



Darwin Initiative Final Report

To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders (<http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/resources/>) it is expected that this report will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)

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 Institution(s)	NatureFiji-MareqetiViti
Darwin Grant Value	£309,407
Funder (DFID/Defra)	DFID
Start/End dates of Project	April 2013-March 2016
Project Leader Name	Dr Mark O'Brien
Project Website	
Report Author(s) and date	Mark O'Brien, Nunia Thomas, Clare Morrison 14 th October, 2016

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 these 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 away 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 (DoF) 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 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 Achievements

2.1 Outcome (from Logframe in Annex 1)

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 measureable improvements in the sustainability of livelihoods for participating forest-owning *mataqali* from the harvesting of forest products, coupled with reduced pressure on the forest ecosystems. These outcomes will be sustained through the development and of training and support.

Indicator 1.1: Minimum total areas of 26,000 ha designated as PA or SMF under PFE by Year 3

The project did not achieve formal designation of the proposed forest sites as PFEs (either Protected Areas or Sustainably Managed Forests) as the PFE entity was not formalised by Government by the end of the project. At the beginning of the project the PFE concept was being discussed by Government and relevant stakeholders with a view to formalise it in 2014. We did not anticipate such a lengthy delay in the formalisation process and subsequently did not include it as one of the important assumptions at the beginning of this project.

Despite this setback, this project sets up the mechanism to achieve formal PFE designation, which will be delivered in collaboration with other stakeholders. We have continued to collect all relevant data, liaise with local communities and other key stakeholders, train local communities and forest wardens, conduct community and stakeholder awareness workshops, and help develop sustainable alternative livelihood projects and management plans (supporting details contained in a number of Annexes that will be specifically referred to in the relevant sections below). As a result, the 11 pilot sites covering ~32,000 ha and ~83,000 ha (from other sites –

see Annex 7) are currently sustainably managed by communities, have management plans in place and will automatically contribute to the national PFE once it is formally established by Government.

While the PFE Framework is yet to be formalised, the Fiji Forestry Bill 2016 continues to promote sustainable forestry management and advocate for the establishment and protection of nature reserves for the permanent preservation of the environment, including flora, fauna, soil and water (Annex 8).

Indicator 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 the PFE by 50 *mataqali*

We increased the awareness and understanding of sustainable forest management by local *mataqali* through targeted community awareness workshops and fieldtrips on resource mapping, ecosystem services and socio-economic assessments. At the end of the project, these workshops had been presented to more than 140 *mataqali* at 19 sites, on eight islands (Annex 9). As a result of the increased community awareness of the ecological, socio-economic and cultural value of Fiji's forests, many communities informally expressed interest in being involved or wanting more information on the PFE concept.

Indicator 2.1: Household income increases by ~15% in at least 25 households in 8 communities through adoption of alternative livelihoods

At the beginning of this project we planned to monitor income increases for individual households based on alternative livelihoods. In 2016, seven of the 11 pilot sites were revisited, and five households per site were interviewed to assess progress in livelihoods. (We did not resurvey the households and communities on Taveuni due to the severe impacts of Cyclone Winston, a category 5 cyclone that hit Fiji on February 20, 2016.) Household income in the 35 sampled households increased by an average of 9% between 2014 and 2016 (Annex 10). This increase was offset by the increase in population within the households (i.e. per capita income decreased).

Based on these results and other observations, we feel that monitoring community livelihoods as well as individual households will provide a better understanding of the success of these livelihoods. Livelihoods need to be promoted to communities rather than individuals but, as seen in this project and others, successful livelihoods are almost always championed by individuals.

Community members associated with some of these alternative livelihoods understood that the livelihood benefits they would receive would be generated in the medium-long term (5-20 years) rather than the short-term (project length) – activities now would benefit their children (Annex 11 and 12).

The ability of several communities to generate increased household income in this project was severely impacted by Cyclone Winston which caused widespread damage through large areas of Fiji. While some of the communities managed to avoid significant damage, alternative livelihoods based on ecotourism were severely impacted by reduced visitor numbers immediately after the cyclone.

Indicator 2.2: Increased participation of 30 *mataqali* 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

The project trialled community participation in the collection of data on land use, socioeconomic and livelihood information for the *mataqali* in 11 communities in preparation for the zoning exercise that will now form the basis of the PFE. These communities wanted to participate in the zoning of their land and make informed decisions as members of the PFE Framework Working Group. This zoning exercise was conducted as part of the implementation of the

alternative livelihoods projects during site visits in the fourth quarter of 2016 (although Cyclone Winston meant that this exercise could not be completed in Taveuni).

Indicator 2.3: Survey of 30 *mataqali* feel their voice is being heard and their participation in PFE brings positive benefits to their communities by Year 3

Baseline information for this component was collected through the use of anonymous feedback forms distributed to individuals attending the workshop sessions of the SES. These forms captured the feelings that individuals had at the beginning of the project in relation to sustainable forest management and the benefits for their community. Eleven communities were resurveyed at the end of Year 3 to determine whether participation in the PFE had brought positive benefits to their communities. These benefits were related to whether communities felt (i) that their voice was being heard in relation to forest conservation and management, (ii) their participation in PFE had brought positive benefits to the community, and (iii) that participation in PFE had increased their awareness and knowledge of conservation and sustainable forest management. The post-project surveys found that 65-93% of individuals in the different communities felt that the project had brought positive benefits to their communities while 60-97% demonstrated improved knowledge and awareness of conservation and sustainable forest management (Annex 13 and 14).

Indicator 2.4: Novel requests for assistance to develop alternative livelihoods from 100 households not already engaged in pilots by Year 3

As part of this project we produced several videos and case study fact sheets of local communities discussing the alternative livelihood projects that they had set-up and how they had benefitted from them. We disseminated these videos and fact sheets to other organisations and local communities. As a result, we have received novel requests for assistance in developing alternative livelihoods or help strengthening their existing livelihoods from 18 communities (~ 230 households, Annex 15). Most of these requests have come during community participation in workshops relating to this project and relate mainly to poultry, plant nurseries and ecotourism (Annex 15).

We have received requests from other organisations, such as the REDD+ Committee, WWF, WCS, CI, who themselves have received requests from communities, to help with alternative livelihood activities for their projects. This project can also be seen as a precursor to a significant public campaign (WAKATU) funded by FAO, supported by DOF, Department of Agriculture and Department of iTaukei Affairs, and orchestrated by CChange (a newly formed local body of Seaweb). The WAKATU campaign has an agro-centric focus and highlights farmers who have been practicing sustainable agriculture for other farmers to learn from – similar to this project's alternative livelihoods and site exchange concept of peer-to-peer learning. NFMV and Birdlife provided valuable advice on how best to deliver results through the campaign.

Indicator 3.1: Ecosystem services in PFE area show no net loss in forest carbon storage

No net loss in forest carbon storage was observed in any community designated PA in the pilot sites as no forests were harvested throughout the duration of this project nor were any of them significantly impacted by Cyclone Winston in February 2016 (see report Annex 16 as an example).

Indicator 3.2: Ecosystem services in PFE show no net loss in water services

Water quantity is not an issue in pilot sites (with > 3000 mm rain per annum) and has not been affected by land-use at any of the sites. Around 50% of households obtained untreated water via a piped system from a local source, either a spring or a dammed stream. Two communities received their water supply from the Water Authority of Fiji, and the remaining communities via a water tank (14%), a borehole (8%) or directly from a stream or river (5%). Water quality can be a potential issue in sites using untreated water. We have undertaken training workshops at

our sites in Taveuni with an external consultant to train NFMV staff, and communities to identify key aquatic fauna sensitive to various pollutants (Annex 17 and 18). To date no water quality issues have been detected in any of the sites monitored.

Indicator 3.3: Ecosystem services in PFE area show no net loss in key forest bird indicator species

Surveys at the beginning and the end of this project showed no net loss in key forest bird indicator species in the pilot sites (Annex 19).

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

The original goal/impact of this project was 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 (see Annex 1).

This project focussed on establishing the enabling conditions for communities and stakeholders (policy, guidelines, capacity) to achieve long term sustainable impacts in relation to forest protection and management. These activities were crucial for the sustainability of the project and its ability to have positive impacts on biodiversity as well as poverty alleviation through community empowerment.

The beneficiaries of this project were the local land-owning communities who became involved by designating their land as informal PFE. In addition to economic benefits through the development of sustainable alternative livelihoods, these communities benefited through maintenance of 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 had impacts on the economic dimension of poverty, e.g. by developing and implementing feasible alternative livelihood plans for Culanuku and Lavena Village), that were obvious over the short term (Annex 20). This project has also inspired and helped other communities to sustainably use their natural resources and implement activities that will provide benefits over the longer term (5-20 years) (Annex 11 and 12). Poverty alleviation is not just about making money, it is also about empowering communities with the capacity to make informed independent decisions about their resource use. As a result, this project has not just supported community interest in alternative livelihoods, it has also attempted to develop feasible resource plans for different communities that realistically address community expectations and the ability of their environment to support these plans.

In many Fijian communities, traditional cultural governance structures are male-oriented and the role of women and youths in community governance and decision-making (and the subsequent sharing of economic benefits) is often limited. In this project, NFMV ensured that women and youths were involved in the site engagement workshops, mapping of the governance structure, and decision-making. 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. The results demonstrated differences in the knowledge of men and women in relation to land use and the community decision-making processes. By taking this approach, NFMV captured women's knowledge in relation to forestry policy, state of natural resources, alternative livelihoods, access to assistance/ markets and lessons learnt from other sites. Using this information NFMV has started and will continue to identify and facilitate avenues through which women can influence decision-making by the community as a whole. In addition, this project 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).

2.3 Outputs

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

Output 1 focused 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*. 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. The final indicator demonstrating that the multidimensional values of Fiji's forests are understood by local *mataqali* is the number of *mataqali* who formally express interest in the PFE process on their land.

NFMV conducted workshops and presentations on the PFE and sustainable forest management to more than 140 *mataqali* on eight islands during the project. At the end of the project at least 50 *mataqali* understood the benefits of sustainable forest management based on interviews done before and after community involvement in the project. Their understanding was also demonstrated through their strong participation and involvement in mapping land use, identifying alternative income activities and developing feasible marketing plans after awareness and training exercises. More than 20 foresters were involved in this project through translation of the Fiji Forestry Code of Practice and training workshops on biodiversity surveys. Post-translation workshop surveys and interviews with the foresters demonstrated the importance of these workshops and training for improving forester's knowledge and skills in relation to sustainable forest management (Annex 21 and 22).

Throughout this project NFMV has presented workshops and seminars on sustainable forest management and the PFE consultation framework to a range of stakeholders in the timber industry, e.g. 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, and the Fiji National University, and other organisations involved in policy-making. As a result of this awareness raising, NFMV have been invited to advise or sit on the management committee of a number of organisations relating to sustainable management, development and conservation (Annex 23). Most recently, both NFMV and BirdLife were invited to be key stakeholders in a program analysing bio-financing mechanisms for Fiji (BIOFIN, see Annex 24). This project examines and analyses government investment in biodiversity and identifies strategies to improve national accounting and increase investment in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

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

As previously mentioned, no sites have been formally designated as PFE due to delays in the formalisation of the PFE process. Despite this official setback, we have 11 pilot sites for PFE establishment (~32,000 ha total) with relevant socio-economic data, ecosystem services data and resource and governance mapping (Annex 7). The local communities are able to monitor logging on their land through their training and understanding of the Forest Code of Harvesting Practice which was translated into the Itaukei language in 2014. Thirty-four community reps are currently being formally trained to become certified Forest Wardens by the Forestry Training Centre (Annex 25 and 26). These community reps will be able to effectively monitor logging activities on their land and report breaches to the DoF or Provincial Offices.

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

The project addressed 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 palm harvest, agriculture); and (iii) reviving traditional resources (e.g. kuta/reed management for mats, palm-thatching, 'masi'/ tapa for cloth, pandanus for

mats). A range of challenges faced local communities in establishing viable alternative livelihoods (e.g. lack of 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 took lessons learnt from sites where livelihoods had been successfully established, including the Natewa/Tunuloa Community Conserved Area. In this site the establishment of tree nurseries, bee keeping and bakeries has been successful and the revival of traditional handicrafts and pineapple and taro plantations using sustainable agricultural methods have been trialled. Many of the livelihood options proposed and initiated helped convince the communities to commit to protecting their forest resources.

In seven sites, communities with more established alternative income activities demonstrated average increases in household income of 9% (Annex 10). Data for other communities were not available or the community alternative income activities had been severely impacted by Cyclone Winston in February 2016 which made it impossible to evaluate any increases in household income.

Detailed assessments of ecosystem services (water, carbon storage) and biodiversity (bird encounter rates) in the pilot sites at the beginning and end of this project demonstrated no net loss in any category as no forests were logged or cleared in any of the pilot sites during this project (Annex 19). These results demonstrate that despite the delay in officially designating the pilot sites as PFE, the communities were committed to protecting their forest resources.

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

Forty-two CCLN members (35 male, 7 female) have participated in site and knowledge-exchange programs as part of this project (Annex 27). A number of these CCLN members have attended and presented at key decision-making forums. CCLN rep Sipiriano Qeteqete (from Lavena) leads on the Ecotourism committee at Navakawau and presents at Tikina meetings. CCLN rep Petero Qaloibau (Naqaravutu) is the co-ordinator of the COMDEKS GEF programme. He liaises with stakeholders regarding encroachment issues and conservation/livelihood projects for the district of Natewa/Tunuloa. He has also represented indigenous communities at international meetings in Samoa, Cook Islands and New Zealand. CCLN rep Tevita Seru (Navukailagi) has represented the community at Tikina and Provincial meetings, communicating on governance and protected areas. CCLN rep Poasa Qalo (Nukuloa Village) presents conservation projects at Tikina meetings on Gau. CCLN rep Joeli Maliki (Yanuya Village) presents conservation projects at Tikina meetings in Nadroga. CCLN rep Meli Naisele (Vatu-i-Ra) showcased sandalwood livelihood opportunities at Natewa/Tunuloa.

In Year 3 a number of videos and case studies were developed for alternative livelihood projects to allow local communities involved in PFE to actively share their project experiences and ideas with other local communities, Site Support Groups (SSGs) within Fiji, and SSGs across the BirdLife Global network (e.g. Annex 28 and 29). These videos provide information to other communities about livelihood options under the PFE approach. NFMV and BirdLife presented these case studies and videos from other parts of the BirdLife network (e.g. Africa, other Pacific countries) to local Fiji communities to highlight similar issues and solutions. NFMV and BirdLife also presented some of these case studies at international workshops and conferences highlighting the importance and success of these activities for sustainable forest conservation and management to a larger audience (Annex 30).

Biodiversity site monitoring data have been used to report against the performance of national (NBSAP) and global policies (CBD 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets) through reports to the Protected Areas Committee (Annex 31). All bird monitoring data has also been included in the BirdLife Global World Bird/Biodiversity Database, and is available through GBIF and Avian Knowledge Network (and can be viewed on eBird).

3 Project Partnerships

Birdlife International (BLI) was 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 BLI 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)**

Birdlife International continue to work closely with NFMV on this PFE project and other conservation related projects in Fiji. The BirdLife approach is to enable NFMV as the lead NGO organisation on Forest Conservation within Fiji.

The Department of Forestry (DoF) was the main government partner and was the lead agency ensuring that the project results were communicated to other government agencies. The Fiji Forest Policy Statement (2007) is administered by the DoF and this project delivered 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 DoF, in recognition of the key contribution that this project made towards their Corporate Plan and the delivery of the Fiji Forest Policy included NFMV as an advisor on its technical committees to mobilise the delivery of some of the project outputs.

During this project the DoF became significantly involved with the training and translation activities required to promote the PFE to local land owning communities and train government and local forest wardens through its Forestry Training Centre (FTC). DoF is one of the key stakeholders involved with the sustainability of this project and will continue with the PFE process, in consultation with BLI and NFMV, as well as take primary responsibility for local community forest warden training and certification through the FTC.

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 in any project 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 this project.

The Provincial Offices are the most important stakeholders in relation to the sustainability of the project within local communities. During the project the conservation officers from each of the four provinces involved were trained in socio-economic survey techniques and data collection. These officers will collect socio-economic data from other interested communities within their provinces after the end of the current project thereby contributing to long term sustainability and expansion of the PFE concept within Fiji. By developing the capacity of the Provincial Council to collect and analyse their own data, this project has enabled them to be more involved and make more strategic decisions of their own.

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 Darwin project progress is key to understanding how Protected Areas fit into the sustainable use of Fiji's remaining native forests. The Protected Areas Committee ensures that Fiji's High Conservation Value Forests remain protected, and that threats or proposals that threaten the continued existence of these forests are addressed effectively with scientific rigor. The Committee has in the recent years had to justify the protection of sites and the rejection of development plans that threaten the continued existence of these areas. We foresee that these threats will remain and as long as the Protected Areas Committee is advised of projects and

the situation on the ground, they can remain a strong voice and influence for the maintenance of Fiji's biodiversity hotspots.

4 Contribution to Darwin Initiative Programme Outputs

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

This project contributed 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...” Fiji's current terrestrial protected areas cover 4.33% of the total land area (~79,100 ha). While not formally protected under the PFE, this project obtained local and Government support for protected forest areas (to enter the PFE when formalised) totalling 115,000 ha (Annex 7) which will increase the area of protected land in Fiji by 6.5% (taking total to ~10%).

It also addressed 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 DoF can work with communities to develop the sustainable forest management programme and increased rural livelihoods as described in the Fiji Forest Policy (2007).

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 23). This project focused on data collection to provide NFMV and Birdlife with the evidence required to share information and site monitoring data with these various committees and convention focal points and report against CBD NBSAP, CBD Aichi targets, and CITES obligations.

4.2 Project support to poverty alleviation

4.2.1 Programme indicators

- Did the project lead to greater representation of local poor in management structures of biodiversity?

In Fiji, local *mataqali* are currently responsible for the management of the forests on their land. In most communities, men dominate the discussions and management of land-use on behalf of the community due to the traditional community structure. This project provided an opportunity for women and youth to be involved and participate in discussions about land use and resource management. In some communities (e.g. Culunuku) the whole community is involved in the management of biodiversity. While this project has improved the chances for women and youth to have a say in management of local resources, it is too early to determine what actual impact this has had overall.

- Were any management plans for biodiversity developed?

Several management plans for threatened species (e.g. Fiji *Acmopyle* Species Recovery Plan), invasive species (e.g. Mongoose Incursion Management Plan) and community protected areas (e.g. Delaisavu Protected Area Management Plan) (see Annex 3) were developed as part of this project in conjunction with NGOs, local communities and government departments.

- Were these formally accepted?

The Fiji *Acmopyle* Species Recovery Plan has been formalised and is waiting for endorsement by the Department of Environment. All other plans are in draft form waiting for formal acceptance – verification processes that will occur after the end of this project.

- Were they participatory in nature or were they ‘top-down’? How well represented are the local poor and women, in any proposed management structures?

All management plans developed through this project were participatory in nature. The level of involvement of women depended on the nature of the plan. Some plans, for example the new

Sago Palm Action Plan, relied on the involvement of women from the local communities as they were heavily involved in the use of Sago Palm for thatching. Women were less interested and subsequently, less involved in the plans related to invasive species. This project endeavoured to interest more women in the management plan preparation by including discussions on these topics in workshops relating to alternative livelihoods which were well attended by women.

- Were there any positive gains in HH income as a result of this project?

In the communities where we were able to collect before and after household income data, there were positive gains in HH income as a result of the alternative livelihood activities established and/or supported by this project.

- How many HH saw an increase in their HH income?

Of the 35 households surveyed, all reported an increase in HH income in as a result of the alternative livelihood activities established and/or supported by this project. Other households/communities could not be surveyed or were not surveyed (inappropriate/distressing in wake of severe damage) in the aftermath of Cyclone Winston in February, 2016.

- How much did their HH income increase (e.g. x% above baseline, x% above national average)? How was this measured?

The average increase in the HH income for the households surveyed was 9% above the baseline at the beginning of the project (Annex 10). Pre-project surveys collected data on monthly HH earning which were extrapolated to annual earnings. Resurveys collected the same type of data for comparisons with baseline data. All income was reported verbally by each HH.

4.3 Transfer of knowledge

One male Fijian student is currently working on his Masters thesis looking at bird diversity in urban forest areas and was trained by BLI staff involved in this project. Field training in bird survey techniques for this student took place in several of the pilot sites.

The transfer of knowledge in relation to sustainable forest use and management by local land-owning communities, supported by NGOs and the Fiji Government occurred through several forms (Annex 3). These included (i) community workshops on conservation, alternative income-generating activities, resource mapping, and importance of sustainable forest management; (ii) field-based training in survey methods for biodiversity monitoring, water quality monitoring, and invasive species management, and (iii) training in methods for socio-economic data collection, website management, financial administration and leadership. This information was disseminated to local land-owning communities, Provincial Environmental Officers, Forest Wardens and Beat Officers, undergraduate students, local business owners, staff from other NGOs and the general public. Most of the knowledge was transferred through workshops (verbal and/or hands-on form), local or national platforms (written reports, print media), and international platforms through conference presentations and/or written reports.

By transferring the information to local communities and the general public, this project has raised awareness and engendered support for sustainable forest management at the grassroots level. Involving local undergraduate students enrolled in Conservation/Biology degrees at the University of the South Pacific enables students to obtain valuable practical experience in dealing with conservation issues at a range of levels from grassroots to policy making. Sharing knowledge with the Department of Forestry has allowed the DOF to become more involved in the project – particularly in relation to translation of the Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice into Fijian and the subsequent training of local representatives as forest monitors. The improved knowledge of DOF resulting from their involvement in this project has highlighted the importance of the PFE framework and the role of the DOF in its eventual implementation (Annex 32). Information has also been transferred through sharing data and lessons learned from this Darwin project with other conservation organisations working on similar projects in Fiji and the region (Annex 33)

4.4 Capacity building

- i. Did any staff from developing country partners see an increase in their status nationally, regionally or internationally? For example, have they been invited to participate in any national expert committees, expert panels, have they had a promotion at work?

Several female staff members from NFMV have seen an increase in their status on many levels (national to international) as a result of their involvement in this project. These staff have been invited to participate in a number of national expert committees, expert panels, international workshops and conferences (Annex 30). They have also been invited to train staff from other NGOs, government departments and local businesses in socio-economic survey methods and TESSA methodology.

The data collected in this project has improved individual and organisational capacity, facilitated training and human resources development, and increased collaboration between organisations involved in forest management and biodiversity conservation. This has led to (i) increased capacity for biodiversity work at the individual (NFMV staff member) and institutional level (Government Departments) within Fiji, (ii) increased capacity and support for Fiji to implement several national and international Conventions relating to biodiversity (e.g. CBD, NBSAP, CITES), and (iii) increased awareness and subsequent support for biodiversity conservation and sustainable management by a range of national policy-makers.

As mentioned previously, staff involved in this project (NFMV and other organisations) have greatly increased their skills and knowledge in relation to the application of sustainable forest management within the rural community setting. Staff are currently applying this knowledge to a range of species-focussed projects which enables them to better implement effective conservation outcomes (Annex 34). The increased knowledge, skills and experience of the staff members involved in this project has led to their nomination for a number of Government-led committees (Annex 23), allowing better dissemination of knowledge and improved ability to implement national and international conventions. This project has directly led to the identification of potential PFE sites that will enable Fiji to increase its contribution to Aichi Target 11 by 6.5% under the 'Other Effective Conservation Measures' category once the PFE Framework is formalised. In addition, this will bring Fiji much closer to meeting its obligations under the CBD Aichi Biodiversity Target 7 related to extending the occurrence of sustainable Forestry practices.

4.5 Sustainability and Legacy

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 easy to understand and implement for all parties beyond the life of the project. Despite the PFE Framework not being finalised during this project, community and other stakeholder support remains high for sustainable forest management as a whole. The local communities in the pilot sites will continue to protect their forests and develop alternative livelihoods in collaboration and with the support of the key project stakeholders.

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 DoF 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 during this project.
 - 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 35). In 2015-2016,

education and awareness of the Code has been led by the FTC with the first 34 community reps officially certified as Forest Wardens expected in August/September 2016.

- 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 36, 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 37). NFMV presented at this meeting as the only stakeholder actively engaged in implementing this crucial component of the Fiji Forest Policy (2007). The DoF has since led 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). Although these Conservation Officer posts were not in place at the outset of the project, all four conservation officers were engaged in the project 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.

As the PFE program is a DoF initiative, post-project the DoF 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 DoF 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.

Project staff will continue to be involved in the PFE process and will liaise with DoF who will take over primary responsibility for the project. Some of the PFE sites (Culanuku, Taveuni (4 sites), Natewa (3 villages), Wainawa village, Nabukelevu village) are involved in other projects run by BLI and NFMV in relation to forest management and sustainable livelihoods and will

continue to be monitored on a semi-regular basis over the next 10 years and for as long as funding permits.

Resources developed for the promotion of the PFE concept (brochures, posters, translated Fiji Forest Code of Practice) and alternative livelihoods will continue to be used by NFMV, BLI and DoF to promote sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity conservation for long-term poverty alleviation in forest communities; and as a guide on how to engage communities in conservation objectives.

5 Lessons learned

We learned two main lessons during this project relating to expertise needed: (i) consider and utilise the expertise available in partners and (ii) the importance of a specific project manager.

(i) Initially our team had planned to translate the Fiji Forestry Code of Practice in consultation with other stakeholders. After discussions with the DoF and after difficulties we had explaining some of the technical terms to local communities during the awareness phase, we engaged the Forestry Training Centre to run the translation process with local community members and forestry officers from other parts of Fiji (Annex 38). 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.

(ii) The micromanagement involved in the project proved to be more time consuming than anticipated. A project coordinator overseeing the project to ensure that all staff better understand their contribution to the overall project, and to better communicate project outcomes both within and outside the organisation is important. We will ensure that similar projects with multiple components and many stakeholders will also employ a coordinator specifically to run the project and to ensure effective communication or reporting of all project components.

5.1 Monitoring and evaluation

Using logframes provided a practical and useful way for the project team, partners and stakeholders to monitor progress of the project. The contribution of the outputs and activities towards the outcomes were clearly demonstrated through the use of appropriate indicators in the logframes. In some cases, the indicators were 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 were easily measured and assessed and were directly linked to outputs. Qualitative indicators were 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 ensured that there was a mix of methodology/indicators used for each output and a range of source material/evidence to support the achievement of outputs.

An internal evaluation at the end of Year 2 indicated that the project was running behind schedule due to problems with team member responsibility for different activities, reporting issues and time constraints resulting from staff involvement in multiple projects and the death of a key team member. The evaluation resulted in the hiring of a project manager to oversee activities and complete reporting tasks, and clarification of the roles of each team member and their associated activities and responsibilities.

5.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

The main issue in the reviews of the annual reports was that we had focused too much on activities in the annual report at the end of Year 1 and not on the indicators and outputs. We rectified this in the annual report in Year 2. None of the feedback we received focused on ways or suggestions to improve the project itself.

6 Darwin identity

The project team has ensured that all communication on the project refers to the Darwin Initiative. We have presented aspects of this project at almost 50 international conferences, local community workshops, and national workshops (Annex 31). There have also been a number of reports and publications produced that acknowledge the Darwin Initiative and highlight its support (Annex 3 and 5). In some cases, the Darwin Initiative support was recognised as a distinct project and in others it formed part of a larger programme.

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.

There is a dedicated website associated with NFMV which provides updates on the project, communities involved, stakeholders and the role of the Darwin Initiative (<https://naturefiji.org/project/delivering-sustainable-forest-management-fijis-people-wildlife/>). These include videos, photos and stories from the field. Website updates are automatically linked to FB and Twitter.

7 Finance and administration

7.1 Project expenditure

Project spend (indicative) since last annual report	2015/16 Grant (£)	2015/16 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)			96%	
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs			116%	Includes £1,500 for audit.
Travel and subsistence			85%	We had anticipated traveling to Taveuni and spending a week completing end of project questionnaires in March 2016. However, Cyclone Winston meant that all non-essential liaison with communities was inappropriate – and so we were unable to complete this during the period of the project.
Operating Costs			132%	
Capital items (see below)			-	Main expense here was expected to be a powerpoint projector screen and generator to take presentations to communities. In practice the project worked closely with Fiji Government Forest Department training centre who provided this equipment gratis.
Others (see below)			102%	
TOTAL				
Staff employed (Name and position)				Cost (£)

Nunia Thomas (Supervisor/Project Manager, NFMV)	
Elenoa Seniloli (Forester, NFMV)	
Reena Fiu (Office Administrator/Finance, NFMV)	
Mark O'Brien (Project leader, BL)	
Jenny Birch (Ecosystem Services Support, BL)	
David Thomas (Community and Livelihood Support, BL)	
Mere Ledua (Finance Officer, BL)	
Don Stewart (Director, BL)	
Nick Askew (Comms, BL)	
Alessandra Capelli (Assistant Finance Manager, BL)	
Kelera Macedru (Field Assistant, NFMV)	
Melania Segaidina (Forester, NFMV)	
Seriana Maramayawa (Field Assistant, NFMV)	
Anna Sahai (Field Assistant, NFMV)	
Clare Morrison (Project Manager, NFMV)	
Kolinio Moce (Forester, NFMV)	
TOTAL	

Capital items – description	Capital items – cost (£)
Hawke Laser Range Finder Chairs Torch Headlights *2 Tents *2 Bondwell Computer Laptop 1 * Office Fan Bondwell Computer Hard Drive Laptop Updates Microsoft Office 2013 1 * Regulator Repairs to Tents and Awnings Powerpoint Projector Tree Tugs Laser Range Finder with GPS	
TOTAL	

Other items – description	Other items – cost (£)
Re-print of Booklets Telephone Bills Website and Internet Translation Costs Material Printing Reporting Production Material for Livelihood Activities Office Costs	
TOTAL	

7.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Source of funding for project lifetime	Total (£)
Save Our Species- Conservation of the Fiji Acropyle - A forgotten national icon (FJD 94,520)	
Arcadia - Organisational Development Fund Phase II (FJD 74,160)	
Aage V. Jensen Charity Foundation - Realising Fiji's Dream: working towards sustainable forest management for people, for nature, forever (EUR 149,987)	
Aage V. Jensen Charity Foundation - Saving Paradise – Protecting Pacific Island Forests by Empowering Community Action (FJD 87,591)	
The David & Lucille Packard Foundation through BirdLife International- Restoration of Important Pacific Seabird Island Phase 3 (FJD 12,000)	
Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund - Managing Invasive Species at key biodiversity areas in Palau and Fiji (FJD 12,000)	
EU - BirdLife Pacific Invasive Species Programme - Fiji component (FJD 84,015)	
GEF Small Grants - Saving Globally threatened birds at Fiji's Mount Nabukelevu IBA through Community based reforestation and sustainable land management approach (USD 47,230)	
BirdLife International Community Conservation Fund - Saving Globally-threatened birds at Fiji's Mount Nabukelevu IBA through Community based reforestation and sustainable land management approach (USD 16,826)	
Birdlife International – GEF - COMDEKS - Satoyama Initiative. Sustainable land use in Natewa/Tunuloa (FJD 6,000)	
TOTAL	

Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime	Total (£)
GEF 5 STAR Ridge to Reef Project. Implementing a “Ridge to Reef” approach to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Sequester Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Fiji. This fund has been accepted and agreed – but BL/NFMV are still in negotiation about the precise cost of the actions. The amount presented here is the figure in the proposal to GEF (NFMV/BL amount = ca. USD 639,221 of USD 7 million in total)	
FAO. Action against Desertification Grant. (ca.USD 150,000 for NFMV out of USD 2 million) – LOA currently in preparation.	
REDD+ Capacity Development for in-country CSO Platform (ca. USD 30,000 grants available)	
TOTAL	

7.3 Value for Money

Throughout the project we have endeavoured to work closely with other organisations to ensure that the best, most favourable, outcome can be achieved, and that the outcome is most likely to continue into the long term.

For example, we developed a close working relationship with the Forestry Training Centre. This provided the most comprehensive approach to delivering the requirements of the Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice (Annex 39), by ensuring that we worked the most experienced/qualified staff from the industry to ensure that both the translation of the Code, and its practical implementation was undertaken to the highest standards and from within the Forest Industry. While the cost of the process was, inevitably, more than if we had undertaken the translation ourselves, the buy-in by the industry, and subsequent ownership of the product means that we are more confident that the Code will be taken up as standard by the Forest Industry.

Much of the Ecosystem Services Site Assessment programme was undertaken by local community members, following training undertaken by project staff. This enabled us to obtain information from a greater number of communities and more households per community than if we had undertaken the surveys ourselves. More importantly however, it provided the local community the opportunity to better understand the situation in their own communities. We did not need to present many of the findings from the surveys to the communities – they had already identified many of the issues as they collected the data. By identifying the problems, themselves communities were more ready to propose and trial solutions to their issues. This became clear from the results of the end of project findings – many communities had embarked upon a range of livelihood options to improve their status, even with little or no support from NFMV or other outside stakeholders.

We accepted a position on the REDD+ Steering Committee, rather than establishing our own, project-focussed, Steering Committee. This caused some issues at the outset, as we attempted to establish the necessity for the concept of Permanent Forest Estates to an audience more focussed on the one aspect, the REDD+ component of PFEs. Our perseverance on the committee is now paying off and we are seen by the forest industry as champions of two key aspects of the REDD+ concept –the consideration of biodiversity and the need to establish a viable Civil Society Partnership. This latter area is now accepted as the main requirement for the REDD+ process to progress to the next step and NFMV are at the forefront of developing the CSO Platform within Fiji. This addresses Indicator 4.2.1, in that it provides a method for local representatives to get their voice heard within the REDD+ process.

The Fiji Government (through the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, the Ministry of Fisheries and Forests, and the Ministry of Agriculture), as part of the awareness-raising required to address land use issues, commissioned SeaWeb (now cChange) to undertake a campaign to highlight the importance and value of land in Fiji. Both NFMV and BirdLife discussed opportunities for this campaign, championed the concept of valuing the land and highlighted communities that provided positive examples to showcase. Wakatu Fiji (discussed earlier) was launched in June 2016 with the strapline ‘Grow the Fiji we Deserve’ with support not just from the above ministries, but NGOs and CSOs, the church and community leaders. The campaign is targeted firmly at the people who own, and utilise the rural resources (<https://www.facebook.com/WakatuFiji/>).

“Too often, when we talk about environmental issues, we talk only about science, the technical aspects of why our resources are declining. This campaign is going to shift the conversation back to the people who depend on the resources. So, people understand this campaign is not about protecting the environment – it’s about supporting our people.”
(Wakatu Fiji 2016).

We see this campaign as providing a strong conduit for local communities to contribute to the discussion about rural land use in general, and native forest management in particular. NFMV would not have been able to access the communities as effectively as this campaign – and we see that by aligning with the campaign we achieve considerable value added benefits – as well as an assured long term future through the ownership shown by the government ministries.

Annex 1 Project's logframe, including indicators, means of verification and assumptions.

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>1.1 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>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</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>1.2.1 PFE Register</p> <p>1.2.2 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</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>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>3.3 Ecosystem services in PFE areas show no net loss in key forest bird indicator species</p>	<p>livelihoods</p> <p>3.1.1 Final ecosystem services reports</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-maker 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</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</p>	<p>2a. Published Framework for Establishment of PFE.</p> <p>2a. Project reports detailing results of</p>	

<p>activities on their land.</p>	<p>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 accordance with Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting by end of project.</p>	<p>implementation of framework at trial sites.</p> <p>2b. Permanent Forest Estates register held by Fiji's Department of Forestry.</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>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</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>	

	baseline established in first half of year 1		
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>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>	<p>4a. Number and geographic distribution of active users of Community Conservation and Livelihoods Network (CCLN) as recorded by Google Analytics 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>			

- 2.7 Develop and test training module for forest-owning *mataqali* in skills for implementing Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting.
- 2.8 Develop communication systems to enable *mataqali* to report incidents of unsustainable logging to Department of Forests, and monitor report submissions.
- 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.
- 3.2 Implement selected livelihood activities at project sites.
- 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.

Annex 2 Report of progress and achievements against final project logframe for the life of the project

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements in the last Financial Year 2015-2016	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Goal/Impact:</p> <p>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 local communities.</p>			Do not fill not applicable
<p>Purpose/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>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</p>	<p>1.1 To date no sites have been formally designated as PFE as the PFE Framework is yet to be formally accepted by Fiji Government. Communities in 11 pilot sites (32,000 ha) and other sites (~83,000 ha) are ready for formal designation (Annex 7)</p> <p>1.2 We have presented the PFE and sustainable forest management concepts to more than 140 land-owning <i>mataqali</i>. More than 40 <i>mataqali</i> have requested more information on PFE as a result of this project (Annex 9)</p> <p>2.1 Household income increased by ~9% in seven communities through adoption of alternative livelihoods (Annex 10). The other communities could not be surveyed in the wake of Cyclone Winston in February 2016.</p> <p>2.2. The project trialled community participation in the collection of data on land</p>	Do not fill not applicable

	<p>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 let loss in forest carbon storage</p> <p>3.2 Ecosystem services in PFE areas show no let 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>use, socioeconomic and livelihood information for the <i>mataqali</i> in the 11 pilot communities. These communities want to and will participate in the zoning of their land and make informed decisions as members of the PFE Framework Working Group.</p> <p>2.3 The post-project surveys found 65-93% of individuals in 11 communities felt that the project had brought positive benefits to their communities while 60-97% demonstrated knowledge and awareness of conservation and sustainable forest management (Annex 14).</p> <p>2.4 We have received novel requests for assistance in developing alternative livelihoods or help strengthening existing livelihoods from 18 communities (~ 230 households, Annex 15).</p> <p>3.1 Pre and post-project surveys of ecosystem services in PFE areas show no let loss in forest carbon storage (Annex 16).</p> <p>3.2 Pre and post-project surveys ecosystem services in PFE areas show no let loss in water services (Annex 10)</p> <p>3.3 Pre and post-project surveys ecosystem services in PFE areas show no net loss in key forest bird indicator species (Annex 19)</p>	
<p>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></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</p>	<p>1a, 1b and 1d. We conducted workshops and presentations on the PFE and sustainable forest management to > 140 <i>mataqali</i> on eight islands during the project. At the end of the project at least 50 <i>mataqali</i> understood the benefits of sustainable forest management based on interviews done before and after community involvement in the project. The actual number of <i>mataqali</i> presented to would be >140 as in some cases attendance was recorded at</p>	

<p>thereby benefitting biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>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>the <i>tikina</i> level (higher level than <i>mataqali</i>). We were not able to present to <i>mataqali</i> on many of the smaller islands due to time and financial constraints, but many of these smaller islands do not have significant forest resources threatened by logging. More than 20 foresters were involved in translation of the Fiji Forestry Code of Practice and training workshops on biodiversity surveys. Forester post-translation workshop surveys and interviews demonstrated their understanding of the benefits of sustainable forest management (Annex 21, 22). Many of the <i>mataqalis</i> involved in the community presentations informally expressed interest in the PFE concept and/or wanting more information for community discussions on the issue.</p> <p>1c. NFMV has presented the PFE forest concept to stakeholders in the timber industry including government departments, e.g. 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, and the Fiji National University. As a result of this project NFMV was invited to be a key stakeholder in a program analysing bio-financing mechanisms and policies for Fiji (BIOFIN, see Annex 24). To date it is too early to determine whether other Fijian government department are mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in their decision-making policies as a result of awareness raising by this project.</p>
<p>Activity 1.4 Undertake biodiversity surveys at project sites to establish project baselines and evaluate progress</p>		<p>Baseline surveys were conducted in 2013-2014. Follow-up surveys were completed in seven sites in 2015-2016 (Annex 19)</p>
<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>		<p>The results of ecosystem service valuations have been made to forest owning <i>mataqali</i> primarily through presentations conducted in English and the Fijian at national and international level and through the general media. These include National Itaukei Resource Owners Committee Meetings, REDD+ Committee meetings, and the FBC 'For the Record Show' on the Fiji REDD+ program and Permanent Forest Estates (Annex 30).</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>Promotion of the site monitoring biodiversity data is ongoing. This is done primarily through the Fiji NBSAP Species Working Group, the Protected Areas Committee, Fiji REDD+ Biodiversity Monitoring Working Group and the Forest Harvesting Code of Practice Steering Committee.</p>
<p>Output 2. The first PFE established under Forest Policy (2007), with locally trained <i>mataqali</i> effectively monitoring</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</p>	<p>2a. The PFE Framework is still under discussion and yet to be formalised.</p> <p>2b. No sites have been formally registered as the PFE framework is yet to be finalised. Eleven sites have been identified over the lifetime of this project and</p>

logging activities on their land.	<p>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 accordance with Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting by end of project.</p>	<p>undergone baseline information collation for ecological and socio-economic data (11 sites) with seven sites being resurveyed during 2015-2016 for impacts of forest protection on biodiversity, ecosystem services and forest carbon storage. All sites are waiting for the formalisation of the PFE framework to commence the registration process.</p> <p>2c. Training of community forest wardens is currently being conducted by the Forestry Training Centre (Annex 26). Thirty-four community representatives will be certified by the end of August 2016 (Annex 25). FTC staff have been participating in awareness campaigns for the project, and are undergoing a change in their curriculum to include biodiversity monitoring. This will be an on-going activity.</p>
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 has not been done as we are still waiting for the Framework of the PFE to be formalised. We have continued to promote the PFE concept to land owners and plantation owners and the Department of Forestry will continue to do so after the end of this project.
Activity 2.4. Trial Framework for Establishment of PFE at eight project sites covering at least 26,000 ha		See comments in Output 2b above
Activity 2.5. Prepare case studies/lessons learned from each of the project sites		We have prepared case study fact sheets and videos from several of the sites on alternative livelihoods developed in this project (Annex 28, 29) and used them to promote the PFE concept and sustainable forest management in other sites
Activity 2.7. Develop and test training module for forest-owning mataqali in skills for implementing Fiji's Code of Forest Harvesting		This has been developed in collaboration with the Forestry Training Centre who use it to train forest wardens and community representatives in collecting socio-economic data and implementing the Code of Forest Harvesting (Annex 40, 41).
Activity 2.8. Develop communication systems to enable mataqali to report incidents of unsustainable logging to DoF and to monitor report submissions?		<p>During our Socio-economic surveys, we asked communities about communication channels for issues relating to forest use/ unsustainable logging/ fire. It was clear from the interviews that there is an existing communication channel as follows:</p> <p>Eye witness – reports at village meeting. The issue is discussed amongst the villagers for decision on actions to take. Village Headman follows up on these actions with the relevant authorities: Fiji Police Force/ Dept. Forests/ Provincial office. These issues are also reported at the District and Provincial level through the Village headman's report.</p>
Output 3. Locally appropriate ecosystem-based sustainable livelihoods established for forest-owning <i>mataqali</i> which reduce poverty and	3a. Detailed assessment of ecosystem services in areas under Permanent Forest Estate management (PA and SMF covering a minimum of 26,000 ha)	3a. No forests logged in any of the pilot sites during this project. In the seven sites resurveyed there was no net loss in forest carbon storage or water services in protected forest areas. The remaining pilot sites could not be officially resurveyed by

<p>conserve forest ecosystems.</p>	<p>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>the end of the project after Cyclone Winston in February 2016.</p> <p>3b. All pilot sites were surveyed at the beginning of the project. At the end of the project seven sites were resurveyed. Households in these sites recorded average income increases of 9% (Annex 10). These increases were offset by increased numbers of household members at the end of the project. The remaining sites could not be resurveyed after Cyclone Winston in February 2016.</p> <p>3c. No net loss in average bird encounter rate in protected forest areas in pilot sites (Annex 19).</p>
<p>Activity 3.2. Implement selected livelihood activities at project sites</p>	<p>Alternative livelihood projects have been set up at 8 sites (Annex 42).</p>	
<p>Activity 3.3. Undertake SES to assess both changes as a result of livelihood interventions and long-term benefits recognised by the forest-owning <i>mataqali</i></p>	<p>Post-project surveys of the pilot site communities were conducted to determine whether the communities felt that participation in the PFE had brought positive benefits to their communities (Annex 14). Pre and post-project SES surveys were conducted to assess community changes due to livelihood interventions and participation in the PFE (Annex 10).</p>	
<p>Activity 3.4. Analyse results of ecosystem service, biodiversity and socio-economic studies to assess impacts of PFE establishment</p>	<p>Although the PFEs were not formally established during this project, results of studies on ES, biodiversity and socio-economic impacts have been analysed for most of the pilot sites. Some sites could not be resurveyed after Cyclone Winston in February 2016 and will be resurveyed in 2017.</p>	

<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>	<p>4a. Representatives from more than 20 communities have been involved in site-exchange and learning tours during this project. For example, 19 participants from seven villages participated in an ecotourism site exchange tour run by Talanoa Treks. Two of the sites represented were from within the project: Naqaravutu Village and Lavena Village, who had indicated that they wished to strengthen their eco-tourism venture. The objective of the site exchange program was to bring together communities who have been involved in forest based tourism, to experience being a tourist and to critique each other's sites, and most importantly to capture lessons learnt to implement in their own sites. Community members have also been involved in site exchange programs for plant nursery development, forest monitoring, and community SES data collection (Annex 27)</p> <p>4b. Biodiversity site monitoring data have been used to report against the performance of national (NBSAP) and global policies (CBD 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets) through reports to the Protected Areas Committee (PAC). All bird monitoring data have also been included in the BirdLife Global World Bird/Biodiversity Database, and are available through GBIF and Avian Knowledge Network (and can be viewed on eBird).</p> <p>4c. Forty-two CCLN members have attended and presented at key decision-making forums (Annex 27). For example, Sipiriano Qeteqete (from Lavena) leads on the Ecotourism committee at Navakawau and presents at Tikina meetings. Petero Qaloibau (Naqaravutu) is the co-ordinator of the ComDecs GEF programme. He liaises with stakeholders regarding encroachment issues and conservation/livelihood projects for the district of Natewa/Tunuloa. He has also represented indigenous communities at international meetings in Samoa, Cook Islands and New Zealand. Tevita Seru (Navukailagi) has represented the community at Tikina and Provincial meetings, communicating on governance and protected areas. Poasa Qalo (Nukuloa Village) presents conservation projects at Tikina meetings on Gau. Joeli Maliki (Yanuya Village) presents conservation projects at Tikina meetings in Nadroga. Meli Naisele (Vatu-i-Ra) showcases sandalwood livelihood opportunities at Natewa/Tunuloa.</p>
<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>	<p>This has been established through the site exchange programs described above and will also be included as a subgroup of the National iTaukei Resource Owners Committee (NTROC) with NFMV as a participating member. Becoming a subgroup of NTROC will allow the CCLN to make use of the network already in place to address issues facing local resource owners.</p>	

Annex 3 Standard Measures

Code	Description	Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
Training Measures							
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis	0					
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained	0					
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained	0					
3	Number of other qualifications obtained	0					
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training	12	Fijian (11) Australian (1)	F= 4 M=8	<p>Research methods for forest canopy herpetofauna;</p> <p>Community socio-economic data collection methods, data entry and analysis;</p> <p>Field application of GIS techniques;</p> <p>Development and training on strategies to communicate with local communities on Invasive species issues in Fiji.</p> <p>Library data entry;</p> <p>Translation of technical forestry terms into Fijian</p>	English Fijian	<p>The students were engaged in various components of the project.</p> <p>The purpose of their engagement was to gain field experience in the application of their Conservation Biology theory.</p> <p>Two students were inspired to continue their education after being part of the program.</p> <p>Two students are still pursuing their undergraduate studies.</p> <p>Two students are now employed – one in the tourism sector and one as a GIS specialist in the land administration organisation: Itaukei Lands Trust Board.</p>

Code	Description	Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
							NFMV engages one of the students as an intern.
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students	8			As above	As above	As above Includes staff/ team contact hours with undergraduate students during guest lectures.
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)	8	Fijian	F = 6 M = 2	Climate change; Carbon stock assessment; Project management; Socio-economic questionnaire development, data collection and data analysis; Invasive species data collection and analysis, invasive species management at site level; Strategic education/ conservation awareness; Species research and monitoring (forest bats); Community engagement and dialogue; Bird surveys, data collection, entry and analysis; Social media engagement; Website management	As above	These students currently work in the conservation sector in Fiji, playing a leading role in advocating for Fiji's biodiversity and its protection.

Code	Description	Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students	46					
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification (e.g., not categories 1-4 above)	0					
6a	<p>Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (e.g., not categories 1-5 above)</p> <p>Talanoa Treks team (19)</p> <p>Sisi Initiative Finance and Administration training for community (30)</p> <p>Department of Forestry team (15)</p> <p>Forestry Training Centre team + interns (6)</p> <p>Community representatives (5)</p> <p>Provincial Conservation officers from Macuata, Cakaudrove, Serua, Rewa (6)</p> <p>Herpetofauna canopy climbing training for community and rangers (5)</p> <p>Learn from the Scientist Series events (general public) (100)</p> <p>Participants in the Leadership Fiji Program in 2014 and 2015 (60)</p> <p>Nabukelevu nursery community training (20)</p> <p>IBA monitoring community training (30)</p> <p>Bird survey methods community training (30)</p>	326			<p>Herpetofauna survey methods;</p> <p>Bird survey methods;</p> <p>Finance and administration;</p> <p>Forest Harvesting Code of Practice training;</p> <p>IBA monitoring methods;</p> <p>Socio-economic survey methods;</p> <p>Freshwater macroinvertebrate survey and identification;</p> <p>Freshwater fish survey and identification;</p> <p>Moth survey and identification;</p> <p>Coastal forest and coral reef survey;</p> <p>Nursery establishment;</p> <p>Climate change and Fiji's environmental issues.</p>	English Fijian	
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	13					

Code	Description	Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
7	<p>Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s) (describe training materials)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Freshwater macroinvertebrate guide for the NFMV Learn from the Scientists series of events (2015); 2. Freshwater stream health traffic light indicator by Live and Learn, trialled by NFMV in the Taveuni Freshwater Macroinvertebrate Survey (2015); 3. Freshwater fish field guide for the NFMV Learn from the Scientists series of events (2015); 4. Socio-economic survey guide for enumerators engaged in the project (2014); 5. IBA monitoring framework (developed before the project but trialled during the project with the Gau community); 6. Kids camp activity materials, e.g. Amazing race (developed with school children of Gau Secondary School as part of developing the Community Conservation Learning Network (2014)); 7. Bird field identification guides for kids (Vatu I Ra, Kadavu, Natewa). These were developed prior to the project, but used/modified during site engagement. 8. Template excel file for Socio-economic data collected during the project. These have been shared with counterparts who have indicated an interest in our 	13			<p>Field identification guides for training communities, students, government staff</p> <p>Guides to conducting socio-economic surveys</p> <p>Manuals for setting up plant nurseries</p> <p>Guidelines for forest harvesting</p>		

Code	Description	Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
	<p>methodology.</p> <p>9. Fiji Acropyle species identification guide developed for a related project. However, the site engagement methods were trialled with the Darwin project;</p> <p>10. Template power point presentations for NFMV projects. These were specifically developed for the project to allow project officers to communicate information from the project to a range of audiences</p> <p>11. Species fact sheets, developed as part of the advocacy for forest based species and used during public awareness campaigns;</p> <p>12. Sago palm harvesting guidelines. These were developed prior to the project, but used in the site engagement for Culanuku village in the livelihood diversification component;</p> <p>13. Toolkit for Ecosystem Site Based Assessment – Fiji manual. This was developed specifically for the project to allow the project officers to conduct TESSA in other communities.</p>						

Research Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country(ies). If copies are required please contact project team.	13				English	Participatory process

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wainikavika Feasibility Study 2. Sovi Basin Herpetofauna report 3. Emalu Forest Herpetofauna report 4. Fiji Acropyle Species Recovery Plan 5. Delaisavu Cat Management Plan 6. Delaisavu PA Management Plan (draft) 7. Sago thinning procedures at Culanuku Sago Rehabilitation site 8. Community resource use maps (from community consultations) 9. Biosecurity plans for Monuriki and Vatu I Ra Islands 10. Mongoose Incursion Response Plan 11. Green Iguana Incursion Response Plan 12. Brown Tree Snake Incursion Response Plan 13. NBSAP Species working group implementation framework 						
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

10	<p>Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Freshwater macroinvertebrate field guide for the NFMV Learn from the Scientists Series of Events. 2. Freshwater fish field guide for the NFMV Learn from the Scientists Series of Events. 3. Invasive palm (<i>Pinanga coronata</i>) species identification poster 4. Sovi Basin herpetofauna survey list 2015. 5. Fiji herpetofauna list 2015 6. Fiji Endangered and Protected Species Act (2002) amendment (2016) – reptiles, amphibians, birds, trees, snails, freshwater fish. 	6				English	
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals	0					
11b	<p>Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere</p> <p>TESSA case studies. Natewa Tunuloa.</p>	1	Fijian	Female	Ecosystem Services	English	
12a	<p>Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sovi Basin herpetofauna survey list 2015 2. Fiji herpetofauna list 	2				English	
12b	<p>Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Database on Civil Society Organisations in Fiji for Fiji REDD+ implementation 2. Fiji Endangered and Protected Species Act (2002) amendment (2016) – reptiles, birds, amphibians, trees, snails, freshwater fish 3. World Bird and Biodiversity Database 	3				English	
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)	0					

13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s) Herpetofauna training collections	1				English	South Pacific Regional Herbarium
-----	--	---	--	--	--	---------	----------------------------------

Dissemination Measures		Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work (Annex 30)	5				English	
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work was presented/ disseminated (Annex 30)	43				English	

Physical Measures		Total	Comments
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)	0	
21	Number of permanent educational, training, research facilities or organisation established	0	
22	Number of permanent field plots established	10	Wainawa Bird Survey transect and points; Taveuni bird survey transect and points Sovi Basin herpetofauna survey transect and points Kadavu bird survey transect and points Natewa bird survey transect and points Wainawa carbon assessment plots Natewa carbon assessment plots Gau collared petrel burrow monitoring points Emalu Fiji Acropyle monitoring plots Delaikoro herpetofauna survey transect and points

Financial Measures	Total	Nationality	Gender	Theme	Language	Comments
<p>23 Value of additional resources raised from other sources (e.g., in addition to Darwin funding) for project work</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Save Our Species- Conservation of the Fiji Acropyle - A forgotten national icon (FJD 94,520) 2. Arcadia - Organisational Development Fund Phase II (FJD 74,160) 3. Aage V. Jensen Charity Foundation - Realising Fiji's Dream: (EU 149,987) 4. Aage V. Jensen Charity Foundation - Saving Paradise – Protecting Pacific Island Forests by Empowering Community Action (FJD 87,591) 5. The David & Lucille Packard Foundation through BirdLife International- Restoration of Important Pacific Seabird Island Phase 3 (FJD 12,000) 6. Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund - Managing Invasive Species at key biodiversity areas in Palau and Fiji (FJD 12,000) 7. EU - BirdLife Pacific Invasive Species Programme - Fiji component (FJD 84,015) 8. GEF Small Grants/ Globally threatened birds at Fiji's Mount Nabukelevu IBA through Community based reforestation and sustainable land management approach (USD 47,230) 9. BirdLife International Community Conservation Fund - Saving Globally-threatened birds at Fiji's Mount Nabukelevu IBA through Community based reforestation and sustainable land management approach (US\$16,826) 10. Birdlife International – GEF - COMDEKS - Satoyama Initiative. Sustainable land use in Natewa/Tunuloa (FJD 6,000) 	£313,791					

Annex 4 Aichi Targets

	Aichi Target	Tick if applicable to your project
1	People are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.	X
2	Biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.	
3	Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions.	
4	Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.	
5	The rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.	
6	All fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.	
7	Areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.	X
8	Pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.	
9	Invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.	
10	The multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.	
11	At least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.	X
12	The extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.	
13	The genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.	

14	Ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	
15	Ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.	
16	The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.	
17	Each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.	
18	The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.	
19	Knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.	
20	The mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.	

Annex 5 Publications

Type * (e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Nationality of lead author	Nationality of institution of lead author	Gender of lead author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. contact address, website)
Internet publication	TESSA Case Studies. Natewa Tunuloa, Fiji. Mere Valu, Mark O'Brien and Jennifer Merriman	Fijian	Fijian	Female	BirdLife International	http://www.birdlife.org/assessing-ecosystem-services-tessa/case-studies

Annex 6 Darwin Contacts

Ref No	20-024
Project Title	Delivering sustainable forest management for Fiji's people and wildlife
Project Leader Details	
Name	Dr Mark O'Brien (Birdlife International)
Role within Darwin Project	Overall coordination of project. Linked BirdLife experts with NFMV Field staff, undertook biodiversity surveys and undertook summary analysis of bird, carbon and socio-economic data.
Address	10 McGregor Road, Suva, GPO Box 18332, Fiji.
Phone	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Mrs Nunia Thomas-Moko
Organisation	NatureFiji-MareqetiViti
Role within Darwin Project	Awareness workshops, biodiversity survey training
Address	14 Hamilton-Beattie St, Suva, Fiji
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 2	
Name	Eliki Senivasa
Organisation	Fiji Ministry of Forests (Conservator)
Role within Darwin Project	Training of community forest wardens, translation of Fiji Forest Code of Harvesting into Fijian Itaukei Language
Address	Ministry of Forests Takayawa Building, Toorak, Suva, Fiji
Fax/Skype	
Email	