



Darwin Initiative Main Project Annual Report

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	Republic of Fiji
Contract Holder Institution	Birdlife International
Partner institutions	NatureFiji-MareqetiViti
Darwin Grant Value	£309,407
Funder	DFID
Start/end dates of project	April 2013-March 2016
Reporting period (e.g., Apr 2015 – Mar 2016) and number (e.g., Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	April 2014-March 2015, Annual report 2
Project Leader name	Dr Mark O'Brien
Project website/blog/Twitter	-
Report author(s) and date	Mark O'Brien, Nunia Thomas, Clare Morrison

1. Project Rationale

Located in the South Pacific, Fiji is an archipelago of more than 300 islands of oceanic origin. Ranging from high volcanic islands to atolls and sand cays, the Fiji Islands are home to a wide variety of plants and animals. Fiji's total land mass is 1.827 million ha, of which 58.3% is forest (177,000 ha is primary forest). 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.

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 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 purposes.

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 was a radical shift from clear-fell logging toward integrated resource management, requiring the involvement of indigenous landowners, the relevant government ministries (Fiji Department of Forestry, Agriculture, iTaukei [Indigenous] Affairs), and relevant market bodies 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 Forestry spoke with 259 *mataqali* (landowning groups) 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 of the value of the ecosystem services provided by forests for rural communities;
2. The appropriate livelihood options under sustainably managed forests and agricultural areas that can be realistically delivered;
3. Good environment policies with sound scientific and technical information existed but were inaccessible to rural communities due to the lack of government capacity to pass on this information.

With the increasing migration of individuals from Fiji's rural to urban areas, and increasing demand for agricultural expansion, there is a critical 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 to address development with a holistic approach – not just extraction, but to recognise other non-economic values and ecosystem services that sustainably managed forests provide.

2. Project Partnerships

Birdlife International is the lead institution and has been a technical advisor to NFMV since 2009. Throughout this project the Pacific Secretariat has assisted in building NFMV capacity by facilitating access to experts in BirdLife International and, in 2014, primarily for the development of locally appropriate site engagement tools:

- Socio-economic survey (SES) questionnaire and analysis tool; and
- Toolkit for **Ecosystem Site-Based Assessment (TESSA)**

The Department of Forestry (DoF) is the main government partner and is the lead agency ensuring that the project results are communicated to other government agencies. The Fiji Forest Policy Statement (2007) is administered by the DoF and this project is delivering on key components of the Forest Policy. From 2010 – 2012, NFMV established a good working relationship with the DoF because of NFMV's role in communicating the Fiji Forest Policy to landowners. The main challenge in 2013 was keeping the issue of Sustainable Forest Management and Permanent Forest Estates active given the new government focus on REDD+. The DoF, in recognition of the key contribution that this project makes towards their Corporate Plan and the delivery of the Fiji Forest Policy, has now included NFMV as an advisor on its technical committees to mobilise the delivery of some of the project outputs (see Annex 4: Code Implementation Steering Committee invitation to NFMV).

The Protected Areas Committee (PAC) is the technical advisory body to the National Environment Council (established under the Fiji Environment Management Act 2005). The committee comprises of both government and non-government stakeholders with a key role in implementing the Fiji National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). The PAC has been the vehicle for identification of, and legislative requirements of, Protected Areas across the country – potentially a key driver of formal recognition of sites for the PFE. , Keeping PAC abreast of the project progress is key to an understanding of how Protected Areas fit into the

sustainable use of Fiji's remaining native forests. NFMV is a member of the PAC, and attends the quarterly meetings, the next of which is planned for May 2015.

The Itaukei Affairs Board (IAB) within the Ministry of Itaukei Affairs looks after matters pertaining to the Itaukei (indigenous) Fijians. All Itaukei villages have a *Village headman* position through the IAB as their government representative in the village. All village headmen report to their district and provincial councils, for whom the IAB board serves as an administrative body. NFMV's policy, before engaging any Itaukei village, is to inform the Provincial Office and to invite them to participate. Updates are either in the form of a presentation at the Provincial Council Meeting, through a report or an official visit to the Provincial Office. There is no formal relationship, but in recognition of NFMV's role in implementing the Fiji NBSAP and helping the Ministry achieve its objectives, the relevant Provincial Offices have continued to work with and support the project through:

- Facilitation of communication with the Village headmen and villages;
- Ensuring that relevant staff (in particularly Provincial forestry and provincial conservation staff) have the opportunity to take part in village meetings alongside NFMV side
- Raising issues from the project at the Provincial meetings;
- Taking on board issues raised by local communities (see Annex 5 for example support letters)

Maintaining a good relationship with the Provincial offices and keeping them involved in the project improves the long-term sustainability of the concepts and capacity built at each site.

3. Project Progress

3.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

Output 1: Multi-dimensional values of Sustainable Forest Management are understood and result in increased uptake by foresters and *mataqali* thereby benefitting biodiversity conservation.

Full TESSA surveys incorporating ecosystem services and traditional cultural values were conducted at three sites and a rapid survey was conducted and completed at three additional sites (see Annex 6 for draft TESSA reports). There were data collection issues (see sections 7 and 8 for more details) resulting in insufficient data at six further rapid survey sites and as such, TESSA surveys will be redone at these six sites, using the revised format used at the three successful sites, in Year 3 at the same time as the biodiversity surveys.

Several presentation and workshops have been conducted to promote the value of eco-service valuations to local *mataqali* and national level decision-makers (see Annex 7 List of Publications). Two of these presentations were made at international conferences. Having successfully presented this to all communities directly involved in the project, we will now make this information available to all interested parties in the country.

An IBA monitoring framework, already developed for Fiji (Annex 24) will be used in Year 3 to train local volunteers in monitoring their biodiversity in relation to Fiji's NBSAP commitments and development of new PA legislation. We will use the NatureWatch app as one of the means to capture this as effectively as possible.

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

The publishing and promotion of the new Framework for the Establishment of PFE has been delayed as the precise nature of the entity that is PFE is yet to be formalised. This is a complex process involving many stakeholders, and has taken longer than anticipated. There is however, a draft Framework (Annex 15) that provides the key steps for whichever form the PFE

ultimately takes. NFMV is already promoting this amongst local *mataqali* as well as the relevant government departments and NGOs.

Although the PFE is yet to be formalised, NFMV have identified 11 project trial sites (~19,000 ha) which have undergone the framework phase of baseline data collation including (i) base line socio-economic surveys (in collaboration with the Provincial office Conservation officers and personnel from the DoFForestry Training Centre (Annex 8 draft Socioeconomic Services – SES reports), (ii) TESSA rapid appraisals (Annex 6 TESSA reports), and (iii) resource mapping, governance mapping and assessments of their capacity to manage their forests. In addition to the 11 trial sites from this project, there are 18 other sites (~100,000 ha) that have had similar baseline information collected as a result of other projects that can be easily and quickly incorporated into the PFE program when relevant (see Annex 9 List of other sites).

The National Code of Forest Harvesting (Code) was translated into Fijian by staff from the Forestry Training Centre in conjunction with local community members and forestry officers from other parts of Fiji (see Annex 10 for translated code document). The translated version was trialled at Nadogo Village in Vanua Levu (Annex 11), and endorsed by the (national) Code Implementation Steering Committee in March 2015.

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

After the development of the SES methodology (Annex 12 Enumerator training) baseline surveys were conducted amongst participating communities (260 households across the 11 project sites, see Annex 8 SES reports). In addition, a further 30 individuals per site (330) were engaged in discussions on alternative livelihood options for the communities. The livelihood options are diverse across the sites (see Annex 13 Alternative livelihood summary), but the communities recognised several common challenges: access to markets, lack of knowledge on the technologies to use, and lack of knowledge/awareness of experiences from other sites in Fiji and the Pacific. NFMV has identified potential markets and other stakeholders and is facilitating dialogue with the communities. We are taking lessons learnt from sites where a variety of livelihoods have previously been established. These include the Natewa/Tunuloa Community Conserved Area and the Nabukelevu Community Conserved Area where establishing tree nurseries, bee keeping, bakeries, the revival of traditional handicrafts and pineapple and taro plantations using sustainable agricultural methods have been trialled.

Output 4: CCLN established and increasing project impact and sustainability and facilitating the dissemination of monitoring data for national and international advocacy

NFMV has continued to organise site exchange programmes between local community members. While there is no official CCLN network yet, the ground work has been laid. Community representatives have been trained in the Socio-economic training course in July 2014 (Annex 12), and have participated in the baseline surveys in all the project sites. Year 3 will see these community reps attend the NFMV AGM as a step towards formalising their existence as a network for peer learning amongst forest owning communities. The recently established National Itaukei Resource Owners Committee will ensure that this network has a nationally recognised body to discuss issues and lessons learned. The community representative participation is being monitored and evaluated (Annex 14 – Summary feedback forms).

3.2 Progress towards project outputs

Overall progress towards Output 1

Output 1 focuses on increasing the awareness and understanding of sustainable forest management by foresters and *mataqali* thereby benefitting biodiversity conservation. The first method was through awareness workshops on SES assessments, resource mapping and ecosystem services to foresters and forest-owning *mataqali*. To date, these workshops have been presented to more than forty *mataqali* at fourteen sites, on four islands and 10 foresters.

Through targeted workshops, fieldtrips and leaflets, we will ensure that all 250 forest-owning *mataqali* are aware of the ecological, socio-economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests by the end of the project. The second approach was through raising the awareness of Fijian government departments to encourage recognition of the value of Fiji's forests in their decision-making processes. A PFE consultation was conducted in February 2015 that involved the Itaukei Affairs Board, the National Code Monitoring and Compliance Team, the Department of National Planning, Fiji Department of Environment, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Fiji Sawmillers Association, Fiji National University and other stakeholders in Fiji's timber industry. At this consultation, the Conservator of Forests realised that because PFE is a zoning issue, there needed to be another round of consultations with the appropriate target audience, rather than one that dealt more with land acquisition. The final indicator that the multidimensional values of Fiji's forests are understood by local *mataqali* is the number of *mataqali* who formally contact the Department of Forestry to express interest in the PFE process on their land. To date 30 *mataqali* are involved, one other has formally written and several others (< 10) have verbally requested more information.

Overall progress towards Output 2.

Output 2 will see the establishment of the first PFE with locally trained *mataqali* monitoring activities on their land. The first step in producing Output 2 is the publication of the first Framework for the Establishment of PFE. This was due to be completed by the end of Year 2 however, the document is still under discussion as the definition of PFE itself is still under debate within government. The expected timeframe for the publication of this document is by the end of the first quarter of Year 3. Until the document is finalised and published no sites will be formally registered under PFE (we expected 8 by the end of Year 2). Despite this official setback, we have 12 pilot sites for PFE establishment (~19,000 ha total) and have undertaken the framework phase of baseline information collection and collation. The data collected includes socio-economic data (Annex 8), ecosystem services (Annex 6) and resource and governance mapping. Finally, to improve the understanding of the Forest Code of Harvesting Practice, and therefore the capacity of local communities to monitor logging on their land, the Code of Harvesting Practice was translated into Itaukei language in 2014 and officially accepted and endorsed by the Code Implementation Steering Committee in March 2015. This translated code has been trialled at one site with plans to trial it at one other site (of native forest harvesting in Year 3. Beyond the end of the project, the Forest Training Centre (within the Department of Forestry) will use the document to train other interested forest owners.

Overall progress towards Output 3

Output 3 focuses on the establishment of appropriate sustainable livelihoods for forest-owning *mataqali* to reduce poverty and conserve forests. The project is addressing three forms of livelihoods: (i) establishing new livelihoods (e.g. tree nurseries, bee keeping, ecotourism); (ii) modifying currently unsustainable livelihoods (e.g. native forest harvesting, sago harvest, agriculture); and (iii) reviving traditional resources (e.g. kuta/ reed management for mats, palm thatching, masi/ tapa for cloth, pandanus for mats).

The indicators for Output 3 also include assessments of ecosystem services (e.g. forest carbon storage, water services, etc.), key forest health indicator species (birds), and the impact of introducing the above livelihoods on household income. In year 2 we completed baseline data for ecosystem services (Annex 6), socio-economic information (Annex 8) and bird encounter rates. The follow up surveys will be conducted in the third quarter of the final year.

Overall progress towards Output 4

Output 4 focuses on the establishment of a Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network for local *mataqali* to improve project sustainability and the dissemination of monitoring data in national and international databases and fora. To date the CCLN has been informally established as part of this project. There have been numerous site exchange visits between members of different *mataqali* for training workshops (Annex 11), the Fiji Forestry Harvesting

Code of Practice translation and SES data collection. More site exchanges are planned for Year 3 as each of the sites begins to implement their alternative livelihood projects. These site exchange programmes are good for the sustainability of the project concept, are effective lesson and skill sharing tools and informally begin the process of the establishment of a formal CCLN.

The dissemination of monitoring data collected from the project to national and international databases and fora will be carried out towards the end of 2015.

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

Indicator 1.1:

A minimum total area of 26,000 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.

Forests will be recognised as either PA or SMF under Permanent Forest Estates (Fiji Forest Policy 2007) by Year 3 (~19,000 ha pilot sites, ~100,000 ha other sites). This project sets up the mechanism to achieve this output, which will be delivered in collaboration with other stakeholders. Even if the PFE entity is not formalised before the end of the project, we will still have sites that are sustainably managed by communities (and their stakeholders), have management plans in place, and where communities are committed to maintaining the forest for the future. These will automatically contribute to the national PFE once it is established.

Indicator 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 mataqali (not directly targeted by this project) by year 3.

The community awareness groundwork done in 2013 and 2014 is motivating other landowners to seek inclusion in the PFE programme with the Department of Forestry. The project's 11 sites document how other communities can participate. In 2015 we expect the publication of the results from these 11 case study sites as well as continued awareness raising of the PFE by NFMV, Department of Forestry and the Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN, see output 4) to result in novel official requests for inclusion in the PFE. To date we have had several informal requests for more information with a view to being included in future PFE planning however, these requests were not made through the official, national channels.

Initially we were planning to use the Department of Forestry's annual report to verify the number of novel requests received from local communities. We have since identified a second indicator – Provincial Office requests, as Provincial offices may also receive novel requests through being the first point of contact between a village and other government agencies and NGOs. In the next year, the project will aim to make the Department of Forestry the key point of contact, although requests may still come through the Provincial Offices.

Indicator 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.

As mentioned in Section 3.1, baseline household surveys have been conducted for 260 households across the 11 sites engaged in this project. In addition to these households and individuals, a further 30 individuals per site (330) have been engaged in discussions on alternative livelihood options for the communities. New stakeholders have been identified during this process to assist in the establishment of the livelihoods identified for each site. In some communities the development of alternative livelihood enterprises will be relatively straightforward (e.g. Lavena mat weaving for the tourists who already visit the site, Culanuku's sustainably harvested sago palm thatch used for the authentic Fijian style roof by the 30+ local

hotels) with economic benefits immediately apparent. In some of the remaining communities, we will help with the implementation of livelihoods that require feasible management and business plans enabling the communities to achieve predicted long term economic benefits e.g. sustainable forest harvesting.

Indicator 2.2:

Increased participation of 30 mataqali targeted by the project to engage in forest governance and decision making as demonstrated (measured) by their membership and continuing engagement in the Permanent Forest Estate Framework Working Group by year 3.

The Permanent Forest Estates Framework (see Annex 15 Draft PFE document) describes the challenges and opportunities brought about by this component of the project. The focus in 2014 was on collecting Socio-Economic and Livelihood data to communicate to stakeholders in Year 3 and in overcoming the challenges encountered during the initial discussions of PFE with relevant stakeholders in 2012-2013.

The project has trialled the collection of data on landuse, socioeconomic and livelihood information for the *mataqali* in 11 communities in preparation for the zoning exercise that forms the basis of the PFE. These communities want to participate in the zoning of their land and making informed decisions through tools developed in this project as members of the PFE Framework Working Group. This zoning exercise will be conducted as part of the implementation of the alternative livelihoods projects during the site visits in the second quarter of 2015/16.

Indicator 2.3:

A survey of 30 mataqali 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.

The baseline information for this component has been collected through the use of anonymous feedback forms distributed at all sites to individuals attending the workshop sessions of the SES (see Annex 16 for feedback form). These forms capture the feelings that individuals had at the beginning of the project and they will be resurveyed in Year 3 to determine whether participation in the PFE has brought positive benefits to their communities.

Indicator 2.4:

Novel requests for assistance to develop alternative livelihoods from one hundred households not already engaged in the pilots by year 3.

NFMV has worked with and trained Provincial Conservation Offices and Forestry staff throughout this project. We will prepare livelihood and sustainable resource management information suitable for communities, and will trial them in Year 3 of this project. Interest from other communities has trickled in verbally, but this will be monitored quantitatively following the targeted release of appropriate stories as identified in communications plan. Details of these requests will be captured through the Provincial offices (the first point of contact with local communities) and the Department of Forestry.

Indicator 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 in Forest carbon storage (tonnes carbon per ha)

The baseline data has been collected to assess the initial Forest carbon storage values at six of the 11 project sites (Annex 6). Estimates of net loss or gain in forest carbon storage will be made at the end of Year 3.

Indicator 3.2:

Ecosystem services in areas under Permanent Forest Estate management (PA and SMF covering a minimum of 26,000 ha) show no net loss in Water Services (cubic metres of water per household per year)

We have established monitoring programmes to assess the volume of water at three villages within the study area. These involve recording the volume of water that flows from a tap in the village for a set period of time and the height of water in the dam that is the water source for the village. It is apparent that water quantity, in a country where there is > 3,000 mm precipitation per annum, is not a problem, and is not affected by the land use at the site. Indeed, the primary concern for many communities is to avoid the build-up of pressure in the system that damages the plumbing. Accordingly taps in many villages are left on for 24 hours of the day.

Water quality is, however, an issue. We have taken steps to collect information on the water quality at a number of sites in Taveuni, using a novel biophysical assessment developed at the University of South Pacific. This will involve a USP consultant working closely with and training NFMV staff, and community organisations, to identify key fauna sensitive to various pollutants.

Indicator 3.3:

Ecosystem services in areas under Permanent Forest Estate management (PA and SMF covering a minimum of 26,000 ha) show no net loss in 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 and 34 on Viti Levu).

Bird survey baseline data was collected in 11 sites in 2013/14. A resurvey and analysis will be conducted in the 3rd quarter of 2015/2016.

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

The original project risks and assumptions were:

1. Fiji remains relatively politically stable during implementation and that the democratic elections, scheduled for 2014, do not alter that stability
2. Target communities continue to become interested in developing PFE's
3. DoF remain committed to the Fiji Forest Policy (2007) and do not significantly alter their stated aims towards sustainable forest management or protection and livelihood improvement
4. That all forests provide opportunities to develop sustainable harvesting of forest products that provide sustainable incomes and biodiversity conservation

To date, the original project risks and assumption still hold true. Fiji had its democratic elections in September 2014 and whilst progress on the project with government department collaboration was slow in the lead up to the elections, Fiji remains politically stable and the election outcomes do not interfere with the project at the lower levels. The target communities remain interested in developing PFEs and this is discussed in further detail with supporting evidence in section 11. DoF remains committed to the Fiji Forest Policy and have increased their involvement in and support for sustainable forest management including strengthening their training facility and its curriculum for this purpose (see section 11 for more details). Our field sites are located in a range of different forest habitats, all of which provide potential opportunities for sustainable use of forests and sustainable livelihoods.

3.5 Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation

The goal/impact of this project is to maintain the ecological, socio-economic and cultural values that Fiji's forests provide through the establishment of a network of Permanent Forest estates (PFEs) that consist of both Protected Areas (PAs) and Sustainably Managed Forests (SMFs). These PFEs will promote local empowerment and support improved, more sustainable

livelihoods for the forest owning *mataqali* contributing to biodiversity conservation and long-term poverty alleviation within forest communities.

To date the project has focussed on establishing the enabling conditions for communities and stakeholders (policy, guidelines, capacity) required to achieve long term sustainable impacts (Annexes 6, 8 and 11). These activities are crucial for the sustainability of the project and its ability to have positive impacts on biodiversity as well as poverty alleviation through community empowerment.

In Year 3 we will focus on mobilising those who have been trained in biodiversity monitoring at the community level, creating opportunities for peer learning amongst the 11 sites in the project and building up a network of local monitoring teams. We will also attempt to implement or facilitate the implementation of alternative livelihoods for trial communities. Monitoring the social, economic and environmental benefits of the alternative livelihoods will allow us to demonstrate the value of this approach.

See section 5 for more on impacts on poverty alleviation

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

This project contributes directly to CBD Aichi Biodiversity Target 7 – “By 2020 areas under...Forestry are managed sustainably ensuring conservation of biodiversity” and Target 11 “By 2020 at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water...especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services are conserved...”

It also addresses Objective 1.3 in Fiji’s NBSAP – “Minimise the loss and fragmentation of community-owned native forests” and will empower communities to help enforce the National Code of Logging practice. This project provides the mechanism by which the Fiji Department of Forestry will add Permanent Forest Estates (PFEs) to its sustainable forest management program.

NFMV sits as a member and technical advisor on 10 committees established by the Fiji government under the CBD, Ramsar, CITES and Programmes of Work (Annex 17 List of committees). Although 2014 has seen a focus on collecting data, interactions with these various committees and convention focal points has permitted NFMV to share information and site monitoring data to report against CBD NBSAP, CBD Aichi targets, and CITES obligations.

5. Project support to poverty alleviation

The expected beneficiaries of this project are the local land-owning communities who become involved in the PFE program by designating their land as PFE and registering with the Department of Forestry. In addition to economic benefits through the development of sustainable alternative livelihoods, these communities will benefit through improved ecosystem services (e.g. water, carbon storage), improved skills (e.g. trained local wardens for monitoring logging in accordance with Fiji’s Code of Forestry Practice), increased knowledge of their own land and capacity to make informed decisions, and finally through the involvement of women and youth in the decision-making processes.

In some of our 11 trial communities the project will have impacts on the economic dimension of poverty e.g. by developing and implementing feasible alternative livelihood plans for Culanuku and Lavena Village (see Annex 18 pamphlets) and obvious over the short term. In the longer term, this project will inspire other communities to sustainably use their natural resources. Poverty alleviation is as much about empowering communities with the opportunity to be able to make informed independent decisions about their resource use. The preliminary results already show that the interest in implementing alternative livelihood sources exists (see Annexes 6 and 13). There is however, a critical need to develop feasible resource plans for these different communities that realistically address community expectations and the ability of their environment to support these plans.

In 2014 we collected the baseline socio-economic data and made baseline assessments of ecosystem services. In the next year we will revisit the sites to collect quantitative data to evaluate the impact that the project is having on poverty alleviation in the 11 trial communities.

6. Project support to Gender equity issues

Although the initial project proposal did not specifically address gender equality (given that it was submitted before May 2014), one of NFMV policies is to ensure that the views and input of women are included in all projects involving local communities. As traditional Fijian cultural governance structures are male-oriented, we understand that the role of women as decision makers can be limited and that their participation generally depends on the open-mindedness of the males of their community.

In this project, NFMV has ensured that women and youths are involved in the site engagement workshops, mapping of the governance structure, and decision-making. In 2014, this was done by (i) recording the views of women and youths separately from the men, (ii) separating groups by gender for group workshop discussions, and (iii) by using anonymous post-workshop questionnaires that recorded the gender and age of the participant (see methods sections of SES reports in Annex 8, Survey questionnaire Annex 16). Although the results are preliminary, they demonstrate differences in the knowledge of men and women in relation to land use and the community decision-making processes. By taking this approach, NFMV has captured women's current knowledge in relation to forestry policy, state of natural resources, alternative livelihoods, and access to assistance/ market and lessons learnt from other sites; and will subsequently identify and facilitate avenues through which women can influence decision-making by the community as a whole. In addition, we have targeted the revival of traditional practices, such as mat weaving (kuta/reed and pandanus), which are traditionally the domain of women and identified links with potential markets (including the tourist industry).

7. Monitoring and evaluation

In early 2014, the team identified key areas to focus on and deliver, giving each team member a set of specific tasks (see Annex 19 Example planning sessions). Major activities for 2014 focussed on finalising the SES datasheet, training of enumerators, data collection and analysis; completing the TESSA data collection and reporting, translating the Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice and completing the Permanent Forest Estates road map with the Fiji Department of Forests.

Meetings were held before and after most field and workshop sessions and an evaluation was conducted by BirdLife International staff (Mark O'Brien) to determine whether the objectives were being met and where improvements could be made, especially for data collection. Individual team members from NFMV met or communicated with BirdLife International staff for technical advice when needed.

For most tasks, this internal monitoring and evaluation approach proved suitable and all tasks were completed on time. In the case of the TESSA component issues associated with the small island nature of Fiji were not effectively addressed until the results from six sites had been analysed. 3 sites have now been successfully completed, the remaining will be addressed in Year 3.

We have resolved to ensure that all data collected will be presented at any evaluation meeting which will be conducted after all field and workshop sessions. Staff members will be encouraged to seek help from other team members if they are having difficulties with aspects of their component/tasks.

The contribution of the outputs and activities towards the outcome will be demonstrated through the use of appropriate indicators as presented in the Logframe (Annex 2). In some cases the indicators are simple quantitative measures e.g. number of applications for Forest Stewardship Certification, number of sites registered under PFE, average bird encounter rate, total land area designated as PA or SMF, etc. These are easily measured and assessed and are directly linked to outputs (see Logframe Annex 2 for details, e.g. Indicators 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3).

Qualitative indicators are usually more complex to measure, for example, demonstrating increased knowledge or awareness, increased motivation to participate, sharing of project experiences and ideas by local communities. To measure these, we try to ensure that there is a mix of methodology/indicators used for each output and a range of source material/evidence to

support the achievement of outputs (see Logframe Annex 2 for details, e.g. Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 4.1, 4.3).

In 2014 there were no changes made to the M&E plan. We will be modifying the M&E plan in Year 3 to officially include gender equality and more rigorously internally monitor data collection and analysis for the different components. Gender equality will be monitored using the establishment of women's groups in village committees and the promotion of women's group projects as recorded in the village headman's report. Data collection and data analysis will be monitored as discussed previously in this section.

8. Lessons learnt

- Successful/worked well

Initially our team had planned to translate the Fiji Forestry Code of Practice in consultation with other stakeholders. After discussions with the Forestry Department and after difficulties we had explaining some of the technical terms to local communities during the awareness phase, we decided to engage the Forestry Training Centre to run the translation process with local community members and forestry officers from other parts of Fiji (Annex 20 Formal agreement between NFMV and FTC). This was a very successful process and highlighted the importance of involving (a) the organisation that developed the policy, and (b) target audience members, when translating policies with technical terms. By doing so we ensured that the Code was translated in the most appropriate way to communicate important information to local communities.

- Unsuccessful/did not work well

Project and staff management

Monitoring and evaluation of data collection

To address these issues, we have

- (i) recruited a project 'mentor' to provide an overview and guidance through the final year of the project, and
- (ii) sub-contracted the biodiversity surveys to external, qualified personnel with whom we have worked well on previous projects and are confident that the project outputs will be delivered.

9. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)

The previous project review highlighted a heavy focus on activities and not on indicators. This year we have focussed on outputs and indicators (as seen in this current report).

10. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

Progress with establishing the entity of PFE was not as fast as we had anticipated. We continue to press for the rapid establishment of the PFE at national level (as outlined in recent DoF proposal 'Viti Levu Emission Reduction Programme – Fiji's Early Idea Submission to the FCPF Carbon Fund' (Annex 28).

The establishment of the legislation for protected areas has been delayed till beyond the end of this project, so we have reviewed how we identify and record the areas of native forest that communities commit to maintaining as forest into the future, and is not targeted for active management. We will assume that the PFE will be primarily a 'zoning' exercise – and will not require a leasing arrangement for all sites where active management is not anticipated.

11. Sustainability and legacy

There are three key stakeholders with whom NFMV is working to ensure sustainability of the project (see below). These are the key stakeholders who will continue with the PFE program after the end of this project

1. Fiji Department of Forestry. There was great support for the project from the Department this year that saw the Forestry Training Centre (FTC), the National Code Monitoring and Compliance (of the Code) team and the Conservator of Forests all engaging NFMV in activities in the last quarter of 2014.
 - a. The FTC translated the Code in late 2014 and went on to implement the first community training in Nadogo. In March 2015 the FTC presented the translated Code to the Code Implementation Steering Committee. This generated interest from the other stakeholders of the non-native timber industry (Annex 21 Minutes of the Code SC meeting). In 2015-2016, education and awareness of the Code will be led by the FTC.
 - b. The National Code Monitoring and Compliance team is responsible for ensuring that the timber industry stakeholders in Fiji are complying with the code. The team, through awareness of this project has a better understanding of where in the Fiji Forest Policy (2007) and the Permanent Forest Estates the Code lies (Annex 22 Second National Monitoring Report 2014, section 10).
 - c. In February 2015, the Conservator of Forests, in recognition of the importance of PFE, convened a consultation meeting to discuss PFE with stakeholders (Annex 23 PFE consultation invitation). NFMV presented at this meeting as the only stakeholder actively engaged in implementing this crucial component of the Fiji Forest Policy (2007). The Department of Forests will now lead in the consultation on PFE at the higher level while NFMV concentrates on producing case studies (through this project) to demonstrate that PFEs can be successfully established.
2. The Provincial Offices. These offices are the most important stakeholders in relation to the sustainability of the project with local communities. When communities need to voice grievances, their first point of contact is their Provincial Office. The Provincial Offices for the project sites: Serua, Cakaudrove, Macuata, Rewa each have a conservation officer – a position that has been created in recognition of the importance of Fiji's natural environment to local communities and to the Fiji government. The role of the conservation officer is to address all matters relating to the environment on behalf of the Roko Tui (Administrator). This project has engaged all four conservation officers through training in Socio-economic survey techniques and their participation in the data collection. These officers will then be able to collect socio-economic data from other interested communities within their province after the end of this project. The project has taught the conservation officers how to enter and analyse the data collected thereby helping them make rapid analyses of the status of the villages they serve. There are many other stakeholders that work with the conservation officers, so building their capacity (through field experience and project involvement) to make their own decisions is a more strategic method than simply informing them of the project.
3. The traditional governance – this is the governance structure that runs parallel to the government (Provincial Office). In three of the four provinces, the governance structures are headed by a Paramount Chief (Tui Cakaudrove, Tui Macuata, Roko Tui Dreketi); whilst the fourth province does not have a paramount chief. In addition to involving the villages through the Provincial Office, the project also involved villages through the traditional structure – which in all four provinces is still strong. This was done for two provinces through the Tui Cakaudrove and Tui Macuata. Both Paramount chiefs are supportive of the project. After the Paramount chiefs, the heads of tribes and heads of clans are important. Because the requests to participate in PFE have come from the communities themselves, heads of tribes and clans are usually informed prior to NFMV's engagement. The project however, still makes a courtesy visit to the heads of tribes and clans to secure their personal support.

The original exit strategy was based around the development and implementation of a framework to help local communities establish and benefit from PFEs on their land. The framework will be designed to be easy to understand and implement for all parties beyond the life of the project.

As the PFE program is a Department of Forestry initiative, the Department is involved throughout this project and post-project will lead on future designation of PFEs. Post-project, BirdLife and NFMV will continue to showcase examples, share lessons learned, and provide feedback and advice to the Department through its membership on the Forestry Harvesting Code of Practice Steering Committee.

Training will ensure that multiple members of the community are skilled in forest management, and that a senior representative of the community oversees proposed activities. In addition, as individuals depart they will be replaced and trained by their peers. This will ensure that at least 3-5 representatives from communities who plan to establish PFEs are certified in skills to monitor logging in accordance with Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting.

Given the current levels of commitment by the different stakeholders described above, and increasing levels of interest from other communities, our current exit strategy remains valid.

12. Darwin Identity

The project team ensures that all communication on the project refers to the Darwin Initiative. While our focus this year has been on data collection, we have presented aspects of this project at international conferences, local community workshops, and national workshops (see Annex 7). There have also been a number of reports and publications produced that acknowledge the Darwin Initiative and highlight its support. In some cases the Darwin Initiative support was recognised as a distinct project and in others it formed part of a larger programme (details in Annex 7).

To date the stakeholders that are most familiar with the Darwin Initiative are non-governmental organisations (either through this project or others), the Fiji Forestry Department, Forestry Training Centre, environmental committees e.g. Protected Areas Committee (PAC), and the local landowning communities directly associated with this project.

We currently do not have a Twitter/Instagram/Flickr/Blog/YouTube/Facebook account to promote this project. We are considering initiating a Facebook account and website in the last 6 months with weekly updates on the project, communities involved, stakeholders and the role of the Darwin Initiative. These will be linked to the NFMV website.

13. Project Expenditure

Table 1 Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2014– 31 March 2015)

Project spend (indicative) since last annual report	2014/15 Grant (£)	2014/15 Total Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs				Additional staff time required to improve project co-ordination
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items				
Others				
TOTAL	96,274	96,273		

14. **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 2014-2015

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2014 - March 2015	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Impact Maintain the ecological, socio-economic and cultural values that Fiji's forests provide through the establishment of a network of Permanent Forest estates (PFEs) that consist of both Protected Areas (PAs) and Sustainably Managed Forests (SMFs). These PFEs will promote local empowerment and support improved, more sustainable livelihoods for the forest owning <i>mataqali</i> contributing to biodiversity conservation and long-term poverty alleviation within forest communities.</p>		<p>We have worked with Provincial Government staff to develop tools that enable communities to report on their Natural Resources, Ecosystem Services and Socio-Economic Status and allow them to plan for their future, identify sustainable livelihood opportunities and facilitate their involvement in the PFE. We have worked closely with national government officers to define PFE and are confident that the concept of zoning will be accepted, at least for the immediate future.</p>	
<p>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 <i>Mataqali</i>, from the harvesting of forest products, coupled with 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.</p>	<p>1.1 Minimum total areas of 26,000 ha designated as PA or SMF under PFE by Year 3</p> <p>1.2 Increased motivation to enter into forestry management agreements as a result of the projects influence as measured by novel official requests for inclusion in PFE by 50 <i>mataqali</i></p>	<p>By the end of Year 3, all the communities participating in this project will understand that their forest resources are limited and that they need to take ownership of their management if they are to receive maximum economic, cultural and ecological benefits. From the baseline socio-economic surveys we see that the communities are interested. Year 3 will focus on communicating this interest to government. Government is still yet to fully understand what the Permanent Forest Estate means (see Annex 15 PFE framework).</p> <p>Communications about the results of Year 2 to the public at the beginning of Year 3 will help us achieve this. Novel requests will be monitored in Year 3. The challenge will be in making sure that <i>mataqali</i> requests are attended to by government – and that government</p>	<p>Undertake biodiversity surveys at project sites</p> <p>Produce Code of Practice for Managing Plantations for Biodiversity and integrate into wider Framework for Establishment of PFE</p> <p>Trial Framework of Establishment of PFE at 8 project sites covering at least 26,000 ha</p> <p>Prepare case studies and lessons learned from each of the project sites</p> <p>Develop and test training module for forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> in skills to implement Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting</p> <p>Develop communication systems for <i>mataqali</i> to report incidents of unsustainable logging to Department of Forestry</p> <p>Implement selected livelihood activities</p>

	<p>2.1 Household income increases by ~15% in at least 25 households in 8 communities through adoption of alternative livelihoods</p> <p>2.2 Increased participation of 30 <i>mataqali</i> targeted by the project to engage in forest governance and decision-making as demonstrated by membership and continuing engagement in PFE working group by Year 3</p> <p>2.3 Survey of 30 target <i>mataqali</i> feel their voice is being heard and their participation in PFE brings positive benefits to their communities by year 3</p> <p>2.4 Novel requests for assistance to develop alternative livelihoods from 100 households not already engaged in pilots by Year 3</p> <p>3.1 Ecosystem services in PFE areas show no net loss in forest carbon storage</p> <p>3.2 Ecosystem services in PFE areas show no net loss in water services</p>	<p>has the capacity to handle the requests.</p> <p>Baseline assessments have been conducted for 12 sites (11 from this project). Possible livelihood projects have been identified. Year 3 will focus on their feasibility and implementation in collaboration with the appropriate stakeholders.</p> <p>In the last year, the project has built up a network of communities from the selected sites, to contribute towards Output 4. This network will drive PFE at the community level and will be used as an example to Department of Forestry and government stakeholders of the need for PFE. In Year 3, the project will target having these communities heard in the recently established National Itaukei Resource Owners Committee.</p> <p>This will be assessed in Year 3 as part of the exercise for 2.2 above.</p> <p>This will be assessed in Year 3, after the implementation of alternative livelihood projects at selected sites within the project. The baseline survey has identified households to engage initially; and has revealed that there is widespread interest across the sites but help is needed with implementation.</p> <p>3.1 Carbon data has been collected for two sites. Net loss will be evaluated in Year 3.</p> <p>3.2. Water services monitoring techniques have been taught to the village headmen of four sites. These</p>	<p>at project sites</p> <p>Follow-up SES to assess changes in household income after implementation of alternative livelihoods</p> <p>Continue establishment of CCLN</p> <p>Integrate site monitoring data with global datasets – IUCN Red List, World Bird Database, CBD 202 Aichi Biodiversity Targets</p>
--	--	--	--

	3.3 Ecosystem services in PFE areas show no net loss in key forest bird indicator species	headmen are currently monitoring water services in their communities. 3.3. Baseline bird surveys have been conducted in nine sites. Net loss will be evaluated in Year 3.	
Output 1 The multidimensional values (ecological, socio-economic and cultural) of Sustainable Forest Management understood and resulting in increased uptake by foresters and <i>mataqali</i> thereby benefitting biodiversity conservation	<p>1a. 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 at the conclusion of the project.</p> <p>1b. 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>1c. 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>1d. 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>1a. Socio-economic assessments, resource mapping and ecosystem services presentations done to more than <i>forty mataqali</i> at fourteen sites, on four islands.</p> <p>1b. As above</p> <p>1c. PFE consultation conducted in February 2015 to government departments and other stakeholders interested in Fiji's timber industry (Annex 15).</p> <p>1d. 30 forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> formally written to express interest in PFE by 2013. One has formally written in, others have verbally requested more information. This will be consolidated in Year 3.</p>	
Activity 1.2 Implement and modify TESSA through community workshops		Full TESSA survey conducted at 3 sites, rapid survey at 3 additional sites (Annex 6 TESSA reports)	
Activity 1.3 Document traditional cultural values of Fiji's forests and incorporate into TESSA		Completed as part of TESSA report (Annex 6). This will be strengthened as stakeholders of the Ridge to Reef (UN GEF) project in Fiji have identified that TESSA will be adapted and used in several other sites in Fiji.	
Activity 1.5 Promote results of eco-service valuations to all forest owning <i>mataqali</i> and national decision-makers		Presentations done at national level and international level: 1. Ridge to Reef (UN GEF) stakeholders consultation in 2014. TESSA has been incorporated into site assessments for new sites on Vanua Levu;	

	<p>2. Society for Ecological Restoration – 2nd International Conference in New Calendonia (November 2014); Toolkit for Ecosystem Services Site-based Assessment in Fiji: Assessing ecosystem services with local communities for better biodiversity conservation by Nunia Thomas.</p> <p>3. The Sub-Global Assessment Network’s capacity building workshop on ecosystem assessments for the Asia-Pacific region, Beijing (November 2014). Toolkit for Ecosystem Services Site-based Assessment in Fiji: Assessing ecosystem services with local communities for better biodiversity conservation by Mere Valu.</p>
<p>Activity 1.6 Promote site monitoring biodiversity data in support of Fiji’s NBSAP commitments and development of new PA legislation</p>	<p>On-going. An IBA monitoring framework has been developed for Fiji (See http://www.birdlife.org/pacific/news/fiji%E2%80%99s-first-framework-iba-monitoring), and will be used to train local volunteers in monitoring their biodiversity.</p>
<p>Output 2. The first PFE established under Forest Policy (2007), with locally trained <i>mataqali</i> effectively monitoring logging activities on their land.</p>	<p>2a. 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>2b. The first eight sites registered under PFE with Fiji’s Department of Forestry by end of year two.</p> <p>2c. 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</p>
	<p>2a. One documented case study (Nadogo Village). PFE framework document still under discussion. The PFE definition itself is still under discussion/debate within government. Needs awareness within government stakeholders in Year 3 (Annex 15 PFE Roadmap).</p> <p>2b. Twelve sites have been identified, and have undergone the framework phase of baseline information collation. The first steps have been completed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Base line socio-economic survey conducted – with the participation of the Provincial office Conservation officers and personnel from the Department of Forests’ Forestry Training Centre (Annex 8). 2. TESSA rapid appraisals conducted (Annex 6); 3. Resource mapping, governance mapping and capacity to manage their forests assessed. <p>The next steps include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The zoning of their land with Department of Forests and the Department of Agriculture; ii. Implementation of alternative livelihood projects identified through the baseline socio-economic survey; and iii. Biodiversity monitoring training. <p>2c. Forest harvesting code of practice (Code) translated into Itaukei language (October 2014) and officially accepted and endorsed by the Code Implementation Steering Committee (March 2015). (Annex 10)</p> <p>The translated Code has been trialled in one site, in which members of another</p>

	accordance with Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting by end of project.	harvesting community were participants as part of the capacity building programme.
Activity 2.3. Publish and promote the new Framework for Establishment of PFE in English and Fijian		On-going, waiting for PFE Framework to be finalised.
Activity 2.4. Trial Framework for Establishment of PFE at eight project site covering at least 26,000 ha		This has begun as in Output 2b above. Each site has its unique set of challenges and capacity, which were identified during the baseline socio-economic assessments. Year 3 will address these opportunities and challenges to help the communities better manage their resources.
Activity 2.6. Translate National Code of Forest Harvesting into Fijian (Itaukei).		Completed (Annex 10).
Output 3. Locally appropriate ecosystem-based sustainable livelihoods established for forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> which reduce poverty and conserve forest ecosystems.	<p>3a. 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].</p> <p>3b. 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>3c. 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 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</p>	<p>3a. Baseline information has been completed for two sites. Year 3 will focus on monitoring the baseline information (Annex 6). Village headmen have begun collecting water services data for selected households.</p> <p>3b. Baseline socio-economic assessments have been completed (Annex 8).</p> <p>3c. Bird surveys have been conducted at nine sites prior to the start of this project. Follow up surveys will be conducted in the third quarter of Year 3.</p>
Activity 3.1. Use participative management planning methods to identify		This has been completed for all sites – through the baseline socio-economic

ecosystem-based sustainable livelihood interventions for <i>mataqali</i> from the harvesting of forest projects.	surveys. Two hundred and forty seven households have been assessed through the baseline socio-economic surveys in eleven sites for this project, and one additional site through the Fiji petrel project (Annexes 6 and 8).
Activity 3.2. Implement selected livelihood activities at project sites	Possible livelihood activities have been identified for eleven sites, but have yet to be confirmed for each site. These have been reflected in the baseline socio-economic assessment reports (Annexes 6 and 8).
<p>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.</p>	<p>4a. 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>4b. 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>4c. Attendance and participation (from a baseline of zero) by CCLN members at key decision-making forums.</p>
Activity 4.1. Establish a Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) and support replication of good practice, improve knowledge exchange and increase sustainability	<p>4a. Nabukelevu villagers (4) from the Serua Province of Viti Levu attended the translated Code training in Nadogo Village in the Cakaudrove Province of Vanua Levu (Annex 11).</p> <p>Community members from Culanuku Village (Serua Province) and Navukailagi Village in Gau Island (Lomaiviti Province, Fiji Petrel site) assisted in the baseline socio-economic survey of three villages on the island of Taveuni.</p> <p>More site exchanges are planned for Year 3 as each of the sites begin to implement their alternative livelihood projects. Site exchange programmes are good for the sustainability of the project concept and are effective lesson tools and skills sharing for the communities.</p> <p>4b. Planned for Year 3. Monitoring training by Site Support Group members will commence as part of 4a above.</p> <p>4c. This will be implemented in Year 3.</p> <p>Site exchange programmes have already begun:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Code training in Nadogo village - participation of Nabukelevu villagers; 2. Baseline socio-economic survey in four villages in Taveuni - participation of representatives from Culanuku Village and Navukailagi Village (Fiji petrel project community), and conservation officer for Cakaudrove Provincial Office (June 2014, March 2015), Macuata Provincial Office (June 2014, October 2014, January 2015) and Serua Provincial office (October 2014).

Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Goal: The goal of this project is to maintain the ecological, socio-economic and cultural values that Fiji's forests provide through the establishment of a network of Permanent Forest estates (PFEs) that consist of both Protected Areas (PAs) and Sustainably Managed Forests (SMFs). These PFEs will promote local empowerment and support improved, more sustainable livelihoods for the forest owning <i>mataqali</i> contributing to biodiversity conservation and long-term poverty alleviation within forest communities.</p>			
<p>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 <i>Mataqali</i>, from the harvesting of forest products, coupled with 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.</p>	<p>1.3 Minimum total areas of 26,000 ha designated as PA or SMF under PFE by Year 3</p> <p>1.4 Increased motivation to enter into forestry management agreements as a result of the projects influence as measured by novel official requests for inclusion in PFE by 50 <i>mataqali</i></p> <p>2.5 Household income increases by ~15% in at least 25 households in 8 communities through adoption of alternative livelihoods</p> <p>2.6 Increased participation of 30 <i>mataqali</i> targeted by the project to engage in forest governance and decision-making as demonstrated by membership and continuing engagement in PFE working group by Year 3</p> <p>2.7 Survey of 30 target <i>mataqali</i> feel their voice is being heard and their participation in PFE brings positive benefits to their communities by year 3</p> <p>2.8 Novel requests for assistance to develop alternative livelihoods from 100 households not already engaged in plots by Year 3</p> <p>3.1 Ecosystem services in PFE areas</p>	<p>1.1.1 PFE register kept by Department of Forestry</p> <p>1.1.2 Department of Forestry Annual report</p> <p>1.1.3 Reports from Fiji Protected Area Committee (PAC)</p> <p>1.1.4 National Forest Inventory</p> <p>1.4.1 PFE Register</p> <p>1.4.2 Department of Forestry Annual Report</p> <p>2.1.1 Household economic surveys</p> <p>2.1.2 Community group meeting reports</p> <p>2.2.1 Minutes from PFE Framework Working Group</p> <p>2.2.2 Letters to Department of Forestry requesting help with alternative livelihoods</p> <p>2.3.1 Minutes from PFE Framework Working Group</p> <p>2.3.2. Community Group meeting reports</p> <p>2.4.1 Community Group meeting reports</p> <p>2.4.2 Letters to Department of Forestry requesting help with alternative livelihoods</p> <p>3.1.1 Final ecosystem services reports</p>	<p>1. Fiji remains relatively politically stable during implementation and that the democratic elections, scheduled for 2014, do not alter that stability</p> <p>2. Target communities continue to become interested in developing PFE's</p> <p>3. DoF remain committed to the Fiji Forest Policy (2007) and do not significantly alter their stated aims towards sustainable forest management or protection and livelihood improvement</p> <p>4. That all forests provide opportunities to develop sustainable harvesting of forest products that provide sustainable incomes and biodiversity conservation</p>

	<p>show no net loss in forest carbon storage</p> <p>3.2 Ecosystem services in PFE areas show no net loss in water services</p> <p>3.3 Ecosystem services in PFE areas show no net loss in key forest bird indicator species</p>	<p>3.2.1 Final ecosystem services reports</p> <p>3.3.1 Biodiversity survey reports</p> <p>3.3.2 State of Fiji's Birds report</p> <p>3.3.3 Peer-reviewed publications</p>	
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. The multidimensional values (ecological, socio-economic and cultural) of Sustainable Forest Management understood and resulting in increased uptake by foresters and <i>mataqali</i> thereby benefitting biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>1a. 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 at the conclusion of the project.</p> <p>1b. 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>1c. 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>1d. 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>1a. Final project report detailing results of interviews with foresters and forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> comparing baseline to end</p> <p>1a. The number of applications for Forest Stewardship Certification</p> <p>1b. Survey at start of project and six months before the end of the project on forest owning <i>mataqali</i> awareness of ecological, socio-economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests.</p> <p>1c. Survey at start of project and six months before end of the project on policy-makers awareness of ecological, socio-economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests.</p> <p>1c. Analysis of the outcomes of government decision-making to assess the extent to which forest environment has been effectively mainstreamed</p>	
<p>2. The first PFE established under Forest Policy (2007), with locally trained <i>mataqali</i> effectively monitoring logging activities on their land.</p>	<p>2a. 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>2b. The first eight sites registered under PFE with Fiji's Department of Forestry by end of year two.</p>	<p>2a. Published Framework for Establishment of PFE.</p> <p>2a. Project reports detailing results of implementation of framework at trial sites.</p> <p>2b. Permanent Forest Estates register held by Fiji's Department of Forestry.</p>	

	<p>2c. 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.</p>	<p>2c. Final project report detailing certificates gained by <i>mataqali</i> for monitoring logging in accordance with Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting.</p> <p>2c. Press cuttings showing coverage of <i>mataqali</i> involved in monitoring of logging and/or receiving certificates.</p>	
<p>3. Locally appropriate ecosystem-based sustainable livelihoods established for forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> which reduce poverty and conserve forest ecosystems.</p>	<p>3a. 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].</p> <p>3b. 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>3c. 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 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</p>	<p>3a. Annual project report</p> <p>3a. Detailed results of ecosystem service assessments</p> <p>3b. Household economic survey reports.</p> <p>3c. State of Fiji's Birds report</p> <p>3c. Peer-reviewed papers</p> <p>3c. Final project report</p>	
<p>4. Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) established and increasing project impact and sustainability and facilitating the</p>	<p>4a. 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</p>	<p>4a. Number and geographic distribution of active users of Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) as recorded by Google Analytics</p>	

<p>dissemination of monitoring data for national and international advocacy.</p>	<p>the BirdLife Global network for the first time.</p> <p>4b. 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>4c. Attendance and participation (from a baseline of zero) by CCLN members at key decision-making forums.</p>	<p>and minutes from CCLN meetings.</p> <p>4b. Data from project sites recorded in BirdLife’s World Bird Database (WBDB)</p> <p>4b. Data from project sites referenced in Fiji NBSAP updates</p> <p>4b. Data from project sites recorded in minutes for PAC</p> <p>4c. Records of CCLN members at key meetings.</p>	
<p>Activities (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)</p> <p>1.1 Establish Project Steering Committee to oversee project implementation</p> <p>1.2 Implement TESSA for the first time in the Pacific at sites in Fiji through community consultation workshops</p> <p>1.3 Document traditional cultural values of Fiji’s forests from <i>mataqali</i> elders and incorporate into TESSA</p> <p>1.4 Undertake biodiversity surveys at project sites to establish project baselines and evaluate progress</p> <p>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> <p>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 & International Co-operation and Protected Areas Committee in support of Fiji’s NBSAP commitments and development of new PA Legislation respectively.</p> <p>2.1 A working Framework for the Establishment of PFEs, drafted in consultation with key national and local (<i>mataqali</i>) stakeholders, prepared.</p> <p>2.2 Research and produce Code of Practice for Managing Plantations for Biodiversity within PFEs, and integrate into wider Framework for Establishment of PFE.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2.5 Prepare case studies/Lessons Learned from each of the project sites.</p> <p>2.6 Translate national Code of Forest Harvesting into Fijian.</p> <p>2.7 Develop and test training module for forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> in skills for implementing Fiji’s Code of Forest Harvesting.</p> <p>2.8 Develop communication systems to enable <i>mataqali</i> to report incidents of unsustainable logging to Department of Forests, and monitor report submissions.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3.2 Implement selected livelihood activities at project sites.</p>			

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*.

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

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.

4.2 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.

Annex 3 Standard Measures

(Note that the project team are focussing on this at our next meeting on 19 May, 2015. 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		1				1	2
6b	Weeks training for above		3				3	6
7	Training Materials		3					8
14b	Conferences/seminars/workshops attended (see Annex 5 for details in Yr 1)	12	3			12	10	30
15a	Press releases	15				15	12	40
17a	Dissemination networks established		2					1
22	Permanent Field Plots (6 sites, 8 plots per site)	26				26	48	48

Table 2 Publications – see Annex 7

Title	Type (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. website link or publisher)
Forest Watch	Newspaper Article	Peni Drauna, Aug 2014	Male	Fijian	Fiji Sun	http://fijisun.com.fj/2014/08/20/forest-watch/
Delivering sustainable forest management for Fiji's people and biodiversity	Pamphlet	NFMV 2014	Female	Fijian	NFMV	Annex 18.1

TESSA in Fiji: Assessing ecosystem services with local communities for better biodiversity conservation	Conference	Nunia Thomas, Nov 2014	Female	Fijian	SERA (Society for Ecological Restoration, Australasia) conference	, Annex 27
Community conservation areas in Fiji: 2 case studies and lessons learnt	Workshop	Nunia Thomas, Dec 2014	Female	Fijian	Protected Area Committee, Fiji	Annex 26
Realising Fiji's dream: Working towards Sustainable Forest Management for People for Nature, forever: Framework for PFE Establishment	DoF meeting; presentation	Nunia Thomas, 2014	Female	Fijian	Department of Forestry.	Annex 25
Delivering sustainable forest management for Fiji's people and biodiversity: Saving the Fiji Sago Palm and authentic Fijian bures with Culanuku village, Serua	Pamphlet (draft)	NFMV	Female	Fijian	NFMV	Annex 18.2
National Forest Harvesting Monitoring 2 nd Round 2014	Forestry Report	Monitoring, Control & Surveillance Unit, DoF	?	Fijian	Department of Forestry	Annex 22
Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice – Translated into iTaukei Fijian	Forestry Report	Forestry Training Centre	?	Fijian	Department of Forestry	Annex 10

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

Annex 4	Forestry Steering Committee invitation to NFMV
Annex 5	Community support letters
Annex 6	Draft example TESSA reports
Annex 7	List of publications/presentations
Annex 8	Draft example SES reports
Annex 9	List of other potential PFE sites
Annex 10	Translated Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting
Annex 11	Nadogo trial of translated Code
Annex 12	Enumerator training
Annex 13	Summary of alternative livelihoods identified by communities
Annex 14	Feedback forms on training
Annex 15	Draft PFE framework
Annex 16	Survey questionnaire
Annex 17	List of environment committees of NFMV
Annex 18	Alternative livelihood pamphlets
Annex 19	Example NFMV planning and evaluation sessions
Annex 20	NFMV and FTC agreement for Code translation
Annex 21	Minutes of Steering Committee meeting March 2015 (not yet available)
Annex 22	Second national Monitoring Report 2014
Annex 23	PFE consultation invitation
Annex 24	A Guide to Monitoring IBAs in Fiji.
Annex 25	Presentation PFE stakeholders meeting
Annex 26	CCA case study presentation
Annex 27	SERA conference presentation

Checklist for submission

	Check
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk putting the project number in the Subject line.	Yes
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	
Have you included means of verification? You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	No, in Dropbox
Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report? If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	No
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	Yes
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	Yes
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	