

End of Project Report

● Project Overview

End of Project Report

The purpose of the End of Project report is to:

- Confirm final project outputs and outcomes,
- Capture how these outcomes will be sustained and
- Close out financial information and
- Seek your views on the process

Completing this form

Please complete and confirm the following sections fully and accurately:

- Section 1: Project Overview
- Section 2: Delivery
 - Conservation Outputs
 - Employment, Capability and Training
 - Iwi, Hapū and Whānau
 - Enduring Legacy
- Section 3: People
- Section 4: Finance and Capital Assets
- Section 5: Reflection

Square brackets and italics indicate guides.

Submitting your report

All completed forms must be submitted through Enquire.

Public disclosure

In the interests of public transparency, End of Project Reports may be published by the Department of Conservation, or the Ministry for Environment as lead agency for the Jobs for Nature programme. Commercially sensitive and personal information will be redacted by reference to the provisions of the Official Information Act 1982 and the Privacy Act 2020. Please identify by highlighting any information in your application that you regard as commercially sensitive or as personal information.

Section 1: Project Overview

External ID

AL06.5

Name

Restoring Rakiura

Delivery Manager

Nicole Sutton

DOC Region

Southern South Island

Council Region

Southland

Funding Approved

2,040,000.00

Co-Funders

Co-funder NZBN	Co-funder Name	Co-funder Category	Value of Cash Funding (co-funder)	Value of In Kind Funding (co-funder)
9429041915844	Environment Southland	Regional Council	30000	
9429043140107	Mazda Foundation	Charitable Trust	10000	

Start Date

13-04-2021

End Date

18-08-2023

Total term

28 months

Description

The project will deliver weed control and intensify and expand existing predator control to secure biodiversity outcomes around Oban/Halfmoon Bay and adjacent areas

Project Outputs

Section 2: Delivery

These are the results you have reported to us via your quarterly reports. If these totals are correct, you should leave the boxes blank. If a total is incorrect, please enter the difference in the respective period's box. For example, if the hours worked total results is 2000 for the 1/10/2022 - 31/12/2022 period, but it should actually be 1800 hours, please enter -200 in the December 2022 box.

Note, please ignore the total results for **People Currently Employed** and **People in Formal Training**. These are never considered cumulatively - we only use the most recently reported number to determine people employed at that time.

Project Results

Hours paid but not worked due to Covid-19

Category: Employment
Unit of Measure: Hours

Total Result
1,008.00

DOC-21

IND-0000049

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
01/2022	03/2022	48.00		
01/2022	01/2022	0.00		
02/2022	02/2022	0.00		
04/2022	06/2022	640.00		
07/2022	09/2022	120.00		
10/2022	12/2022	160.00		
01/2023	03/2023	40.00		
04/2023	06/2023	0.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	0.00	null	null

Data Source

-

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

March 2023

0

April 2023

0

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

Funding Paid on Wages

Category: Finance

Unit of Measure: Dollars

Total Target

1,667,328.00

Total Result

1,547,253.00

SEC-03

IND-0000003

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
07/2020	06/2022	1,667,328.00		
04/2021	12/2021	232,107.00		
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
01/2022	01/2022	63,198.00		
01/2022	03/2022	87,343.00		
02/2022	02/2022	65,182.00		
04/2022	06/2022	169,078.00		
07/2022	09/2022	192,629.00		
10/2022	12/2022	137,531.00		

01/2023	03/2023	215,115.00		
04/2023	06/2023	231,421.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	153,649.00	null	null

Data Source

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

March 2023

0

April 2023

0

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

Hours Worked

SEC-04

IND-0000004

Description: Hours worked

Category: Employment

Unit of Measure: Hours

Total Target

67,364.00

Total Result

61,292.50

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
06/2021	08/2023	67,364.00	Nil	Hours worked
04/2021	11/2021	6,969.00		Hours worked
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
10/2021	12/2021	3,082.50		
01/2022	01/2022	2,805.00		
01/2022	03/2022	2,735.00		
02/2022	02/2022	2,624.00		
04/2022	06/2022	7,309.00		
07/2022	09/2022	7,726.00		
10/2022	12/2022	5,849.00		
01/2023	03/2023	7,962.00		
04/2023	06/2023	9,205.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	5,026.00	null	null

Data Source

-

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

March 2023

0

April 2023

0

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

Employment Starts

Description: Employment starts

Total Target

Total Result

SEC-05

Category: Employment

17.00

50.00

IND-0000005

Unit of Measure: People

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
04/2021	06/2022	17.00	Nil	Employment starts
04/2021	11/2021	19.00		Employment starts
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
01/2022	01/2022	0.00		
01/2022	03/2022	0.00		
02/2022	02/2022	0.00		
04/2022	06/2022	7.00		
07/2022	09/2022	2.00		
10/2022	12/2022	6.00		
01/2023	03/2023	9.00		
04/2023	06/2023	7.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	0.00	null	null

Data Source

-

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

March 2023

0

April 2023

0

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

People Currently Employed

SEC-06

IND-0000006

Description: Note: this is a non-adding measure.

Category: Employment

Unit of Measure: People

Total Target

340.00

Total Result

369.00

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
01/2022	08/2023	340.00		Note: this is a non-adding measure.
04/2021	08/2023	36.00		People currently employed
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
10/2021	12/2021	18.00		
01/2022	01/2022	18.00		
01/2022	03/2022	16.00		
02/2022	02/2022	17.00		
04/2022	06/2022	46.00		

07/2022	09/2022	47.00		
10/2022	12/2022	37.00		
01/2023	03/2023	54.00		
04/2023	06/2023	58.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	22.00	null	null

Data Source

-

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

March 2023

0

April 2023

0

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Area Treated For Possums

SEC-10

IND-0000010

Description: Area treated for possums. Funding agreement specifies minimum target of 210ha; up to 1240ha

Category: Environmental

Unit of Measure: Hectares

Total Target

210.00

Total Result

310.00

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
04/2021	08/2023	210.00	Nil	Area treated for possums. Funding agreement specifies minimum target of 210ha; up to 1240ha
07/2021	12/2021	210.00		Area treated for possums. Updated July 2022 to remove repeat reporting of same trapped area
04/2022	06/2022	0.00	null	Updated July 2022 to remove repeat reporting of same trapped area
07/2022	09/2022	100.00		
10/2022	12/2022	0.00		
01/2023	03/2023	0.00		
04/2023	06/2023	0.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	0.00	null	null

Data Source

-

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

March 2023

0

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

April 2023

0

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

Area Treated For Rats And/Or Mustelids

SEC-11

IND-0000011

Description: Area treated for rats. Funding agreement specifies minimum target of 210ha, up to 1240ha

Category: Environmental

Unit of Measure: Hectares

Total Target

210.00

Total Result

310.00

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
04/2021	08/2023	210.00	Nil	Area treated for rats. Funding agreement specifies minimum target of 210ha, up to 1240ha
04/2021	12/2021	210.00		Rat trapping. Updated July 2022 to remove repeat reporting of same trapped area
04/2022	06/2022	0.00		Rat trapping. Updated July 2022 to remove repeat reporting of same trapped area
07/2022	09/2022	0.00		
10/2022	12/2022	100.00		
01/2023	03/2023	0.00		
04/2023	06/2023	0.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	0.00	null	null

Data Source

-

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

March 2023

0

April 2023

0

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

Area Treated For Other Animal Pests

SEC-15

IND-0000015

Description: Area treated for feral cat control. Funding agreement specifies minimum target of 210ha (up to 1240ha)

Category: Environmental

Unit of Measure: Hectares

Total Target

210.00

Total Result

210.00

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
04/2021	08/2023	210.00	null	Area treated for feral cat control. Funding agreement specifies minimum target of 210ha (up to 1240ha)
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
01/2022	03/2022	0.00		
01/2022	01/2022	0.00		
02/2022	02/2022	40.00		
04/2022	06/2022	0.00		

07/2022	09/2022	0.00		
10/2022	12/2022	50.00		
01/2023	03/2023	120.00		
04/2023	06/2023	0.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	0.00	null	null

Data Source

-

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

March 2023

0

April 2023

0

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Area Treated For Weeds

SEC-17

IND-0000017

Description: Area treated for weeds target for over the life of the project

Category: Environmental

Unit of Measure: Hectares

Total Target

1,240.00

Total Result

1,218.60

Period Start	Period End	Target / Result	Baseline / Data Source	Description / Comment
04/2021	03/2023	1,240.00	null	Area treated for weeds target for over the life of the project
04/2021	12/2021	128.60		Area treated for weeds
10/2021	12/2021	0.00		
01/2022	01/2022	37.00		
01/2022	03/2022	67.00		
02/2022	02/2022	70.00		
04/2022	06/2022	112.00		
07/2022	09/2022	151.00		
10/2022	12/2022	162.00		
01/2023	03/2023	228.00		
04/2023	06/2023	248.00	null	null
07/2023	09/2023	15.00	null	null

Data Source

-

Comment

-

April 2021

0

May 2021

0

June 2021

0

July 2021

0

August 2021

0

September 2021

0

October 2021

0

November 2021

0

December 2021

0

January 2022

0

February 2022

0

March 2022

0

April 2022

0

May 2022

0

June 2022

0

July 2022

0

August 2022

0

September 2022

0

October 2022

0

November 2022

0

December 2022

0

January 2023

0

February 2023

0

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

March 2023

0

April 2023

0

May 2023

0

June 2023

0

July 2023

0

August 2023

0

Please explain how the funding has enabled you to achieve the key outcomes of the project

The funding enabled SIRCET to hire staff and purchase equipment necessary to achieve the key outcomes.

Employment outcomes were to create 17 full time equivalent (FTE) roles per annum. The large wage portion of the funding allowed us to achieve this within 7.7% of the expected outcome, this was still achieved despite a quicker than anticipated recovery by the tourism sector in Southland and Stewart Island/Rakiura. Both predator control and weed control tasks were included in this project. Of the first 21 staff employed, 15 had been unemployed or underemployed prior to working for SIRCET.

Our Conservation Outcomes required considerable working hours for many staff. The two main objectives were to: control the pest weed Darwin's Barberry over 1240 ha; and to maintain and extend pest animal trapping networks over the entire project, specifically targeting rats, feral cats, and possums. Operational funding was used to purchase longer-lasting pest traps, field equipment required to undertake pest (plant and animal) control, PPE, vehicle, and administration expenses. Wage funding was used to undertake the groundwork for the pest animal and weed control. Outcomes include an increased network of pest animal trapping from 210 ha to 310 ha. The wage funded allowed us to grid search > 1,200 ha of land for Darwin's Barberry. It is estimated that it would have taken up to 10 years to achieve this outcome if the funding hadn't been available. Overall, the increased predator control and weed removal is most likely to have resulted in improved biodiversity around Oban village.

Our Training outcome was to upskill staff in Health & Safety (H&S) relevant to conservation, GPS navigation, weed and pest control techniques. The funding allowed staff to attend several training courses including: first aid, Growsafe (agricultural chemicals), handling of hazardous substances, and species monitoring. The training also focused on future proofing for staff, to increase employment chances following conclusion of the JFN project.

Section 2: Delivery

Conservation Outputs

Please review the outputs on the Project Outputs step

Please explain the variation between targets and results to any conservation outcomes

Our initial target area for Darwin's Barberry control was 1,240 ha. To achieve this outcome, we required 100% rate of access permission to be granted from all landowners in the target area. Unfortunately, we did not achieve 100% land access, which meant we were unable to search a small portion of the planned area (22 ha). The resulting area searched was 1,218 ha. The team worked hard to get permissions from as many landowners as we could, using personal networks and seeking help from Environment Southland. A key learning from this project is that a 100% permission rate is most likely not achievable – which will be beneficial experience to take on when planning future projects. As a result of not being able to access 100% of land in the target area, it is likely that there may be some Darwin's Barberry plants that have not been controlled.

Our targets for our predator control for this project were fully met, so there was no variation here. We have achieved protection for a second peninsula in our control area at Horseshoe Point (in addition to Acker's Point). In addition, we have improved the entire network with longer lasting and more ecologically sound traps. Our monitoring showed that we consistently had better results in our trapped area when compared with the untrapped control area.

What lessons have you learnt from the delivery of your conservation outputs?

Overall, we learnt that with the right resources to match a high goal that good conservation outcomes can be achieved.

Specific lessons that SIRCET have gained from the project include:

- 100% landowner access for pest control is unlikely to be obtained;
- future proofing the predator control network has made it easier for volunteers to resume the pest control (following conclusion of the JFN project);
- the establishment of consistent processes for employment of staff, H&S, and skills required for fieldwork.

I have uploaded a map of where the work occurred in the Document Upload step

No

Section 2: Delivery

Employment, Capability and Training Outcomes

Please review the outputs on the Project Outputs step and confirm the total Full Time Equivalent (1 FTE= 1560 hours per year, being 30 hours per week for one year), employment starts, hours worked and people completed formal training for the Project.

Please explain the variation between targets and results to any employment, capability, and training outcomes. The employment target was to employ 12 field team members, 3 field team leaders, 1 administrator, and 1 project manager (17 staff) for the entirety of the project. However, employment results varied throughout the project. As the economy recovered from COVID new opportunities became available for staff and personal reasons meant that many staff left before the first year concluded. Overall, 50 individuals were employed over the duration of the project, with 5 of the original staff remaining until completion of the project. Due to reasonably high staff turnover, there were times when fewer staff were employed by the project. As a result, we dropped below our FTE employment target. To regain on lost ground, we hired additional staff, which boosted the team to 20 staff for a short period of time. Additional hours were made available to staff (via revised employment agreements), to allow them the choice to undertake additional work to achieve our employment and conservation outcomes. As a result, this helped us to reduce the FTE deficit, which came out as 7.7% (underspent).

The target area to search for Darwin's Barberry weed control was originally 1280 ha. This area was unobtainable during the project, due to private landowners refusing access on their property. Where possible, we attempted communication and resolving of any issues with the landowner. In response, DOC reduced the milestone to from 1,240 ha to 1,152 ha. We were able to search 1,218ha, a result that was greater than the revised milestone, but less than the original target.

Our training outcome was that all staff be upskilled in H&S, tool use, GPS, field navigation, native plant propagation, weed and predator control techniques. This was achieved as explained in questions later in this report.

What impact has the employment and training delivered through this project brought to individuals and/or communities? Many staff employed by the project were unemployed or looking for opportunities to expand field work competencies to complement their qualifications. Improving field skills has had a big impact on these individuals as this is a pre-requisite for some positions. Staff upskilled in fieldwork, particularly weed and predator control. Some staff moved on from their roles into higher skilled positions (e.g., Predator free Southland Co-ordinator), while others have remained on the island continuing studies and conservation work.

All workers upskilled with both formal and informal training available throughout the project. First Aid courses were provided on four occasions and attended by 32 staff, with Growsafe training provided over two courses and attended by 22 staff. In both instances, people from other organisations on the island were able to participate. Additional courses and number of staff attending included: chainsaw course (9 staff), 5-minute bird count course (14 staff), Hazard and Risk Management course (4 staff), Management and Handling of Hazardous Substances and Certified Handler Preparation (12 staff), CIMS4 (1 staff), and day skippers course (2 staff). In addition, staff are continuing a Certificate in Business Management. Informal training is discussed in a later section of this report.

later section of this report.

The community impact of this project was mostly positive – with increased biodiversity outcomes to help protect the native birds, bats, insects and lizards and decrease in pest weeds. The community largely depends upon biodiversity for their own wellbeing and the tourism industry, which provides much of the income for the island.

The community welcomed staff from off the island into our town and (hopefully) have an increased understanding of habitat protection and restoration.

Were there any specific challenges in employing and maintaining employment?

Absenteeism

Increased cost of living e.g., increase in cost of petrol

If other, please specify

-

If your project has been impacted by COVID-19, how has it been impacted?

-

If other, please specify

-

How did the project end up providing relief to COVID-affected individuals, communities, businesses, or organisations?
We started the project in 2021 with a total of 17 staff. Of these staff, ten had previously been either unemployed or coming to the end of current employment. Others were underemployed or in insecure employment. Thirteen of these staff were from Stewart Island/Rakiura or the wider Southland area. One staff member had returned to NZ because of the effects of COVID, and had been unable to get employment here. The timing of having secure employment for these people was vital to them during the COVID affected times where jobs had been increasingly hard to come by, particularly in the conservation and tourism industries.

Businesses in Oban typically have seasonal highs and lows and the addition of several staff as permanent residents to Stewart Island for a longer period of time helped level out this seasonal fluctuation. The project contributed to having (approximately) 17 permanent staff in a community of around 400 people, resulting in a high percentage of secure employment.

How did you work with MSD?

MSD Employment Services

If other, please specify

-

Did you work with other organisations (including iwi/hapū) to identify people to be employed for this project, and if so, how?

Initial employment opportunities were advertised throughout New Zealand including job adverts on the Stewart Island notice board and online. The employment process was open to all. We engaged with Awarua Whanau Services to identify people. Our project manager had discussions with MSD in Invercargill and two employees came from this initiative. We reached out to educational organisations to see if new graduates from the outdoor learning sector would like some fixed term work.

If you provided a formal qualification, please indicate in what area

Theory/ Classroom

Practical/ Field training

If other, please specify

-

If you provided any informal training, please tell us what type of training

On the job informal training was ongoing throughout the project. Although many of our positions were entry level jobs which could have been completed having only a small amount of on-the-job training, we were committed to upskilling all staff as much as possible above what was necessarily required for this job only. We attracted employees who had written qualifications beyond what was needed but were after the field work aspect to round out their future employment prospects. Therefore, we had a wide range of skills with each new employee, and they were encouraged to share their knowledge with others.

Informal training included trapping techniques and animal identification skills, plant identification skills, grid searching methods, basic GIS skills, navigation using maps (compass and GPS), health and safety, how to read weather forecasts, keeping safe in the outdoors, basic survival skills (e.g., lighting fires, tying knots), plant propagation and planting, team building exercises, Māori history and culture, CV preparation, and interview skills.

If your project provided education, training or awareness, raising activities to any part of the community, or the wider public, please tell us what type of activities or events and how many

The project included several initiatives involving engagement with the community.

One of the milestones of our project included doing an extension of our trapping area around the township. Part of this was a plan to get the community involved in backyard trapping and learning about why it is so important that all the community get involved in this. The Halfmoon Bay School became interested in doing a rat trapping competition with all the students involved. We helped them set this up by providing traps, advice and contributed to prizes. These traps are scattered throughout the community. This proved a resounding success with a total of 501 rats and multiple media stories about the competition and the need for rat control both in NZ and overseas.

We provided a column in our monthly Stewart Island News (SIN) where we highlighted various invasive weeds and how to control these. We also organised and ran trapping workshops to learn about the different traps, as well as some planting of native species in public areas such as Butterfields Beach – an opportunity for the community could join in and learn about native plants as well as invasive weeds. In addition, we undertook annual night bird call counts for blue penguin (Korora) and Kiwi.

During conservation week we had a community beach clean-up that involved staff, the school, DOC, and the wider community, we provided plants and assisted with community planting around the new Helipad (a Health Committee initiative in Trail Park), one of our staff presented a talk on Marine Mammals, and we ended the week with a trap building workshop for the community building box traps to replace older styled corflute tunnels.

During the project timeframe we celebrated 20 years of SIRCET and were able to showcase the JFN project to the community through displays and guest speakers.

Where relevant, how many past or present kaimahi have received informal training?

50

Did the project target youth/rangatahi capability or development?

No

If yes, how?

-

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Section 2: Delivery

Iwi, Hapū and Whānau

Who is mana whenua for the area where the project is located?

Awārua Runanga of Ngāi Tahu are Tangata Whenua for this part of Rakiura. Rakiura Maori Land Trust (RMLT) are Kaitiaki of a large area of land on Rakiura and we work very closely with them.

Is your project led or co-led by hapū or iwi?

No

If yes, who?

-

To what extent does your project work with whānau, hapū or iwi?

We have occasional engagement with whānau, hapū or iwi

Did Mātauranga Māori inform your project planning or practice?

We utilise mātauranga Māori occasionally in our project

Describe how the project has recognised and provided opportunity to iwi, hapū and whānau in the region.

Opportunities might be related to exercising or involvement in:

- Mātauranga Māori
- Rangatiratanga
- Kaitiakitanga
- Commercial opportunities generated;
- The protection of taonga species
- Cultural impact assessments;
- Treaty Settlement commitments

Describe how the project has recognised and provided opportunity to iwi, hapū and whānau in the region

The JFN project worked closely with the Rakiura Māori Land Trust (RMLT) and protects taonga species across hectares of RMLT and surrounding land. The taonga species including the tītī are protected by a regularly checked intensive trapping network that is NAWAC approved and minimises the risks of non-target species being caught. The network targets three species of rats as well as possums, and feral cats in a 310 ha area and is responsible for catching well over 4,000 pest predators over the course of the project. We embrace kaitiakitanga - the concept of guardianship over the taonga species and land through our trapping and weeds work. Seeking to eradicate Darwin's Barberry, an invasive weed is also a long-term goal for SIRCET to help the native flora regain a footing back into the affected areas of bush.

Mātauranga has also been incorporated throughout the project with a korero on Māori mythology including Papatūānuku and Ranginui. Their stories provide useful knowledge as they progress through their lives. We consistently highlight that we are all in this together *and unity is essential for progress and prosperity.*

If known, how many of your current or past project team members are whakakapa to the location and identify as uri (descendants) of the local hapū or iwi?

3

If your project has or had uri team members, do you feel that the project has helped mana whenua to improve their ability to exercise kaitiakitanga?

Yes

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Section 2: Delivery

Enduring Legacy (Sustainability of your project's gains)

What is the next step for your project or organisation beyond Jobs for Nature? Do you have funding from other sources and/or will become self-sustaining?

The next steps for SIRCET are to apply for additional funding to maintain the gains made throughout the Jobs for Nature project and continue with the trapping network. SIRCET will continue to apply for funding as it becomes available, and we are pursuing some business sponsorship opportunities with local and nationwide businesses. We also have a team of volunteers who have had a rest during our JFN project. Some of these have already started checking their lines again and enjoying the easy to check and clean traps.

For the invasive weeds we have so far secured \$25k from Environment Southland to do a mop up of Darwin's Barberry work this coming summer and continue with some feral cat trapping. Applications are in at Lotteries Commission and WWF who have both funded us before. Missing out on the DOC Community Fund was disappointing and combined with a lengthy delay in the notification to applicants, this has meant a drawn out timeframe to re-organise and seek other funding avenues.

We also have our Adopt-a-Trap and Sponsor-a-Hectare programmes that are linked to online donating or for on island donations from tourists. Tourists continue to be interested in our work and our displays at the environment centre give them up to date information and the opportunity to donate.

Describe how the project's environmental outcomes will be maintained after Jobs for Nature funding comes to an end? SIRCET will continue to work with Environment Southland on the Darwin's Barberry control programme with applications for funding as needed to continue this work. Funding has already been approved for additional control in the 2023/24 summer months. We will also continue to liaise with DOC Rakiura on other funding opportunities that may arise.

For the predator control programme, SIRCET has already had a return of volunteers wanting to check rat trap lines throughout the village. We also continue to apply for funding to employ a predator controller to continue with this work. In the meantime, there are limited funds available from fundraising initiatives to continue to check the traps monthly or as required during vulnerable times for the local native species.

Ongoing monitoring is funded partially by ES for predator monitoring and Save the Kiwi for night bird call counts and these will be continuing with additional funding from reserves.

Our education and outreach will be maintained by our Community Liaison who is funded separately to Jobs for Nature and is guaranteed for the next 11 months. This role is vital for us.

How many people, if any, will continue employment within your entity or project at the end of JFN Funding?

2

What are the next steps for people you have employed and/or trained through your project?

At least 10 of the staff that were at the finish of the project have already secured further employment and all of these either in conservation or guiding on conservation reserves. Others are doing some study and some others

these either in conservation or guiding on conservation reserves. Others are doing some study and some others are taking a travel break before deciding where to go.

If the opportunity arises then we have a number of staff still residing on the island with more conservation skills than before that may be contacted if we get more funding in the future.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

RECEIVED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT
If the project is not able to maintain employment, what pathways and/or support were available to assist kaimahi to transition out?

CV assistance was offered, many future job opportunities in conservation were shared with the staff. Time off was given to those who had interviews for different roles and some members of staff have had study paid for that will continue until January 2024. The Project Manager and Trustees were pro-active in assisting staff to secure ongoing gainful employment.

Are there any other outputs/outcomes from this project that will endure past the end of JFN funding and how will these be maintained?

Relationships with other organisations have been forged throughout this project and these will continue past the end of JFN funding.

We now have contacts at Bluff Hill/Motupohue Trust which as a project is somewhat linked with Stewart Island as this is where one source of rats may move between the two islands. If they become predator free our project could affect that and vice versa.

We have also strengthened our relationship with RealNZ by assisting with a project they manage at Little Glory. SIRCET was fortunate to have already had this relationship before JFN.

Predator Free Rakiura also has had an interest in our project as it is grass roots to what they are hoping to achieve in the future. We will certainly stay in touch with them and share results and hopefully help them trial techniques or help them with research as they move towards a target that will change the way we see predators on Stewart Island.

Internally, the trust has developed far greater capability due the many diverse and wide-ranging aspects of managing the JFN funding/ work, such as:

- Management of Tenancy Agreements within our local community, the occasional challenges created opportunity to ensure an optimum outcome was achieved. There were times that the Trustees collaborated far beyond what expectations were previously, thus resulting in a greater understanding of each other.
- Leasing agreements locally also enabled good management learning opportunity and outcomes.
- Having the foresight to recognising what negotiations needed to eventuate during the project and actioning these were another aspect of becoming a more capable group of trustees.
- Reaching out to local authorities and learning institutions such as SIT.

Have you secured funding from any other sources to continue operations, or if appropriate, is the business commercialised and operating in a self-sustaining way?

No

Has the project created any physical assets on Public Conservation land?

No

Have you spoken to DOC about how these will be maintained?

-

Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about your experience delivering this Jobs for Nature project?

There was a learning curve for all involved in delivering the project. We have come out of the project as a cohesive and hard-working unit. We encountered a common perception that our funding has resulted in a decrease in funding for DOC's core work and we found this difficult to understand. The trustees found that they needed to be more hands on than expected particularly with some employment and housing issues.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Section 3: People

Of the people you employed on your project, approximately what proportion are:

Answers should total 100%

Female

Proportion %
62

Male

Proportion %
36

Gender diverse

Proportion %
2

Prefer not to say

Proportion %
0

End of table

Of the people you employed on your project, approximately what proportion are aged:

Answers should total 100%

Under 18

Proportion %
6

18-24

Proportion %
12

25-49

Proportion %
70

50-64

Proportion %
12

65 or older

Proportion %
0

Prefer not to say

Proportion %
0

End of table

Of the people you employed, on your project, approximately what proportion identified as:

Individuals may have more than one ethnicity

Māori

Proportion %
16

Pacific Peoples

Proportion %
2

New Zealand European

Proportion %
66

Other European

Proportion %
14

Asian

Proportion %
2

Other

Proportion %
0

End of table

How did your project improve the wellbeing of individuals involved?

Having the confidence to move to a place that is unfamiliar presents many individual challenges with the rewards being as varied and often on a personal level. This question is therefore difficult to quantify. As trustees, we observed a real sense of purpose and enjoyment of the work, community and life balance for a number of the younger individuals.

Many of the staff had improved wellbeing simply because they had full time employment and a consistent wage. Some of the staff had improved wellbeing as they were promoted to team leaders and were able to develop their confidence and communication skills. All staff benefited from an increased connection with and understanding of the natural world.

Section 4: Finance and Capital Assets

Financial

(Please confirm the following information. Please note this only includes the Department of Conservation Jobs for Nature funding, and no co-funding sources)

Total Department of Conservation Jobs for Nature funding received
2,040,000.00

End of project actuals

(Total spend from the commencement date of the project to the completion date of the project; this should align with financial reporting)

1,943,987.00

Has a surplus of Department of Conservation Jobs for Nature funding been identified?

Yes

If so, how much? Has this been dealt with in accordance with Clause 55b in the funding agreement?

96013 - 66013 to be repaid, 30000 not provided as last payment.

Did the project spend over and above the Department of Conservation Jobs for Nature granted funds?

No

If so, please indicate how this overspend was compensated for

-

How has COVID-19 affected the project's spending?

Other: If other, please specify

If other, please specify

No impact on the projects spending

Were any capital assets purchased or developed over the life of the project valued at more than \$20,000 (plus GST, if any)?

No

Has this been dealt with in accordance with Clause 31 in the funding agreement? If not, why not?

-

Section 5: Reflection

The responses from this section will be provided to the overall Jobs for Nature Programme Secretariat as part of its evaluation.

Can you tell us about your experience with the pre-project and contract process?

The pre-project process was greatly helped by being able to meet with the Regional Director who managed our expectations. The application was large and incredibly complex, and much of the work put into it at this stage was re-done as part of the contract process, which felt like duplicated effort. Without the voluntary assistance of some very skilled and experienced conservation managers we would not have been able to complete it. There was also additional information required which we were only made aware of during the Christmas-New Year break and had to scramble to provide. Once the decision had been made that our application was successful we were then subject to a lengthy delay (roughly 2 months) while we waited for a formal ministerial announcement of our funding. This prevented us from advertising our roles and had significant flow on effects for the project time-line that required an adjustment to the contract, which required high level approval that was not easy or quick. The contract process was well organised and ran smoothly.

Was the selection process for funding transparent and proportional?

Was the fund criteria made available to you prior to applying for funding? Did you know the decision-making process for your project application?

Yes we had a good understanding of the criteria and who was at the decision making table.

Has anything stopped you being able to spend all the planned funding? How has this been dealt with?

This could include issues related to natural events

Nothing has prevented the Trust from being able to spend the allocated funds. Whilst there were a few unforeseen expenditure costs, these were discussed openly with funding management and resolved in a timely, efficient manner whilst remaining within the budgeted funds.

Repeatedly, payment of the instalments was made later than anticipated causing undue frustration and worry for the trust. We feared that our reputation was at risk as we did not have the resources to cover the large wage bills if our invoices were unpaid.

What parts (if any) of the project would have happened anyway or been funded through other mechanisms? For example, could you have trained staff without programme funding or with other funding your organisation received?

Both the Darwin's Barberry and the predator control would have occurred but on a much smaller scale. Previous years' funding levels only allowed us to do around 120ha per year. Now there is talk of this plant moving into an

years' funding levels only allowed us to do around 120ha per year. Now there is talk of this plant moving into an eradication programme on Stewart Island rather than progressive containment. This would not have happened if not for this project.

Predator trapping would have continued but the traps were getting old and requiring a lot of maintenance. This project allowed us to update and future proof much of the trapping network and expand to other areas not trapped before. This would not have happened if not for this project.

All the staff that went through training and learnt new skills would not have got this from us any other way but for this funding.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Please tell us about anything positive or negative which didn't go to plan for your project and has not already been covered.

This could include any unintended consequences of the work you undertook or even issues with planning etc. or unexpected success you had not planned for but contributed positively to you, your project or community.

It was harder than expected to get all the team housed. Initially there were a number of Stewart Islanders employed who had their own living arrangements. Three of these people sought accommodation in houses we had found for the remainder which put more pressure on this situation. This was an unexpected outcome that hadn't been planned for. Another issue with housing staff was that the homeowners wanted to rent to SIRCET and not directly to the staff. This required the trustees to take on the duties of a property manager.

There were some landowners who had previously not wanted to be involved with SIRCET and the trapping network. Because of the high presence that JFN created locally, many of those landowners are now engaged with the trust.

The trust was most fortunate in being able to secure the premises on 45 Elgin Terrace (previously known as Pearlers), having a large office space and another area for all staff to use, kitchen, bathroom plus an additional area for storage. This enabled the project to function smoothly. Such a place is rarely available for leasing over a two year timeframe on Stewart Island and without it, the project may have been irreversibly compromised. The trust continues to lease the storage area.

As a Trust we had not fully anticipated the positive contribution our staff would make to the local economy.

How do you think the Jobs for Nature programme performed overall?

In general Jobs for Nature has been a massive force for good across the country. Some may object that it has diverted funding from DOC's core business, but we were assured at the time that this was 'new money' and not from the existing conservation budget. However subsequent budget cuts have made people suspicious about this claim. It has given lots of people the chance to try out conservation as a job and awakened them, and also their social circle and whanau, to both the challenges and rewards of caring for our environment. When you talk to people across the country about projects they are very pleased with the work that has happened and equally concerned about how to keep the momentum going.

SIRCET has become more capable than in the past due to the JFN opportunity. The results speak for themselves – all goals were met! So the programme grew us as an organisation.

Financially beneficial to local businesses and community. Several employees have stayed on Stewart Island and are working in other roles and contributing to the community. So it provided benefits to the local economy.

and are working in other roles and contributing to the community. So it provided benefits to the local economy.

Both SIRCET and the programme's reputation suffered as a result of inflexible and unclear policies about development opportunities for staff that involved DOC projects. We were happy to pay staff to volunteer on local DOC projects (for a fixed amount of time only, similar to corporate volunteer programmes) where we could show these developed their skills and understanding of conservation work and gave them valuable opportunities to network. However our definition of local projects and DOC's did not align which resulted in some staff missing out on valuable opportunities and some reputational damage in the community.

What were the main strengths and weaknesses of the Jobs for Nature Programme?

This can include your funding agency (DOC), as part of the programme, and your agency can reflect their

This can include your funding agency (DOC), as part of the programme, and your answer can reflect their strengths and weaknesses.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

The strengths were: a regional focus, our DOC support people were always available, consistent, responsive, and listened to our requests. This, in turn meant the trust was able to progress with relevant problem solving when required, no matter how unpleasant that sometimes was.

The funding 'matched' the tasks that we (the trust) were expected to achieve and whilst one might say that this is a result of a good application, it is also a result of an excellent choice by the funders.

Weaknesses: Having small volunteer run group take over massive governance tasks that would previously have been located in central government achieved buy in from local communities but also ran the risk of burn out, where those in governance were taking on the role in addition to their regular jobs.

Did the Jobs for Nature programme have the right delivery systems and processes in place when your project started?

This can include your funding agency as part of the programme and your answer can reflect their systems and processes

Many of the systems in place when we started were changed but settled to some relatively easy reporting model and finance reports required.

Did implementation of your project happen on time and benefit the intended people?

We had a timing problem at the start where our budgets and the funding agreement assumed full employment in April 2021. It does take time to get a team on board and this was rectified by an amendment to the timing of our project when this was identified. A number of unemployed people were in the first intake of staff so this did benefit the intended people.

● Document Upload

Financial Report and Other Documents

Please use the button below to upload your completed financial report template. You can download the financial report template here: <https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/our-work/jobs-for-nature/reporting/quarterly-report-jfn.xlsx>

Please also upload a map of where the work occurred. This can be a snip from topographic map, with tracks highlighted etc. If necessary, and if known, it can also include the GPS co-ordinates for distinctive points on the perimeter.

You can add any other documents that might support your data, and we encourage you to upload any documents that might help us tell your Jobs for Nature story.

Note there is a 50MB limit per file.

Document Upload

JFN Project Finance Quarterly Reports 2021_2023

Map Barberry Areas and Tracking Sept 21 to Aug 23

Map Predator Control Network Aug 2023

● Declaration

Declaration

☒ Acknowledgement

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT