in Wainawa, Natewa Tunuloa and Taveuni.
- Annex 12: Newspaper articles register.

## Checklist for submission

	Check
<b>Is the report less than 10MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.	
<b>Is your report more than 10MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
<b>Have you included means of verification?</b> You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	
<b>Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report?</b> If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	