



Report of the Final Project Review Meeting GEFPAS Integrated Island Biodiversity



**23rd – 26th November 2015,
Kingdom of Tonga**

**GEFPAS Integrated Island Biodiversity
Final Project Review Meeting**

***23-25 November, Vava'u and 25th, Tongatapu,
Kingdom of Tonga***

Key Meeting Outcomes

The GEFPAS Integrated Island Biodiversity Final Project Review Meeting was convened in Vava'u, Tonga from the 21st – 24th November and concluded on the 25th November, 2015 in Nuku'alofa, Tonga and was attended by representatives from the Cook Islands, Nauru, Tonga, Tuvalu, SPREP and UNEP and it concluded with the following key outcomes:

I. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Meeting:

1. Agreed that the main outcomes of the final review meeting would inform the Terminal Evaluation and provide input into the preparation of the final Project Implementation Report (PIR).
2. Highlighted the importance of utilising Pacific island local experts including the sharing of expertise and experiences between and among countries.
3. Recognized the importance of promoting and showcasing the outstanding achievements and results of the project.

II. TERMINAL EVALUATION

The Meeting:

4. Confirmed that the Terminal Evaluation (TE) would be carried out collectively across the Pacific for the four GEFPAS projects which includes the Micronesian Challenge, Integrated Island Biodiversity, Invasive Alien Species and the Phoenix Island Protected Area.
5. Noted that the terminal evaluation process will start in January 2016.
6. Noted the key objectives of the TE which were to monitor and evaluate project results and achievements; identify challenges and risks to full achievement of project objectives; make recommendations on specific actions that might improve delivery; Identify and document lessons learnt; and promote accountability for resource use.
7. Agreed on key timelines and milestones for final reports to be completed and submitted by all the four participating countries to SPREP as outlined below:

- 1) 2nd week of January, 2016
 - 2015 4th quarter expenditure report (QER)
 - 6-monthly narrative report for the period from July – December 2015
 - 2015 Annual Co-finance report (January – December 2015)
 - Tracking tool for 2015

- 2) 31st March, 2016
 - 1st quarter expenditure report (QER)
 - Final narrative report for January – March 2016
 - Final co-finance report for January – March 2016
 - All project deliverables, outputs and products

8. Agreed on key deliverables to be completed and submitted by SPREP to UNEP as follows:
 - 3) 30th June, 2016
 - Final Project Implementation Report (PIR)
 - Final Co-finance report for 2015 including January – June 2016
 - Final Narrative report for January – June 2016
 - Final audit report

III. FINANCIAL STATUS AND BUDGET REALLOCATION

The meeting discussed status of project funds at the country level including funds with SPREP and UNEP as at end of September, 2015.

The Meeting:

9. Noted that USD\$596,665.00 remains unspent for the entire project, part of this was reported as being committed to current activities and will be reported as expenditure in the 4th quarter expenditure reports .

10. USD\$250,000.00 of the USD\$596,665.00 was identified as not been allocated or committed due largely to changing priorities or activities which were not completed within the project timeframe for both Nauru and Tuvalu respectively. Thus, the amount of USD\$250,000.00 was agreed in principle to be re-allocated to regional and national activities.

11. In re-allocating funds, the meeting agreed that **regional activities** would be coordinated and implemented by SPREP on the understanding that these would benefit all four countries. *Regional training* was agreed as the top priority, along with regional *communications and promotion* to showcase project results and achievements to support opportunities to replicate and scale up project results, inform policy and decision making processes at all levels, mobilize new and additional funding opportunities and for educational and awareness raising activities. The meeting also identified key events for showcasing the project next year which included the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation

annual meeting, the World Conservation Congress, CBD COP13 and the SPREP annual meeting.

12. For the re-allocation to **national activities**, the meeting agreed to re-allocate funds to support follow up priority activities in Vava'u, Tonga including add-on activities for Nauru.

The proposed re-allocation plan is as follows:

Activities	Amount in USD
Regional activities	\$125,000.00
National activities in Tonga	\$100,000.00
National activities in Nauru	\$25,000.00
Total	\$250,000.00

An activity breakdown and prioritisation was undertaken. Refer to Annex 1 for more detail.

Given that the majority of the unspent funds were from the Tuvalu country allocation, the proposed re-allocation was therefore agreed in principle only subject to receipt of official agreement from the Tuvalu National Executing Agency, the Department of Environment.

13. The meeting agreed that SPREP with assistance of UNEP would coordinate formal correspondence on this matter to Tuvalu to facilitate a final decision before the end of December, 2015. It was also agreed that Mr. Kitiseni Ovia, Tuvalu IIB Project Coordinator would also facilitate discussions internally with the Director of Environment on this matter.

IV. FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES

The Meeting:

14. Identified strategic opportunities which could benefit from the outcomes of the GEFPAS IIB project such as national level policies for example, the NEMS, SOEs, NBSAPs, community owned conservation area management, local governance systems, the Ridge-to- Reef projects and other similar small and large scale conservation initiatives that are currently implemented in the four countries.
15. Identified a diverse range of funding opportunities such as those under GEF6 including GEF7 and the GEF Small Grants, CBD Life Web, EDF-11, bilateral funding as well as those through philanthropic organizations, all of these could help to carry forward the main outcomes of the GEFPAS IIB project once the project is officially closed.

V. MEETING REPORT

16. A full meeting report will be prepared by SPREP and circulate to all meeting participants for review and comments.

Annex: Proposed budget reallocation

	Reallocation to regional activities	Completed by	Ranking	Budget USD	Total
1	Case studies (success stories and key achievements)	end April	2	\$15,000.00	
2	Documentaries and manual	end April	3	\$30,000.00	
2.1	P3D and Manual (how to manual and video based on Tonga P3DM)				
2.2	Combined BIORAP video				
2.3	IIB video of key highlights				
3	Comms products for key events	Mid May	2	\$20,000.00	
3.1	Printed materials (posters, brochures, etc)				
3.2	Articles on Island Business and other mainstream media outlets				
3.3	IIB merchandise				
	Sub-total			\$65,000.00	
4	Training	end March	1		
4.1	MSP in Nauru (travel costs for IIB participants including associated training costs)			\$30,000.00	
4.2	Open standards in Samoa MIRADI (travel costs for IIB participants including training costs)			\$30,000.00	
	Sub-total			\$60,000.00	
	TOTAL for regional activities				\$125,000.00
	Reallocation to national activities				
5	Tonga activities			\$100,000.00	
	Salary for IIB Project Coordinator	6 months	1	\$20,000.00	
	Gazetting of new PAs (consultations, travel, fuel, printing of GIS maps), legal fees, advertisement in the local paper)	end March	2	\$10,000.00	
	Promotional and marketing materials	end March	1	\$15,000.00	
	rat eradication and training	end March	2	\$30,000.00	
	bird monitoring for Mt. Talau and Toloa Rainforest	end February	3	\$10,000.00	
	marine monitoring programme for Vavau islands	end February	3	\$15,000.00	
					\$100,000.00
6	Nauru (for additional costs after 4th QER 2015)				
	MSP	end February			
	Wetlands inventory	end February			
					\$25,000.00
	GRAND TOTAL				\$250,000.00

1. Introduction

The final review meeting of the GEFPAS Integrated Island Biodiversity (IIB) Project was held at the Hilltop Hotel in Neiafu, Vava'u from the 23rd to 25th November. The meeting was organized by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and hosted by the Tongan Government, through its Ministry for Environment (MEIDECC).

The meeting was convened over a period of 4 days focusing on overall project achievements, progress made, key highlights, lessons learnt key reporting requirements and opportunities to continue and replicate outcomes of the project once it comes to an end.

Please refer to [annex 1](#) for the final agenda of the meeting.

2. Representation

All four IIB participating countries (Cook Islands, Nauru, Tonga and Tuvalu) were represented at the meeting. The meeting was also attended by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) – GEF Implementing Agency and representatives of the project executing agency, SPREP. Secretariat and facilitation support was provided by the GEFPAS IIB Project Manager, Easter Galuvao (SPREP), Ecosystems and Biodiversity Officer, Amanda Wheatley (SPREP) and GEFPAS IIB Project Technical Expert, Vainuupo Jungblut (SPREP). Logistical support was provided by Tonga's Department of Environment.

3. Background

This report provides a record of the main discussions and agreed outcomes of the final review meeting of the IIB project. It also serves as a guide to the completion of remaining activities; provide input into the terminal evaluation of the project as well as input into the preparation of the Final Project Implementation Report (PIR); the report also outlines a range of opportunities for scaling up project results once the project ends.

DAY 1 - 23rd November 2015

4. SESSION 1 – Official Opening

4.1 Official Opening

The final review meeting of the GEFPAS IIB project was officially opened with a prayer by Vainuupo Jungblut (SPREP) and welcoming remarks were made by the representatives of the Government of Tonga, UNEP and SPREP, respectively.

5. SESSION 2 – Meeting overview, objectives and expectations

Easter Galuvao provided the overview of the meeting including the overall objectives and expected outcomes. These are outlined below:

5.1 Meeting Objective

The overall objective of the final review meeting was “To assess the overall status of implementation against project targets and results achieved”

5.2 Expected Outcomes

The expected outcomes of the final review meeting were:

- *An overview of overall project results and achievements*
- *A realistic and time-bound process for final project reporting (Jan - March 2016)*
- *Decisions on remaining activities and unspent funds*
- *A clear roadmap on a strategic way forward beyond the end of the IIB project*

5.3 Participant Expectations

Each participant was given the floor to introduce themselves and share expectations of outcomes they would like to achieve at the end of the meeting.

In summary, all participants expressed the importance of taking forward the outcomes of the IIB project and replicate and link these to other related on-going initiatives including future initiatives. Participants also expressed the importance of having a specific discussion on remaining activities including unspent funds and practical ways to ensure remaining activities and funds are delivered within the remaining timeframe of the project. Participants also requested that the meeting should be a forum to share experiences and lessons learnt.

Please refer to [annex 2](#) for detailed participant expectations.

6. SESSION 3 – Overall project status

The Project Manager, Ms. Easter Galuvao (SPREP) provided an overview of the project including the project goal and objective, its 8 outcomes and 23 outputs and key milestones. Furthermore, SPREP-specific outputs under the project were highlighted which included direct technical assistance for the Nauru BIORAP, Vava'u Rapid Biodiversity Assessment (BIORAP) and the Rarotonga Cloud Forest Survey, Cook Islands.

Opportunities established through the project were also highlighted such as collaboration with partner organisations, securing of additional funding for Tonga to conduct a coastal Ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) trial and a successful delivery of training on Participatory 3 Dimensional Modelling (P3DM).

Furthermore, the successful south-south/cross-country cooperation was also highlighted as a good practice which the IIB project had accomplished and should be continued.

7. SESSION 4 – Country Reports

7.1 **Cook Islands: Ms. Mii Matamaki, project coordinator for the Cook Islands** presented on Cook Islands' IIB project and highlighted the key achievements below:

- The successful completion of workshops for training of teachers on biodiversity conservation which garnered positive feedback from teachers, educational and awareness activities such as a cross-island walk with school kids with information on native and invasive species;

- The Ma'uke Unga (coconut crab) reserve survey which was a community-supported initiative to conduct a survey and establish a coconut crab reserve. Under this survey, training for communities on the coconut crab survey methodology was undertaken;
- Survey and research on rare medicine plants, based on the knowledge of traditional medicine practitioners which has gathered a good deal of support for the protection of these rare medicinal plants; and
- The Rarotonga cloud forest survey which provided additional information that would be useful for future management of the cloud forest.

Update on specific activities:

- For Activity 1, it was recommended to establish a home nursery for medicinal plants for Rarotonga as a pilot that could be replicated to outer islands if it was successful.
- For Activity 2, the Pacific Islands Conservation International (PICI) completed a turtle nesting viability assessment on the islands of Rarotonga and Mangaia. However, there was no evidence of nesting activity although turtles were found in these waters.
- Rare and traditional plants and trees were acquired and replanting was carried out with schools and also in preparation for the 50th celebrations this year. This activity underscored the need to link project activities to events such as national celebrations which would raise the profile of the project, especially activities related to sports and culture.
- For Activity 3, the Rarotonga cloud forest survey was carried out over a period of three weeks across five mountains and a "Did you know?" awareness column was published in the local newspaper on endangered species.
- For Activity 5, locating and mapping of species of interest, was revised to 'species of interest' which was focused on the coconut crab ('unga). This activity involved training environment staff and the community, many of whom were hunters. An interesting point to note was that participants didn't have the skills to identify a female coconut crab before the survey but after the training they were well equipped with the basic skills to do so. It was also important for the communities to view the coconut crab as not just food but also as an important part of the ecosystem.
- For Activities 8 and 9, Biodiversity regulations, which have had many delays due to a number of reasons. The drafting of the Suvarrow Island Environment Regulations and Management Plan, and the Biodiversity Conservation Regulations were both completed. However, the government changed the format for regulations and also the crown law department didn't have the capacity to review the regulation which had been the main reasons for the delays. This activity is now handled through a private lawyer. A lesson learnt from this activity was to ensure ample and sufficient time is allocated to activities that would require lengthy consultation processes. This activity is planned for completion by March 2016.
- For Activity 10, the IIB project provided support of the mid-term review of the Cook Islands NESAF (National Environment Strategic Framework)
- For Activity 11, a specialist was engaged to improve components of the website for the whole environment service and noted that the database would be a tool for disseminating and storing

information. The NES Facebook page was regularly updated with stories and newsfeeds including IIB stories.

- For Activity 12, re-programming the biodiversity database aimed to make the database similar to Wikipedia where a range of researchers could contribute to the database. The timeline for completion of the upgrade was not set but it was part of on-going work with the natural heritage trust (Gerald McCormack).
- For Activity 13, two training workshops to train teachers to teach biodiversity were successfully completed in 2013 and 2015 respectively, facilitated and delivered by the Live and Learn Fiji. Positive feedback was received from teachers who reported that they were now using the activities from the workshops and practising them with students. Most importantly, biodiversity was now integrated into the primary school curriculum.
- For Activity 14, a social marketing plan for national awareness, communication and knowledge management was developed and NES has launched a Facebook page which is linked to the NES website. The IIB had further supported the awareness of biodiversity by working with the Ministry of Education to develop school resources.
- For other activities, Activity 4, Mitiaro endangered plant, this activity was no longer a priority as it was already undertaken by local government and traditional leaders.
- For Activity 6, Pilot R2R, this was also no longer a priority as Muri Environment Care group faced capacity constraints due to the departure of key members.
- For Activity 5, the Ra'ui mapping of species and areas activity would be undertaken using funding secured through the Cook Islands Marine Park.

On lessons learnt:

The following were identified as lessons learnt from Cook Islands IIB project:

- It was good to have one coordinator from the start to the end of project noting that Cook Islands had a few coordinators throughout the life of the IIB project.
- It is highly recommended to start with the most difficult activities , e.g. Consultation and legislation development,
- It was important to link activities to key national and local events, e.g. Cook Islands 50th Anniversary celebrations,
- Regular project steering committee meetings were needed,
- It was important to reduce the time from project conception to project inception,
- Permanent staff employed within the Environment Division should be appointed as Project Coordinators, this would avoid the issue of retaining the officer once the project finished.

For **next steps**, an audit of the project was needed, final reports were needed and activities needed to be carried forward - e.g. surveys on other islands, a 'lessons learnt' report for other projects to consider.

7.2 **Tonga: Ms. Ana Fekau, project coordinator for Tonga** presented on their implementation of the project where the following key achievements were highlighted:

- The completion of the Megapode (Malau) surveys for Niuafou'ou, Fonualei and Late Islands (Activity 1 and 2);

- The completion of the community education program for Niuafu'ou on the importance of the megapode (Activity 3);
- The revision of the Threatened Species Recovery Plan (2014-2024) (Activity 4);
- The completion of vegetation plots within the 'Eua National Park (Activity 6), in collaboration with the Ministry of Lands and Survey and JICA volunteer;
- The official approval by cabinet of conservation areas based on the recommendations of the BIORAP (Activities 5 & 7);
- The completion of the BIORAP, which engaged 18 international experts along with 20 local staff and experts and found many endemic, rare and new species for Tonga, along with some invasive species. Also, the completion of the BIORAP synthesis report, its translation and the publishing of the full BIORAP report (Activities 9 and 10).

Update on specific activities:

- Seven priority sites recommended for protection in the BIORAP were submitted to Cabinet in August 2015 and it was decided to only progress the Government-owned sites, since dealing with Noble-owned lands was very time consuming and complicated.
- The information management system and database activity was not needed as this was picked up by a GIZ project. All project activities were completed, other than the database.
- In terms of other activities and **next steps**, a review of legislation relating to the Megapode protection was being conducted and the recommendations of the Vava'u BIORAP report needed follow up e.g. through P3D modelling, rat control under invasive projects, fencing of Mt. Talau endangered plants, 6 special management areas being established through other projects, all of which fit under Tonga's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).
- In terms of **challenges** faced, Ms. Lupe Matoto, Tongan Director for Environment, revealed that it was often difficult to get support for biodiversity conservation from both the community and government and gave a national example as evidence. Ms. Easter Galuvao suggested that this was a situation where community champions were needed to push this important issue. E.g. the Governor of Vava'u has been a great supporter of the project and related outputs (e.g. - BIORAP). They were trying to strengthen the Vava'u office of MEIDECC and this was one of the reasons why the project was based in Vava'u.

7.3 **Tuvalu: Mr. Kitiseni Ovia, project coordinator for Tuvalu** presented on the Tuvalu IIB project. The Tuvalu component only started in January 2014 and he became the project officer in March 2015 following the resignation of the previous coordinator. A personal goal for him was to gather information on Tuvalu's biodiversity and make this information readily available.

The following achievement was highlighted:

- The completion of the demarcation of Conservation Areas - one on each island with four of the eight conservation areas marked out with a GPS.

Update on specific activities:

- The remaining areas needed their boundaries updated and re-mapped due to revisions. An issue which needed consideration was whether to have all these areas under by-laws or local law.
- For the establishment their database, this activity was already being implemented under a SPC/GIZ project and therefore the funding for the database was re-allocated to the BIORAP activity.
- For the Tuvalu BIORAP, the survey was scheduled for November 2015 and was to cover 4 islands (Funafuti, Nukufetau, Nui, Vaitupu). Furthermore, all logistics and planning was completed, however, the survey was cancelled at a very late stage by the Tuvalu Prime Minister as he did not approve of the work plan and the involvement of Alofa Tuvalu.
- The Funafuti Conservation Area Awareness Survey was undertaken in early 2014 as an initiative of the Fisheries Department. The information collected through the survey was submitted to Fisheries for upload to their database.
- For Education and awareness activities, activities were conducted during Environment Week 2015, which included school visits and a costume competition.

On lessons learnt

The following were lessons learnt from the Tuvalu IIB project:

- Tuvalu Fisheries should be included in the management of future projects as they had the capacity to deliver on the marine-related activities, but had no control over the project as it was managed by the Department of Environment.
- An MOU with Fisheries Department would have been useful to facilitate their involvement and engagement in project activities.
- The management of different projects across departments needed improvement.
- The Tuvalu Government promotes the use of local NGOs such as TANGO and use of local experts.
- There is a need for Tuvalu to put in place a policy to protect intellectual property being taken out of the country.

In terms of **next steps**, it was a priority for Tuvalu to complete remaining project reports, to hand over the remaining project activities and information on project wrap-up requirements to the Environment Department. This was in preparation for Kiti's departure for further studies in January 2016. There was a need to investigate options to assist with funding for ongoing fisheries surveys and activities and suggested that the BIORAP be integrated into Tuvalu's Ridge-to-Reef Project (UNDP).

General Discussion

The following were points raised from the discussions:

- Noted that SPREP had consulted across Government Departments and NGOs at the start of the Tuvalu project.
- Tuvalu Fisheries provided guidance on priority activities of the project particularly those with a marine focus and Fisheries also had a key role during the initial stages of the project
- Delays occurred as a result of changing project coordinators.

- Several meetings with Fisheries occurred again when Kitiseni was appointed as the new project coordinator in March 2015. However, the relationship with Fisheries had changed significantly possibly due to Fisheries getting their own projects and significant funds.
- A small survey could still happen focussing on terrestrial aspects however; the Tuvalu government would need to determine their priority activities based on what could be realistically achieved in the remaining timeframe of the project.
- It was important to identify and consider activities that could be assist the future R2R project
- Develop a specific ‘how to’ guide for the BIORAP methods based on the three BIORAPs conducted under the IIB project.

7.4 **Nauru: Mr. Berrick Dowiyogo, project coordinator for Nauru** presented on the implementation of Nauru’s IIB project pointing out that the IIB project started off strong in Nauru particularly with the completion of the Nauru BIORAP. However, when there was a change of project staff, there was a lack of handover when the previous project coordinator departed which made it difficult for the new project coordinator to get the project back on track. Berrick reported that the President of Nauru wanted all environment-related projects to support each other and work together for example, the Nauru Ridge-to-Reef and Fisheries would work together on reducing reef fishing pressure and to introduce FADs outside the reef.

In terms of results achieved, information on Nauru’s Biodiversity was collected and compiled through the BIORAP and awareness and education activities had been carried out.

In terms of outputs, the BIORAP report and documentary and awareness programs were carried out including the media showcase of the BIORAP documentary. School curriculum meetings were planned with the Nauru Education Department to initiate the integration of biodiversity conservation into the school curriculum. The BIORAP report was very well received by the Government and the BIORAP documentary was well received by the schools and the community.

On lessons learnt

Nauru IIB project identified the following lessons learnt:

- The close interaction between SPREP and the Nauru Government which, provided valuable assistance, was appreciated very much especially through the in-country technical assistance visits.
- The close collaboration between government departments and other projects in Nauru was beneficial. A particular lesson was the inefficient transfer of knowledge from previous coordinators a suggestion was put forth for an induction for new coordinators that could assist in such situations.
- Better mechanisms were needed to limit the control of a single official over the project, this could involve the establishment of a board/committee that would oversee projects and provide technical input.

For **follow-up actions**, Nauru will be updating all reporting requirements and outstanding financial reports and advised that SPREP and UNEP will be receiving a letter of renewed support from the Nauru Government to convey their support for completing all project activities and reporting.

Noted that Nauru has limited land and consequently faced much competition for land use but despite this, people living around the Ijuw/Anabar wetland were keen to protect the area for its biodiversity

values and to reduce the risk of competition for land-use threatening these values. The proposed conservation areas have been identified including the wetlands and bird sanctuary, as guided by the recommendations of the BIORAP.

8. **SESSION 5 – Group Discussions**

This session focused on a discussion of overall progress made against the overall project results framework (please refer to the GEFPAS IIB Project Document - Results Framework).

In the discussions, participants noted the following:

- Reaffirmed that the Project Implementation Report (PIR) is one of the GEF reporting requirement. This report is compiled by UNEP and SPREP based on country narrative progress reports and are submitted to the GEF, which then uses the report to assess overall progress made towards achieved global environment benefits.
- Noted the importance of utilising the Pacific’s own local experts who could be mobilized to share their experiences and knowledge to other pacific island countries. This was one of the key highlights of the IIB project.
- Noted that co-financing seemed to be low in the Pacific and that GEF projects in other regions get much higher co-financing ratios through large banks which provided loan money to countries to put up as co-financing. One good example from the Pacific was the Cook Islands which had used an ADB loan as co-finance.
- Sustainable financing mechanisms should be seriously considered with the aim of placing these large funding as investments in Trust Funds to fund biodiversity conservation work. It was noted that Tonga was in the process of setting up a Climate Change Trust Fund. There was a suggestion to consider the option of exploring setting up trust funds collectively across the region such as the Micronesia Conservation Trust Fund.

Day 2 - 24th November 2015

9. **SESSION 6 - Update on Financials**

For this session, Easter Galuvao (SPREP) provided an update of the financial status of individual country projects:

- The remaining funds for the Cook Islands was USD\$102,595. This was based on their country report and the majority of this amount appeared to be already committed.
- The remaining funds for Tonga was USD\$2,723
- The remaining funds for Tuvalu was USD\$230,946, of which USD\$214,915 was left at SPREP and was not committed.
- The remaining funds for Nauru was USD\$174,306 of which USD\$148,931 was left at SPREP.
- The remaining allocation for SPREP was USD\$56,094.
- The remaining allocation for UNEP was USD\$30,000 and this amount was earmarked for the final project review.

In total there was USD\$596,665 remaining. So far, the SPREP, UNEP and Nauru funds were committed and the Cook Islands and others mentioned commitments in their country updates.

10. **SESSION 7 - Main project deliverables and outputs overview - Communication**

Under this session, ideas and tools for documenting and communicating project results were discussed, including how to share outputs with national and regional stakeholders.

Please refer to [annex 3](#) for feedback from this session.

11. **SESSION 8 – GEFPAS IIB Project - Lessons learnt**

Under this session, key lessons learnt were shared with the meeting based on national and regional level outcomes and experiences. To be read together with the information in Session 3 of the meeting report.

For *Tuvalu*, **Mr. Kitiseni Ovia** provided a brief overview of their lessons learnt:

- Tuvalu Fisheries should be included in the management of future projects as they have the capacity to deliver on the marine-related activities, but have no control over the project, therefore, an MOU with Fisheries Department was needed.
- The management of different projects across departments needed improvement.
- The Tuvalu Government promoted use of local NGOs such as TANGO and use of local experts.
- Tuvalu needed a policy to protect intellectual property being taken out of their country.

For the *Cook Islands*, **Ms. Mii Matamaki** provided a brief overview of their lessons learnt:

- It was good to have one coordinator from the start to the end of project. Cook Islands had a few coordinators throughout the life of the IIB project.
- It would be good to start with the hard activities first, e.g. Consultation and legislation development, that it was important to link activities to other events, e.g. 50th Anniversary Celebrations.
- Regular project steering committee meetings were needed.
- It was important to reduce the time from project conception to project inception.
- Permanent staff employed within the Environment Division should be appointed Project Coordinators, this would avoid the issue of retaining the officer once the project finished.

For *Tonga*, **Ms. Ana Fekau** provided a brief overview of their lessons learnt:

- It was important to establish and utilise a technical working group (TWG) for the project.
- It was important to have a supervisor who knew the process for administering projects in Tonga.
- On staffing issues, it was important to have someone to support the project coordinator as there had been challenges in securing an ongoing position for the project coordinator funded by the project.
- Once beneficial lesson was the collaboration with the GEFPAS Invasive Species project coordinator which provided benefits for both projects' activities in terms of cost sharing and financial reporting.

- It was important to integrate project and activities into the relevant host department structure so that activities would continue after the project finishes, even without the project position.
- Planning for continuation of staff and activities through development and timing of projects was crucial in sustaining project outcomes.
- Establishing MOUs in a timely manner between Government departments and with the NGOs and private sector was an issue.
- Ownership of project activities and outcomes could be facilitated better by closely involving stakeholders in the development of proposals and implementation of project activities.
- In terms of financing, a small grants approach could work to foster ownership of activities by the community. The Cook Islands had done this earlier in partnership with the GEF Small Grants committee.
- She pointed out that a single steering committee which is used for all projects would work and that that this would limit meetings to only a couple times per year as all projects would be addressed together.
- Country work attachments based at SPREP could be beneficial for capacity building.
- The south-south partnering between countries (e.g. on the BIORAPs) was very beneficial.
- The project may have had too many activities and it was hard to know exactly which activities to implement at the inception of the project. Such issues had been addressed by having a good and flexible donor based at SPREP.

Future project ideas based on lessons learnt were discussed and follow-on to the IIB project was agreed, which could potentially cover the following:

- A Pacific Island Protected Areas Course – host in one of the project countries
- A park rangers program with work attachments
- South-south partnering scheme
- A marketing /social media training

12. **SESSION 9 - Final project reporting and timelines**

Under this session, a review and discussion of the status of narrative reports and Quarterly Expenditure Reports (QERs) took place, including a discussion on input into the final project implementation Review (PIR).

The agreed final project reporting timelines are below:

2nd week of January, 2016:

- 2015 4th quarter expenditure report (QER)
- 6-monthly narrative report for the period from July – December 2015
- 2015 Annual Co-finance report (January – December 2015)
- Tracking tool for 2015

31st March, 2016:

- 1st quarter expenditure report (QER)
- Final narrative report for January – March 2016

- Final co-finance report for January – March 2016
- All project deliverables, outputs and products

It was agreed that the key deliverables were to be completed and submitted by SPREP to UNEP as follows:

30th June, 2016:

- Final Project Implementation Report (PIR)
- Final Co-finance report for 2015 including January – June 2016
- Final Narrative report for January – June 2016
- Final audit report

13. SESSION 10 - Project terminal evaluation

Under this session, a presentation and discussion on requirements for the terminal evaluation (TE) was carried out.

Dr. Greg Sherley, UNEP reported that an evaluation for GEF (as the donor) was done through the Terminal Evaluation (TE) report and that evaluations were to be done collectively across the Pacific for 4 GEF projects - Micronesian Challenge, GEFPAS IIB, GEFPAS IAS and PIPA.

He provided background on the 4 Key objectives of the TE, its methodology and its timeline which was confirmed to start from January 2016. The proposed schedule for country visits for the TE is outlined below:

- Tonga – 2nd week Jan 2016
- Cook Is – 3rd week Jan 2016
- SPREP/UNEP in Samoa – 4th week January 2016

Cook Islands (Rarotonga) and Tonga (Vava'u) were the mostly likely countries to be visited due to their participation in the GEFPAS IAS project. Country visits are important as UNEP and GEF encouraged country views and is also an opportunity for countries to provide feedback on the project.

Greg emphasized that it was important for countries participating in the country visits to have the terminal evaluators schedule as early as possible in order to organise interviews and also field visits. The evaluation approach included interviews and questionnaires and the budget for the TE would need to cover domestic flights and travel costs to Vava'u and Makuararo, as well as for the accompanying project coordinator in Tonga (Ana). The Cook Islands Project coordinator (Mii) did not need to accompany the evaluator on the 3-day visit to Makuararo as they have an officer based on that outer island.

It was also noted that the TE would look at the mid-term review and how much of the recommendations were adopted and how changes were made.

Regarding the tracking tool, this was an important report that will provide key information for the TE. Coordinators were encouraged to review the tracking tool and complete the 2015 tracking tool and submit by end of January 2016.

14. **SESSION 11 - Exit and transitional planning**

Timelines were agreed for the final stages of this project including reporting and terminal evaluation. Refer to the timeline in Session 9 above.

Day 3 - 25th November 2015

15. **Session 12 - Project work-plan and budget revisions**

This session worked through what activities could be achieved before the end of the project, and to revise the workplan and budget accordingly. This would lead to an agreed project revision able to be developed at the completion of this meeting.

15.1 Nauru

For Nauru, activities 1, 6 and 7 were reported as being completed. The status of the other 8 activities is reported on below:

- Activity 2 – They have decided to keep only the wetland management component
- Activity 3 – Proposed that this activity be covered under the Nauru Ridge-to-Reef (R2R) Project.
- Activity 4 – This activity was deemed a low priority, as the BIORAP revealed healthy coral cover for Nauru.
- Activity 5 – To be covered under the Nauru Ridge-to-Reef (R2R) Project
- Activity 8 – This activity is continuing. Marine spatial planning with the Nauru Fisheries Department
- Activity 9 – This activity is continuing.
- Activity 10 – This activity is continuing. National IIB Stakeholders workshop successfully completed Oct 2015 engaging communities.
- Activity 11 – To be covered under the Nauru Ridge-to-Reef (R2R) Project

Current Activities

- Activity 13 – The management plan for proposed conservation area was underway.
- Activity 16 – The update of the National Wetland Inventory was initiated.
- Activity 17 – BIORAP media promotion already underway, but curriculum and poster proposed as future activity.

For Nauru, it was reported that USD\$174,000 remained, USD\$107,830 of which was already committed to Marine Spatial Planning (Feb 2016) and the Wetland Management Plan (70% completed). USD\$66,476 was uncommitted but with the update of financial reports the actual uncommitted would decrease to USD\$50,000 which could be re-allocated.

15.2 Cook Islands

For the Cook Islands, the status of each activity is reported on below:

- Activity 2 – Proposed to support the Kakerori work already happening through a rat eradication activity. This would also build a good partnership with the Tangaeo Rangers. Also P3DM. Not currently committed but planned. USD\$18,785
- Activity 3 – Final payment for Wildlands Cloud Forest Survey, and to pay for P3D modelling. Committed USD15,000, and plan USD\$6,361 towards P3DM.
- Activity 7 – Project Audit USD\$5,000
- Activity 8 – Suvarrow Island Environment Regulation and Management Plan. Committed \$17,500
- Activity 9 – Regulations under the Environment Act for Biodiversity Conservation consultation. Committed USD\$11,500
- Activity 14 – Translating, synthesising some reports, documentary and resources. USD\$15,383
- These activities led to 100% commitment of the USD\$102,595. Currently USD\$27,451 not committed but allocated to activities.
- Discussion: Activity 8, and to some extent Activity 9, had some risk of not occurring as they involved consultation which could be impacted on by weather events and other delays.

15.3 Tuvalu

For Tuvalu, the status of each activity is reported on below:

- Activity 1 – Demarcation of conservation areas. New GPS for Lands & Survey Department – USD\$10,000.
- Activity 4 – Will not be completed as the Tuvalu BIORAP was cancelled.
- Activity 5 – The database was not a priority as a GIZ project is already undertaking this.

A new activity proposed was for communication and education material (USD\$15,000). e.g.- deck of cards which are used for bingo, a conservation area brochure, a plant brochure.

For Tuvalu, it was reported that USD\$190,000 remained and was available for re-allocation.

In the following discussion, two key points were noted:

- I. The purchase of a GPS unit was approved
- II. An agreement with Lands & Survey team was needed in order for them to undertake the conservation area demarcation in the outer islands.

15.4 Tonga

For Tonga, the status of each activity is reported on below:

- Tonga has spent all funds allocated for the project and remaining activities are being funded from funds under the Noumea Convention. Those still requiring funding include:
- Submission of Cabinet paper for new conservation areas
- Draft declaration papers for new conservation areas and their gazettal
- Produce P3DM documentary – funding needed for this.
- Produce awareness materials

Tonga proposed a list of priority activities to be completed by end of March 2016 (in order of priority):

• Salary for IIB Project Coordinator (6-months' salary)	\$20,000
• Gazettal of new PAs	\$10,000
• Promotional material	\$20,000
• Rat eradication (in partnership with IAS project)	\$25,000
• Bird monitoring	\$10,000
• Late Island investigation and proposed restoration and rat eradication.	\$35,000
• Marine monitoring program (including Late Island following the fire)	\$20,000

TOTAL USD\$140,000

A discussion followed, where participants noted that:

- Work following from the P3DM training in Tonga was realistic as it had already started.
- For the other proposed activities, Tonga needed to focus on what could realistically be completed within the time available.
- It was important for them to consider those regional activities that they wanted to participate in including Nauru's P3DM training, the Open Standards training course in Samoa, Social media training etc.
- Many activities were ready to be implemented such as rat eradication as baits were already purchased.

15.5 Regional Ideas:

Feedback from discussion on ideas for regional activities is reflected below:

- Training or participation in other countries activities Nauru's P3DM, Open Standards course in Samoa, Social media training etc.
- Production of a regional BIORAP documentary
- The production of a Pacific BIORAP and P3DM 'how to' guide
- A compilation of case studies
- Various communication products

These ideas would total approximately USD\$110,000. Tonga had USD\$140,000 worth of additional activities it could commit to. This would utilise the USD\$250,000 of the funds needing re-allocation.

15.6 Summary of financial status across the project

It was reported that the remaining funds for re-allocation was approximately USD\$256,000 with the final figure being dependant on the 4th Quarter reporting from countries.

Day 4 - 26th November 2015

16. SESSION 13 - Project concept development and funding opportunities

This session was devoted to discussing and brainstorming on funding opportunities from GEF and other sources, Identify project ideas building on IIB project results and outcomes and a discussion on practical ways to promote the project ideas that were identified. This session took place at the conference room of the Tonga Department of Environment, Nukualofa.

16.1 Funding Opportunities

To continue the implementation of project activities beyond the IIB project the following funding options were identified:

Donor/Initiative	Description & Details
CBD Life web	CBD funding mechanism that works as a tool that matches projects to donors. www.lifeweb.cbd.int
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	GEF 7 – the strategies documents will be released in the near future. Multi-focal and multi-country projects are likely to be a key focus. https://www.thegef.org
Green Climate Fund (GCF)	The Fund is a unique global initiative to respond to climate change by investing into low-emission and climate-resilient development. GCF was established by 194 governments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions in developing countries, and to help adapt vulnerable societies to the unavoidable impacts of climate change. SPREP is one of the implementing agencies of the GCF. www.greenclimate.fund
International Climate Initiative (ICI)	German fund www.climatefinanceoptions.org
GEF Small Grants	https://sgp.undp.org
11 th European Development Fund (EDF11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regionally a project is being developed by FFA on coastal fisheries proposal with SPREP as a partner. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/funding-instruments-programming/funding-instruments/european-development-fund_en
Bilateral funding with New Zealand	www.aid.govt.nz/
Bilateral funding with Australia	http://dfat.gov.au/aid/Pages/australias-aid-program.aspx
Private organisations	Waitt Foundation – www.waittfoundation.org Macarthur Foundation - https://www.macfound.org/ Ocean 5 - http://oceans5.org/ Packard Foundation - https://www.packard.org/
UNEP	Coral reef program which has funding -

	http://coral.unep.ch/CRU_Home.html
USAID	https://www.usaid.gov/documents/1865/usaid%E2%80%99s-biodiversity-conservation-and-forestry-programs-2012-report
South-south cooperation	It is often good to partner with French territories as they have access to French funding.

The second part of the discussion focused on re-visiting the discussion on budget re-allocation in detail and an agreement was reached on priority activities to be funded which included regional activities and additional country activities for Tonga. Although there was a general agreement on the final budget reallocation, this was subject to receipt of an official response from the Tuvalu Director of Environment who was not present at the meeting, mainly because the majority of the unspent funds to be re-allocated were from the Tuvalu project component.

The total estimated budget to be re-allocated is USD\$250,000.00

The proposed re-allocation plan agreed to follows below:

- USD\$65,000 to be re-allocated for communication products and key events (Case studies, combined BIORAP video, IIB video including country summary, magazine publishing, promotional products, key regional events – participation and printing.
- USD\$60,000 to be re-allocated for regional training and courses (MSP, Open Standards)
- USD\$125,000 to be re-allocated to national activities:
 - USD\$100,000 for Tonga
 - USD\$25,000 for Nauru as a buffer amount for their activities

The allocation to Nauru may change once Nauru’s final 4th quarter report is completed.

The meeting confirmed the following 2016 events to share IIB results and highlight project achievements:

- the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation annual meeting
- the IUCN World Conservation Congress
- thirteenth conference of the parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity –27th
- SPREP Annual Meeting of officials

For prioritising regional and national activities under the proposed budget re-allocation, the following was agreed:

- That a regional IIB promotional video could include country sections which could also be used separately by each individual country to make further promotional products (with some editing).
- That agreement from the Government of Tuvalu was needed on the re-allocation to regional and national activities. It was agreed that the project coordinator would discuss this issue with their Director for Environment in mid- December 2015 and SPREP would send through an official letter with information including the outcomes from this meeting to Tuvalu.

17. **SESSION 14 – Wrap up, next steps and close of Meeting**

For next steps, agreement on the following was reached:

- Countries to work on their budget revisions (both national and consolidated budgets)

- The record of the meeting would be prepared and circulated in due course by SPREP.
- An official letter to communicate meeting outcomes, including a letter to Tuvalu on the proposed-reallocation of project funds to be prepared and sent out by SPREP.
- A media release of the meeting to be prepared and circulated to participants for comments, finalised and disseminated by SPREP through its media networks and contacts.
- Further development and posting of content on the IIB webpage hosted on the SPREP website.

In terms of next steps for the countries, agreement on the following was reached:

- That countries would work on to revise their budgets and workplans
- For reporting – Countries would work on their 4th quarterly reports and the tracking tool, which is due by January next year.
- Countries to compile all outputs in time for the terminal evaluation of the IIB project.

17.1 Final remarks by participants

To wrap up the meeting, both participants and organizers provided final remarks. These are reflected below:

17.1.1 **Ms. Mii Matamaki (Cook Islands)** - thanks and appreciation was expressed to Ana Fekau, Lupe Matoto and the Tongan Environment Ministry for hosting a successful meeting and for enabling participants to witness their beautiful country. She expressed her gratitude to SPREP, UNEP and the Tongan Environment Department. The meeting made some concrete decisions on the way forward and that good progress was made on that front. Furthermore, the project had been a journey which had broadened her knowledge and was a good life experience. Lastly, working with the community through the IIB project was a special experience for her and they had achieved a lot as a result.

17.1.2 **Mr. Joe Brider (Cook Islands)** - the meeting did meet their objectives for participating and it was good to work collaboratively and to meet with colleagues from the other three IIB countries.

17.1.3 **Mr. Kitiseni Ovia (Tuvalu)** - the IIB project consultations with communities gave him a voice as a youth in the community and this was a rare and humbling experience. Lastly, the meeting gave him the information he needed to brief their Environment Director on requirements for the remaining project activities and the way forward.

17.1.4 **Mr. Berrick Dowiyogo (Nauru)** - the meeting was very important as it clarified a lot of issues and meeting the other project coordinators was beneficial for him. He was appreciative of the work that SPREP and UNEP carried out and was keen to show this appreciation by completing their remaining activities in a timely manner. Lastly, he was pleased with the outcomes and the re-allocated budget and workplan.

17.1.5 **Ms. Ana Fekau (Tonga)** - noted that she was the only coordinator who was involved from start to finish and it was a long journey with challenges. She thanked SPREP and UNEP for allowing them to host the meeting and they looked forward to progressing with the final activities with the additional funds allocated to their activities. Lastly, she emphasised that connecting with each other was very important and hoped that that the communications would continue between the IIB country coordinators.

17.1.6 **Ms. Lupe Matoto (Tonga)** - thanked the meeting for accepting the additional activity and funding proposal from Tonga, although she acknowledged that this would still require formal confirmation. Lastly, that they had learnt a lot from the other 3 IIB country projects.

17.1.7 **Dr. Greg Sherley (UNEP)** - re-capped on the history and background of the project and pointed out that it was nearly cancelled 6 years earlier. It took a lot of late nights, a steep learning curve and basic principles to get the project approved. The project showed good comradery through the difficult task of re-allocating budgets and this project had accelerated into the final stages. Regardless of the result of the terminal evaluation, he was very happy with the project and its outcomes. Lastly, he urged participants to continue to think forward and beyond this project and thanked the SPREP colleagues for an excellent meeting.

17.1.8 **Mr. Vainuupo Jungblut (SPREP)** - he was fortunate to join the project in its final stages and likened the project and its personnel to a family who had to make sometimes difficult decisions in the best interest of moving forward. There had been a lot of soul searching during the meeting to determine the next steps and he was pleased that a road map was agreed to. Lastly, he was confident that the legacy of the project would live on through future activities, also with the possibility of an IIB-plus project on the horizon.

17.1.9 **Ms. Easter Galuvao (SPREP)** - having the meeting in Tonga and linked to the P3DM training was worked out really well and was very useful. Noted that she had joined the IIB journey from the start and it has been a very successful one. Furthermore, having the opportunity to work with such dedicated project coordinators from the 4 countries was a great experience and it would be great to work towards an IIB-plus with south-south collaboration incorporated. She acknowledged Dr. Greg Sherley (UNEP) and the excellent collaboration between UNEP and SPREP which was made easier with UNEP being based at SPREP. She looked forward to the final closing of the project and to everyone attending the Nauru marine spatial planning and/or the Samoa Open Standards training course.

The meeting closed at 12.30pm.

GEFPAS Integrated Island Biodiversity

FINAL Project Meeting

21st, 23rd – 25th November, Vava'u, Tonga

FINAL Annotated Agenda

Friday 20th November, 2015

6:00pm: Attend the Tonga GEFPAS IIB - P3D training closing reception which also serves as a welcome reception for IIB participants

Note: The Tonga IIB Project will be carrying training on Participatory 3 dimensional (P3DM) mapping tool targeting local communities and stakeholders. The P3D model is a tool which is useful for planning and resource management purposes. IIB participants will take part in the closing of the training and to view the P3D model which the participants are expected to produce as part of the training.

Saturday 21st	Agenda item	Objective	Organizers
9:30am – 3:00pm	Field Trip (refer separate programme)	To observe restoration work which has been carried out on Mt. Talau; A brief visit to the EbA project site; Meeting with the whale watching operators on Vavau (this activity is for the Cook Islands team)	MEIDECC, VEPA, GEFPAS IAS and IIB Projects
Sunday 22nd Rest day (Option: attend local church service)			

Monday 23rd

Focus: An overview of Overall project progress from 2012 to 2015

Session 1: Official opening

8:30am - 8:45am	Official opening of the meeting	Prayer Opening Remarks (UNEP, SPREP & host country)
-----------------	---------------------------------	--

Session 2: Meeting overview, objectives and expectations

8:45am - 9:00am	To establish a common understanding of the meeting objectives. Review and adopt the Meeting Agenda	SPREP - Easter
-----------------	---	----------------

Session 3: Overall project status

9:00am – 10:00am	To provide a snapshot of the overall implementation status of the IIB project including its financial status Report on progress since the November 2014 review meeting Discussion	SPREP - Easter
------------------	---	----------------

10:00am – 10:30am	<i>Morning tea break</i>	
-------------------	--------------------------	--

Session 4: Country reports

10:30am – 11:10am	Report from Cook Islands on overall status of project implementation <i>40 minutes</i>	Joseph Brider, Director of NES & Mii Matamaki, GEFPAS IIB Coordinator
11am – 11:40am	Report from Nauru on status of overall project implementation <i>40 minutes</i>	Elkoga Gadabu, Secretary of CIE & Berrick Dowiyogo, GEFPAS IIB Coordinator
11:30am - 12:40pm	Report from Tongan status of project implementation <i>40 minutes</i>	Lupe Matoto, Director of Environment - MEIDECC and Ana Fekau, GEFPAS IIB Coordinator
12:40pm – 1:40pm	<i>Lunch break</i>	
1:40pm - 2:20pm	Report from Tuvalu on status of project implementation <i>40 minutes</i>	Kitiseni Ovia, GEFPAS IIB Coordinator

Session 5: Group discussion

2:20 pm – 4:30pm	Discussion on overall project progress made against the overall project results framework (see GEFPAS IIB Project Document - Results Framework)	All participants
------------------	---	------------------

Session 6: Key outcomes and messages		
4:30pm - 5:00pm	Discuss main outcomes, main messages and action points	All participants

Tuesday 24 th Focus: Process for closing the GEPAS IIB Project			
	Agenda item	Objective	Presenter/Speaker
8:30am - 8:45am	Recap from Day 1 and review Agenda for Day 2		SPREP – Vai
Session 7: Final project reporting and timelines			
8:45am – 10:00am	Review and discuss status of narrative reports, co-financing and QERs including a discussion on input into the final PIR		Greg & Easter
10:00am – 10:30am	<i>Morning tea break</i>		
Session 8: Main project deliverables and outputs Overview (10mins)			
10:30am – 11:30am	Ideas and tools for documenting and communicating project results		Vai and Amanda
Session 9: GEPAS IIB Project - Lessons learnt			
11:30am - 12:30pm	Sharing of key lessons learnt based from national and regional level outcomes and experiences (refer separate template for lessons learnt)		Easter
12:30pm – 1:30pm	<i>Lunch break</i>		
Session 10: Exit and transitional planning			
1:30pm – 2:30pm	Discussion on concrete actions taken to expand, replicate and implement results of the IIB project. This will include a discussion on pipeline opportunities and future prospects		Greg
Session 11: Project terminal evaluation			
2:30pm – 3:30pm	Presentation and discussion on requirements for the terminal evaluation		UNEP – Greg Sherley
3:30pm - 4:00pm	Main outcomes, main messages and action points		All meeting participants
4:30pm – 5:30pm	Special event: Showcase results and achievements of the GEPAS IIB project targeting invited youths, school children and those who work directly on conservation issues.		tbc

Wednesday 25 th			
Focus: Planning for the remaining of 2015			
	Agenda item	Objective	Presenter/Speaker
8:30am – 9:00am	Recap from Day 2 and review Agenda for Day 3		SPREP
Session 12: Project workplan and budget revisions			
9:00am – 10:00am	Overview of project workplans and budgets		UNEP & SPREP
10:00am – 10:30am	<i>Morning tea break</i>		
10:30am – 11:30am	<i>Group work by country:</i> Review, revise and update workplans and budgets taking into account status of project implementation including financial commitments and payments to be made		All project coordinators
11:30am – 12:30pm	Presentation of revised workplans and budgets		All project coordinators
12:30pm - 1:30pm	<i>Lunch break</i>		
1:30pm	<i>Check in at the airport – depart for Tongatapu @ 3:30pm</i>		

Thursday 26 th			
	Agenda item		Presenter/Speaker
Session 13: Project concept development and funding opportunities			
8:30am – 9:30am	Brainstorm on funding opportunities from GEF and others		UNEP, SPREP and all participants
9:30am – 10:00am	<i>Individual country work:</i> Identify project ideas building on IIB project results and outcomes		All participants
10:00am – 10:30am	<i>Morning tea break</i>		
10:30am – 11:00am	<i>Individual country work:</i> Identify project ideas building on IIB project results and outcomes (continue)		All participants
11:00am – 12:00pm	Group discussion on project ideas identified including practical ways to		All participants

	promote them	
Session 14: Closing		
11:00am – 12:00pm	GEFPAS IIB Final Project Review Meeting closing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Main meeting outcomes and next steps - Final remarks 	UNEP, SPREP and all participants
1:00pm onwards	<i>Lunch break and own time</i>	

PARTICIPANT EXPECTATIONS from the meeting:

- *To see what the four countries have been up to with Biodiversity and to see how the invasives project can potentially build on some of these activities*
- *Keen to discuss how the team will manage the unspent funds, and also to hear what other countries have undertaken and how this fits within future Ridge to Reef projects (R2R). Can the outcomes of this project feed into the CBD survey for driving GEF 7 priorities?*
- *Keen to discuss uncompleted activities and funds, and how to continue the activities through other projects such as the invasive species project.*
- *Keen to discuss how to manage the unspent funds and a way forward.*
- *Discuss how Tonga can assist other project coordinators implementing projects within Tonga*
- *Countries can do a project revision at this stage, so we need to stock take on what's been achieved, what hasn't, and the budget remaining. Can then do a revised workplan and budget to spend the remaining funds.*
- *Interested in making a decision on the unspent funds in Cook Islands and how they may be utilised post December. Also want to look at how to build on the activities of the IIB in the future.*
- *The outcomes from this meeting will feed into many different things including the Terminal Evaluation Report.*
- *Identify how we make use of outputs for other strategic purposes.*
- *Much hard work has been done over the past years. Keen to identify some concrete ways forward in using these outputs and effort to continue moving forward. This may be through some smart, efficient communication activities.*

Communicating / sharing your IIB project outcomes and lessons learnt

What are your key outputs from the project?

- BIORAP report, synthesis
- BIORAP documentaries including translated version
- Translated BIORAP synthesis
- P3DM
- Photographs and video from project activities
- Documentaries/videos
- Cook Islands database
- Collection of country reports and data
- Facebook page – Cook Islands
- IIB project webpage

Technical reports

- TONGA: Tonga ‘Eua National Park Vegetation Plot, Megapode Recovery Plan and also report
- COOK ISLANDS: Cook Islands Cloud Forest Guidelines, Coconut Crab Technical report and methodology, Medicinal plants, Live and Learn

What is the objective of communicating your project outcomes?

- Changing behaviour and attitude
- Inform research
- Influence policies and decision making
- Securing donor funds
- Securing commitment from community, landowners, politicians,
- Influencing and inspiring younger generation
- Appreciation for the plants, animals and ecosystems – diverse roles

Who are the target audiences?

- Island community
- Government
- Children
- General public
- Specific groups e.g. Fisherman, farmers, traditional leaders, landowners, hunters/gathers,
- Tourists

- Tour operators
- Researches
- Regional/global agencies
- Donors and partnership opportunities
- Private sector
- Other countries – general public and also Environment staff (e.g. South-south cooperation and sharing of knowledge)
- Church
- Tourism agency
- Project donors and partners
- What are some communication methods or tools?
- Field Guides, foldouts, posters based on database. Even as a phone app.
- Partner with other agencies and their activities –e.g. Tourism, Rotary Group
- Linking with Special events – e.g. Miss Pacific. Ambassador of the Pacific. International and regional events such as World Conservation Congress, COP, Pacific Games.
- Link to world events including World Environment Day, World Wetlands Day, Arbour Day,
- Sell/promote the species/ecosystem to a mainstream audience – marketing/communication professional.
- Song, dance, photo, speech competitions, dress-up, wearable art,
- Sport/competitive event – e.g. Cook Islands amazing race with questions and challenges. Conservation messages in sport programs or during event.
- Champions for the message.
- Mascots and linking to events – e.g. Tonga South Pacific Games
- Facebook
- Website
- YouTube for documentaries and short films
- One voice/message
- Country level branding/message –
- *Social media/marketing training for IIB project officers/environment officers
- Guided tours especially for kids.
- Webcams on nests, caves, fruit trees,
- International/regional collections of case-studies and success stories
- Airplane magazines and tv screens
- Airport departure and arrival lounges
- Magazines – Island business
- Models of key species
- Products – USB flash drives, t-shirts.