

## Darwin Plus: Overseas Territories Environment and Climate Fund Final Report

*To be completed with reference to the “Writing a Darwin Report” guidance: (<http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources-for-projects/reporting-forms>). It is expected that this report will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)*

### Darwin Project Information

Project reference	DPLUS096
Project title	Building Ascension Island’s Biosecurity Capability
Territory(ies)	St Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
Lead organisation	Ascension Island Government Conservation and Fisheries Department
Partner institution (s)	St Helena Agriculture and Natural Resources Division
Darwin Plus Grant value	£38,090
Start/end date of project	1/5/2019 – 30/09/2020
Project leader name	Diane Baum
Project website/Twitter/blog etc.	N/A
Report author(s) and date	Diane Baum 12/10/2020

## 1 Project Summary

Early detection, containment and eradication are accepted as the most effective means of preventing future damage from non-native invasive species, but prior to this project there were no procedures on Ascension Island for checking cargo or visitors, nor any rapid response or surveillance capability. In a 2017 review of biosecurity capabilities across UK Overseas Territories, Ascension was one of the lowest scoring territories with either no capacity or only basic structures in place across most of the assessed categories.

This project has created a fully-functioning biosecurity programme that is in line with international best-practice and consistent with our closest neighbour, St Helena. It achieved this by addressing five key areas:

1. Establishment of legislation providing powers to detect and respond to threats
2. Develop the staff and resource capability to check cargo and passengers
3. Establish effective rapid response protocols
4. Improve surveillance monitoring for new introductions
5. Raise awareness amongst island community and importers

The risk of new introductions can never be completely eliminated, but the procedures and capability created through this project will greatly reduce the threat posed to biodiversity and public health on Ascension.

## 2 Project Stakeholders/Partners

This project was initiated by the Ascension Island Government (AIG) because the need for biosecurity controls had been identified as a priority in the territory. Implementation of the new biosecurity system will be the responsibility of AIG and so it rightly took the lead in project planning, monitoring and decision making, but the following partners and stakeholders have played a key role:

- **The St Helena Agriculture and Natural Resources Division** provided technical support to the project. St Helena has recently developed a biosecurity system and the parallels between the two islands meant it provided a useful model on which to build. ANRD have been extremely generous sharing their documentation, databases and public engagement material to serve as templates for Ascension and providing training for members of AIG staff who visited St Helena. Many of the import routes are shared between the islands and an important outcome of this collaboration has been consistent import standards (Annex 6) that make it easier for importers to implement, and cooperation between the two jurisdictions will help to increase detection and compliance rates.
- **The Tackling Invasive Non-native Species in the Overseas Territories Project (TINSOT) led by the GB Non Native Species Secretariat** has been running in parallel to this project and has provided expert advice throughout the development of the Ascension Biosecurity Strategy. The gap analysis carried out by TINSOT in 2017 provided an important baseline against which progress has been measured (Annex 7). The pathway and horizon scanning elements of the TINSOT drew on international experts and the results of these have been incorporated into the Ascension Biosecurity Strategy (Annex 8).
- **The Ascension Island Council (AIC)** is the elected body that advises on all policy and legislation decisions on the island. The introduction of biosecurity legislation requires the support of the AIC and so they have been involved throughout the project. Records of Council meetings (Annex 9) demonstrate it has been discussed at length both before and after the public consultation. The Council recommended adoption of the biosecurity legislation and strategy on 30<sup>th</sup> April. Key to the successful engagement with the Council has been the willingness to focus on their areas of concern. A specific document assessing the financial implications of a new biosecurity system to AIG and other organisations on the island was prepared in anticipation of their major concern and helped to allay their fears.
- **Importers to Ascension** will be crucial to the success of the new biosecurity system since they will be expected to take responsibility for the condition of their imports and in some cases put in place additional measures to ensure they comply with the new standards. Detailed discussions have taken place with all the major importers to understand their businesses and ensure the biosecurity controls cause no disruption or burden beyond those required for the system to be effective (Annex 11). This inclusive approach built trust and support to the level that two importers were willing to allow inspections to take place before any legislation was passed so we could refine our procedures. As Annex 11 shows, almost all importers have expressed a willingness for their employees to be trained and provide extra detection capacity.

### 3 Project Achievements

#### 3.1 Outputs

##### **Output 1. Pre-border risk management system in place**

Prior to this project, Ascension had no biosecurity system in place meaning there were no controls on what was entering the island and no means of reducing the threat. There is now a comprehensive Biosecurity Strategy (Annex 8) and legislation in place that puts the emphasis on importers taking measures to reduce the risk of new introductions. This includes Import Health Standards for eight classes of imports, exceeding the target of four in the project logframe. We have also introduced a licensing system for the highest risk imports, including all live animals, to ensure tailored conditions can be applied to any application that is approved. The Import Health Standards follow the model of St Helena's and the Falkland Islands and changes have only been introduced where differing risk assessments required it. This has been received positively by importing organisations, who have been consulted through the development of the system and are supportive of the import standards (Annex 11).

A visit made by a member of AIG staff to shipping agents in the UK and St Helena helped to raise awareness of the incoming standards and allowed good personal relationships to be formed that have aided the flow of information and support for the system as it has been rolled out. From May onwards compliance with the standards will be a legal requirement, but regular importers as well as contractors undertaking the major runway repair project on the island are already following the standards.

A declaration form for visitors entering Ascension has been prepared and will become a legal requirement from November 2020, but it has not been used yet due to flights being suspended as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The aim of this one year project was to put the system in place and so the indicators relate to the creation of new standards and processes and efforts to secure support from stakeholders through dialogue and consultation. These indicators were appropriate and have demonstrated great progress to create an effective system from scratch with high levels of cooperation from those who will be affected. The success of the next phase of this initiative, as we implement the strategy and enforce the legislation, will require different indicators of success that focus on the compliance with standards, detection of introductions, collaborative improvement plans and, where necessary, appropriate enforcement action.

##### **Output 2. On-island inspection regime initiated**

The training of AIG staff in inspection techniques on St Helena was one of the most important parts of this project creating not just the output of trained staff but also lasting relationships between teams working in biosecurity on Ascension and St Helena. This has been of great benefit to both territories since it has laid a strong foundation for cooperation in the future. The training visit also helped to establish the sense of an AIG Biosecurity Team as colleagues from the Conservation and Customs teams worked together for the first time. The target of three people trained was met, but this indicator does not adequately capture the multiple benefits that resulted from this exposure visit.

Training of further staff on Ascension was delayed relative to the original project timetable as it was felt necessary to refine the inspection protocols and get approval for the wider Biosecurity Strategy from the Ascension Island Council before involving more colleagues. Training has now been delivered. Six members of the Conservation and Customs teams are being given comprehensive training on how to follow inspection protocols to maximise the chances of detection and ensure evidence is collected to a high standard. In addition, further people

working for AIG and other organisations who are involved in offloading cargo will be given basic training in how to detect and contain threats and who to contact to take further action. This will multiply our effectiveness and provide crucial extra capacity with little extra resource required.

While we were waiting for the legislation to come into force, we have been working with some importers and AIG staff returning from leave who have allowed us to carry out inspections to refine the protocols and train staff. A risk assessment tool has also been developed to allow Biosecurity Officers to identify the highest risk imports and make an inspection plan with detail on the shipments and cargo type that will be targeted and the required sampling rate. We now have the protocols and experienced staff to roll out inspections on civilian imports now the legislation has come into force. Military imports to Ascension are covered by the legislation but we need to finalise MoUs with the RAF and USAF to be able to inspect their containers. Some initial work has been done on this, but it could not be progressed formally until the legislation was finalised. Dialogue with the military organisations has been undertaken throughout the project and we are confident that good working relationships and joint inspection procedures will be possible.

The inspections carried out to date have intercepted a range of introduced organisms or identified practices that would not be compliant with the new legislation (Annex 13). This provides some evidence that the system is working, but to try to demonstrate the degree of efficacy two simulation exercises were carried out whereby foreign items were placed in break bulk cargo without the inspection team's knowledge. These were all discovered during the inspection and the intention is to repeat these exercises to ensure standards are maintained. The presence of customs seals means it is more difficult to set up simulated incidents for containerised cargo, but we will endeavour to find ways to test the efficacy of these inspections in the future.

### **Output 3. Rapid response capability operational**

Response plans have been prepared to cover all the main types of introductions likely to occur on Ascension (Annex 14). These have been prepared with the input of consultants from Australia and New Zealand and the Ascension Environmental Health Team. The plans have been shared with AIG colleagues during training sessions, which have also provided the opportunity to practice with new equipment that has been purchased for the containment and treatment of introduced species.

Only two members of AIG staff (rather than the planned three) were able to gain a qualification in the safe use of pesticides through this project (Annex 15). The cancellation of a planned training course in St Helena prevented people being trained as planned but we were able to arrange for two members of the AIG Conservation team to be trained in the UK. There are now four members of AIG staff with qualifications in the safe use of pesticides and, while we would like to increase this number to build resilience, it should allow us to mount a safe and effective response to any biosecurity threat detected.

It had been intended to create simulated incidents following the initial training of AIG staff in order to test and improve response capabilities. However, inspections of incoming cargo detected a range of new introductions that provided ample opportunity to test our response capability. The first detection occurred before the equipment had arrived on island and the response training had been delivered. However, AIG Conservation and Customs staff worked well together to contain the threat (live Dipteran larvae within the packaging of a mattress) and Environmental Health were able to control it. This was not completed within the target time, but the containment was good enough that there was no threat of escape. Subsequent detections have led to responses being mounted within the one hour target.

#### **Output 4. Effective surveillance monitoring for high risk threats**

Surveillance monitoring has been stepped up and now covers all high risk species identified in the horizon scanning exercise. A surveillance monitoring strategy has been produced (Annex 16) and is now being implemented by AIG with assistance from the MOD who have an established mosquito monitoring programme on the island. Ants have been a particular focus given the high likelihood of them arriving on imports and the threat they pose to native species on Ascension. Initially the intention had been to monitor five sites monthly, but it was felt that detection rates would be better if the number of sites was increased and sampling occurred less frequently. We are now sampling 10 sites every 2-3 months.

Identification of the samples collected during surveillance monitoring has been difficult. They have been preserved and some sent to the FERA laboratory in the UK. However, we have yet to receive any results back. Attempts have been made to record and identify the samples retained on-island and species level identification has been possible in some cases, but for groups such as ants the level of specialist knowledge required exceeds our capability. It looks unlikely that FERA will be able to provide the ongoing identification capacity required and so we will have to explore other means of identifying samples from our surveillance monitoring.

#### **Output 5. Raised public awareness of non-native species and actions to prevent their introduction**

We have produced banners, posters and leaflets to be displayed around Ascension and at the Airport to alert people to the new import standards (Annex 17). Information is also now being provided with new contracts for people moving to the island and with tourist entry visas.

We organized two public meetings and workplace briefings reaching a total of 76 people. There have also been press articles and social media posts to publicise the new biosecurity controls. This public engagement work is ongoing and there is existing staff capacity within AIG to deliver this beyond the end of the project funding.

## **3.2 Outcome**

As a result of this project and the assistance of the TINSOT, Ascension now has a biosecurity system that meets international standards. The revisited Gap Analysis (Annex 7) provides an excellent summary of the progress made from the baseline when this exercise was first carried out in 2017. In almost all cases Ascension's capabilities have improved and for many criteria the assessment has gone from no or basic provision to good status. The Ascension Island Council recommended adoption of the new Biosecurity Strategy and legislation on the 30<sup>th</sup> April and the legislation came into force on the 2<sup>nd</sup> November.

The protocols, databases, template forms and guidance are all now in place to provide the structure of an effective system. They have been designed to be easily understood by non-specialists, since biosecurity will form only a small part of the duties of most AIG staff implementing the strategy. One of the most positive aspects of this project is the way that members of the AIG Conservation and Customs Teams have worked together and shared knowledge to develop the system and how people from other areas of AIG and organisations working on the island have been keen to help. Workplans have not proved an effective indicator of this since the unpredictability of ship and plane arrivals means that biosecurity activities cannot be incorporated accurately into forward-looking workplans, and the time spent on these activities is better recorded retrospectively.

The public engagement strand of this project was been delayed due to the length of time it took to get Council approval for the strategy and COVID-19 pandemic. Extending the project to the end of September 2020 gave us the opportunity to deliver public meetings, press articles and social media posts to publicise the new system before it was introduced. Posters and signs have been displayed around the island and we have recorded good levels of awareness amongst the general public and importers.

## **3.3 Monitoring of assumptions**

Assumption 1: Appetite for introduction of biosecurity controls maintained within AIG and the Ascension Council.

Comments: The Appetite for introducing new biosecurity controls has remained strong within AIG even though there has been a change in Administrator on the island during the course of the project. The election of a new Council in September 2019 did cause some disruption since the justification for biosecurity controls had to be made again and factors unconnected to the project such as projected AIG income had led some Councillors to feel that AIG should not be taking on any extra responsibilities at this time. Through discussions with the Councillors it was possible to demonstrate that biosecurity controls were a more efficient use of resources than dealing with the consequences of non-native species. The Council's views on the topic are evidenced in Annex 9.

Assumption 2: AIG employees and importing organisations open to new working arrangements and maintain ongoing support for biosecurity controls

Comments: This assumption has been met to a much greater degree than we predicted. There has been widespread support and enthusiasm for this project amongst colleagues across AIG and in other organisations. People who work unloading cargo have taken a great interest in what might be found on it and are conscientiously checking and reporting detections to us. Other organisations have seen the need for these controls and have allowed us access and offered to help with inspections. Even the military organisations on Ascension have been very open to the system from the outset and we have had to do far less persuasion than we anticipated. The attitude of organisations on the island is captured in the summary of responses to the biosecurity consultation (Annex 11).

Assumption 3: New biosecurity legislation is adopted giving AIG powers to treat or destroy cargo.

Comments: Biosecurity legislation was recommended in April and came into force in November 2020. This is later than we had anticipated and has meant the development, training and testing of procedures had to be done in advance of the legislation, which has not been ideal. We had hoped to be able to use the template legislation produced as part of TINSOT, but this proved to be too detailed to be workable in a small territory such as Ascension. With a vacancy in the position of Crown Council on Ascension between March and September 2019, there was an inevitable delay in the drafting of Ascension-specific biosecurity legislation. However, our new Crown Council prioritised this and worked assiduously to produce a draft by February 2020, which has now been. The new ordinance has been designed to support the Ascension Biosecurity Strategy and will provide all the powers necessary to implement it.

Assumption 4: The training experience on St Helena is sufficiently comprehensive to allow effective dissemination and delivery of inspection regime

Comment: The Biosecurity Team within St Helena's ANRD could not have been more welcoming and helpful. They allowed members of AIG staff to shadow and take part in inspections, and generously shared their forms and procedure documents to act as templates for Ascension. The training was in depth and allowed us to understand every aspect of the St Helena system. What had been slightly underestimated was the difference in infrastructure, resource availability and risk prioritisation between St Helena and Ascension that meant there was a greater degree of adaptation required to design a system suitable for Ascension than had been anticipated. This did not jeopardise the project, but did require more work and time after the St Helena visit before an Ascension-specific regime could be produced and added a delay to the consultation and training elements of the project.

Assumption 5: Range of treatment options developed on Ascension are appropriate for all scenarios.

Comments: Through this project we have developed a number of treatment options that cover all the high risk groups identified in the horizon scanning exercise and those recorded previously on Ascension and St Helena. However, reports of a bat on Ascension did demonstrate we had not covered all possibilities! The animal turned out to be a bird and the likelihood of a bat arriving on Ascension is very low, but it did illustrate that we cannot be prepared for every eventuality and may have to improvise with the skills and equipment we do have.

Assumption 6: Cost-effective monitoring strategies are available for all species identified as high risk invaders.

Comments: We have been able to put in place effective monitoring of all high risk terrestrial species within the limited resources available. Marine species are more challenging, but our newly-recruited Marine Team Leader is a specialist in the use of environmental DNA (eDNA) to identify marine non-natives. As part of the establishment of our Marine Protected Area, we hope to roll out eDNA surveillance monitoring in conjunction with the Pew Charitable Trust and University of Liverpool by the end of 2020/21.

Assumption 7: FERA able to provide ongoing identification capability

Comments: This assumption has been violated and will present some difficulty for our ongoing surveillance monitoring. It became evident early on in the project that there was not sufficient capacity within FERA to provide an identification service for all OTs and this combined with the difficulty of sending samples from Ascension led to long delays. To some degree we were already prepared for this and have designed a border inspection and response regime that does not rely on identification; instead we are taking a precautionary approach and all organisms found in cargo will be assumed to be non-native. The lack of identification capacity will impact our ability to conduct effective post-border surveillance monitoring and pick up non-native species that have evaded the border controls. This is already compromised by our lack of knowledge about native and established non-native invertebrates. Further grant funding has been applied for to establish a baseline and build systems that allow on-island identification of invertebrate species. In the meantime, we are concentrating on being able to distinguish the highest risk introductions so that they can be quickly identified if they arrive on Ascension.

Assumption 8: The public are willing to engage with the range of education activities run through the project. People sufficiently aware of the importance of the issue to volunteer their time.

Comments: This aspect of the project has not progressed as far as hoped, however, we have seen a high level of interest amongst the Ascension population and the visibility of the project during training and consultation on the strategy has led a number of people to report sightings and ask for more information. So far this assumption has not been properly tested, but there are positive indications that it will be met.

#### **4 Project support to environmental and/or climate outcomes in the UKOTs**

Non-native species are identified as the major threat to biodiversity on Ascension in the National Biodiversity Action Plan with all 17 of the Species Action Plans citing it as a major threat. The Ascension Environmental Charter includes a commitment to attempt to control and eradicate non-native species, and the Ascension Marine Protected Area Management Plan lists non-native species as one of the major threats to achieving its objectives.

This project has established a biosecurity system on Ascension, reducing the risk of new introductions and taking a major step forward in tackling non-native species on the island. This will help Ascension to meet its obligations under the Convention on Biodiversity and Convention on Migratory Species as the species identified as the highest risk future invaders would threaten Ascension's endemic plants, invertebrates, frigatebird and fish as well as green turtle, which are listed on Annex I of the Bonn Convention.

The project has been designed specifically to create an effective biosecurity system that can be operated within the ongoing capacity of AIG.

#### **5 OPTIONAL: Gender equality**

In this instance there is not a gender aspect to the project and so this question is not relevant.



## **6 Sustainability and Legacy**

One of the main strengths of this project has been the focus from the beginning on how it would lead to a biosecurity system that could be sustained by AIG into the future. The starting point was the resources AIG would have to devote to this and working backwards from there to see if an effective system could be created within that limitation. Approaching the problem in this way has resulted in a strategy that can realistically be implemented. AIG will be the body responsible for implementing the strategy and our ownership of this project has ensured the outputs meet our needs for the sustained operation of the biosecurity system.

Ascension now has a strategy, legislation, protocols, equipment and most importantly a trained team in place to deliver much-needed biosecurity controls on the island. These elements have been tested during the development phase and will require minimal resources beyond those already available within AIG. Delivering the Biosecurity Strategy is written into the objectives of the Director of Conservation and Fisheries and the Biosecurity Officer ensuring there are individuals responsible and accountable for sustaining the process beyond the end of this project.

## **7 Lessons learned**

The collaboration with St Helena's Biosecurity Team has worked extremely well and the relationships formed will continue to strengthen the biosecurity controls on both islands beyond the end of this project. The timing of this project relative to TINSOT has also been very helpful allowing the outputs and expertise available through TINSOT to feed into this project. The approach taken to consult with those who will be affected by the changes and those who will be implementing the system throughout the development of the strategy has been crucial to the success of this project and resulted in widespread support from stakeholders.

A major difficulty with this project was progressing training and public engagement before the strategy and legislation had been finalised and approved by the Ascension Island Council. This was partly due to other priorities for the Council and an unexpected gap in legal capacity on the island that could not have been anticipated, but greater effort should have been made to progress the strategy and an outline of legal powers even if the legal drafting had to be delayed. This would have given us the assurance to press ahead with training and consultation knowing they would not be significantly altered in the future.

The main recommendation from this project is to involve stakeholders very early in the process and be prepared to address their areas of concern in research and consultation material rather than provide the information you have determined is important. Really listening to people and understanding what matters to them has allowed us to provide reassurance or find solutions and compromises that meet everyone's needs.

Development of policy and legislation is always a complicated and multi-staged process. As a result of this project, greater emphasis will be placed on scoping consultations and supporting information with stakeholders prior to it being produced to ensure it is focused on the questions they want answered.

### **7.1 Monitoring and evaluation**

Given the relatively low cost and short time period of this project it would be disproportionate to devote significant resources to Monitoring and Evaluation. The AIG Project Lead and Project Officer were responsible for M&E and used the internal AIG monitoring and evaluation protocols with the outputs listed in the logframe used as key performance indicators. As described in other sections of this report, these have mostly been met within the project time frame. The major slippage caused by the delay in approval for the strategy and the consequences of this for the public engagement strand, was picked up by the monitoring and recognised in the half year report. However, putting greater pressure on the Council or launching the public engagement campaign in advance of their approval risked jeopardising the

Council's overall support. It was felt that meeting the other project targets and accepting a delay to the public engagement strand was the best approach. The COVID-19 pandemic has further disrupted the public engagement work, but events and publicity has been undertaken and the resources have been produced for ongoing work in this area. AIG will have the staff capacity to continue after the end of this project and so the outputs will still be achieved in full.

The Gap analysis (Annex 7) demonstrates the very low baseline Ascension started from and the progress that has been made to achieving the project outcome. The outputs of this project have clearly contributed the necessary elements to creating a biosecurity system that simply didn't exist when the project began.

## 7.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

N/A – No previous reviews undertaken

## 8 Darwin Identity

The Darwin logo has been used in engagement and publicity material associated with this project (Annexes 8 and 17) and the contribution made acknowledged in the Biosecurity Strategy and during discussions with the Ascension Island Council. There is good recognition of the Darwin Initiative amongst the Council and senior members of AIG due to this project and past support for high profile work connected to the MPA and endemic plant restoration.

Social media posts publicizing the new biosecurity system linked to the Darwin Initiative channels and acknowledged the support received.

## 9 Finance and administration

### 9.1 Project expenditure

Project spend (indicative) in this financial year	2019/20 D+ Grant (£)	2019/20 Total actual D+ Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs				
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items				
Others (Please specify)				
<b>TOTAL</b>				

The only significant variation from the budget was the £ underspend in the other costs section. This was due to making a large saving in the shipping costs for the containers we purchased for use on Ascension as areas to fumigate or spray contaminated goods with pesticides. The shipping agent was extremely helpful and agreed to fill the containers with other cargo bound for Ascension and so we did not have to pay for shipping the full volume of the containers.



Department  
for Environment  
Food & Rural Affairs



Foreign &  
Commonwealth  
Office



Staff employed (Name and position)	Cost (£)
N/A	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

Consultancy – description and breakdown of costs	Other items – cost (£)
Pesticide trainer	
BPCAPesticide trainer	
Pesticide trainer	
Pesticide trainer	
Killgerm - Pesticide trainer	
Biofume - Biosecurity consultant (review of import standards)	
Biosecurity Research Ltd – Biosecurity consultant (review of response plans)	
Pesticide trainer	
Biofume – (review of surveillance protocols)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

Capital items – description	Capital items – cost (£)
Animal trapping equipment	
Tablet computers	
Treatment containers	
PPE	
PPE	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

Other items – description	Other items – cost (£)
Shipping	
Shipping	
Production of banners and signs	
Shipping	

Shipping	
Shipping	
Shipping	
Shipping	
Shipping	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

## 9.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Source of funding for project lifetime	Total (£)
AIG staff time in kind	
St Helena ENRD staff time in kind	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime	Total (£)
AIG staff time per year	
Consumables per year- AIG Conservation and Environmental Health budget	
RSPB (contribution towards Biosecurity Officer salary)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

## 9.3 Value for Money

This project provided excellent value for money establishing an entire biosecurity system within a very modest budget. It built capacity within existing AIG staff to not only use resources effectively, but also secure a strong legacy for the project. Where possible, external expertise was sought from the St Helena ENRD, which meant it was better tailored to the situation on a remote OT and also, because of the very generous support from our St Helena colleagues, incurred no cash cost. We were also fortunate that this project coincided with the TINSOT project meaning we benefitted from their expertise and outputs.

## Annex 1 Project's full current logframe as presented in the application form (unless changes have been agreed)

Please insert your project's logframe (if your project has a logframe), including indicators, means of verification and assumptions. N.B. if your application's logframe is presented in a different format in your application, please transpose into the below template. Please feel free to contact [Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk](mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk) if you have any questions regarding this.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Impact: Significant reduction in the risk that new non-native invasive species will become established on Ascension (Max 30 words)			
Outcome: Ascension will have an international-standard biosecurity system incorporating pre-border requirements, compliance inspections, rapid response and surveillance	0.1 By Y1Q4 compliance with APHA biosecurity capability checklist 0.2 By Y1Q4 effective inspections and response capability incorporated within AIG core functions 0.3 By Y1Q4 At least 25% of island population aware of biosecurity issues	0.1 Copy of completed checklist 0.2 Amended workplans, inspection reports, reports of incident response exercises 0.3 Records of attendance at public meetings, number of volunteers acting as 'eyes'. Public questionnaires	Appetite for introduction of biosecurity controls maintained within AIG and the Ascension Council.  AIG employees and importing organisations open to new working arrangements and maintain ongoing support for biosecurity controls
Outputs: <b>1. Pre border risk management system in place</b>	1.1 By Y1Q2 Import health standards adopted for 4 key import types 1.2 By Y1Q3 uptake of 4 import health standards by all importing organisations 1.3 By Y1Q2 coordination of 4 import health standards with St Helena	1.1 Import health standard documents available online 1.2 Copies of compliance certificates for all cargo 1.3 Correspondence between AIG and ANRD 1.4 Records of inspection visits 1.5 Declaration proforma and records of passenger completion	AIG Council are persuaded of the need and recommend adoption of new biosecurity regulations or instruction comes down from Governor.

	<p>1.4 By Y1Q3 Inspection visits made to 3 main importers in St Helena and UK</p> <p>1.5 By Y1Q2 biosecurity declaration required for all visitors</p>		
<p>2. On island inspection regime initiated</p>	<p>2.1 By Y1Q1 3 AIG staff trained in inspection techniques by ANRD</p> <p>2.2 By Y1Q2 6 further AIG staff trained in inspection techniques by AIG staff who visited St Helena</p> <p>2.3 By Y1Q3 inspections carried out on all high risk and proportion of all cargo and passengers at entry</p> <p>2.4 By Y1Q4 inspection regime able to detect contaminated cargo in two simulated exercises</p>	<p>2.1 Record of training attendance</p> <p>2.2 Record of training attendance</p> <p>2.3 Copies of inspection reports</p> <p>2.4 Results of simulated incident exercises</p>	<p>New biosecurity legislation is adopted giving AIG powers to inspect. AIG staff able to travel to St Helena.</p> <p>Training experience sufficiently comprehensive to allow effective dissemination and delivery of inspection regime</p>
<p>3. Rapid response capability operational</p>	<p>3.1 By Y1Q2 4 Incidence response plans in place and understood by key AIG personnel</p> <p>3.2 By Y1Q1 3 AIG staff gain qualifications in safe use of pesticides</p> <p>3.3 By Y1Q4 appropriate treatment identified and deployed within 1 hour of detection in two simulated incidents</p>	<p>3.1 Copies of incident response plans</p> <p>3.2 Qualification certificates</p> <p>3.3 Results of simulated incident exercises</p>	<p>New biosecurity legislation is adopted giving AIG powers to treat or destroy cargo.</p> <p>Range of treatment options developed on Ascension are appropriate for all scenarios.</p> <p>AIG staff feel sufficiently confident and empowered to enact incident response plans</p>

<p>4. Effective surveillance monitoring for high risk threats</p>	<p>4.1 By Y1Q2 traps appropriate for high risk species deployed and checked at 5 key locations</p> <p>4.2 By Y1Q2 effective procedures in place to identify any novel organisms</p>	<p>4.1 Copy of surveillance monitoring strategy and results of monitoring</p> <p>4.2 Copies of MoU between AIGCFD and FERA</p>	<p>Cost effective monitoring strategies are available for all species identified as high risk invaders.</p> <p>FERA able to provide ongoing identification capability</p>
<p>5. Raised public awareness of non-native species and actions to prevent the</p>	<p>5.1 By Y1Q3 500 copies of a leaflet and four banners highlighting biosecurity risks on Ascension produced and distributed online and displayed at key locations</p> <p>5.2 By Y1Q3 at least 25% of people living on Ascension aware of non-natives</p> <p>5.3 By Y1Q4 10 Volunteers trained to spot potential new introductions</p>	<p>5.1 Copies of leaflets. Photographs of banners displayed at port and airport</p> <p>5.2 Attendance at public meetings and copies of leaflets and signs, results of questionnaires before and after project</p> <p>5.3 Attendance at volunteer training and copies of monitoring forms filled out by volunteers</p>	<p>Public are willing to engage with the range of education activities run through the project. People sufficiently aware of the importance of the issue to volunteer their time.</p>
<p><b>Activities</b> (each activity is numbered according to the Output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)</p> <p>1.1 Create import health standards for fresh food, aggregate, plant materials and sea containers that are consistent with St Helena and international best practice</p> <p>1.2 Incorporate health standards into new regulations</p> <p>1.3 Communicate health standards to importing organisations and create verification and reporting procedures</p> <p>1.4 One member of AIG staff travel to St Helena and UK to conduct inspection visits and communicate new import procedures with main importers</p> <p>1.5 Communicate new biosecurity restrictions to SA Airlink for inclusion in passenger information and include biosecurity declaration in entry visa</p> <p>2.1 Three AIG staff travel to St Helena to receive training in inspection techniques</p> <p>2.2 Trained AIG staff in turn train 6 staff on Ascension in inspection techniques</p> <p>2.3 Inspection protocol designed and tested</p> <p>2.4 Inspections carried out on all shipments</p> <p>2.5 Two simulated incident exercises to test effectiveness of inspections</p>			

- 3.1 Purchase of container, equipment and pesticides
- 3.2 Three AIG staff travel to St Helena to receive training and gain qualification in safe use of pesticides.
- 3.3 Biosecurity incident plans created, tested through two exercises then refined
- 4.1 Devise surveillance monitoring strategy to capture high risk species identified in horizon scanning project
- 4.2 Deploy traps at five locations on island to cover points of entry and different habitat types. Begin monthly checks
- 4.3 Review and strengthen existing sample preparation protocols and relationship with FERA to ensure ongoing identification of specimens
- 5.1 Creation of leaflets and signs be available at entry ports, online and provided to all visa and import applicants
- 5.2 Meetings with island employers and open public meetings
- 5.3 Dedicated biosecurity themed activities with school and community groups and focus on biosecurity at AIGCFD visitor centre and event stalls
- 5.4 Recruit and train volunteers to be vigilant for new introductions

## Annex 2 Report of progress and achievements against final project logframe for the life of the project (if your project has a logframe)

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements for the life of the project
<b>Impact</b> Significant reduction in the risk that new non-native invasive species will become established on Ascension		As a result of this project a strategy and new legislation has been adopted that will reduce the risk of non-native species arriving on Ascension. AIG staff are now trained and equipped to detect and respond to new introductions and there is a high level of support for these measures amongst organisations on the island.
<b>Outcome:</b> Ascension will have an international-standard biosecurity system incorporating pre-border requirements, compliance inspections, rapid response and surveillance	0.1 By Y1Q4 compliance with APHA biosecurity capability checklist 0.2 By Y1Q4 effective inspections and response capability incorporated within AIG core functions 0.3 By Y1Q4 At least 25% of island population aware of biosecurity	The capability checklist shows significant improvement from the 2017 baseline with Ascension now having good provision in 13 of the 22 criteria (Annex 11) Effective inspections and responses are being carried out by trained AIG staff following protocols established during this project (Annexes 13 & 14) Two public meetings conducted. Materials have been prepared and engagement with organisations and members of the public during the



Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements for the life of the project
	issues	consultation has been positive. No measurement of awareness has yet been undertaken.
<b>Output 1. 1.</b> Pre border risk management system in place	1.1 By Y1Q2 Import health standards adopted for 4 key import types 1.2 By Y1Q3 uptake of 4 import health standards by all importing organisations 1.3 By Y1Q2 coordination of 4 import health standards with St Helena 1.4 By Y1Q3 Inspection visits made to 3 main importers in St Helena and UK 1.5 By Y1Q2 biosecurity declaration required for all visitors	Import health standards have been prepared for eight classes of imports and will come into legal force in May 2020 (Annex 6). The standards have followed the format of those on St Helena and where possible the same measures have been stipulated. There has been no legal requirement to follow the Import Health Standards, but two importers and the contractors repairing the runway have already begun following them and allowing us to carry out inspections on a voluntary basis (Annex 13).  Visits were made to three importers and shipping agents in St Helena and the UK allowing the proposed new standards to be explained.  A biosecurity declaration form has been prepared but its formal use will not begin until the legislation is adopted.
Activity 1.1 Create import health standards for fresh food, aggregate, plant materials and sea containers that are consistent with St Helena and international best practice		Eight Import Health Standards have been created following the model of St Helena (Annex 6)
Activity 1.2 Incorporate health standards into new regulations		The Import Health Standards form part of the new Biosecurity Regulations
Activity 1.3 Communicate health standards to importing organisations and create verification and reporting procedures		The Import Health Standards have been developed in consultation with importers. Compliance checking procedures are in place.
Activity 1.4 One member of AIG staff travel to St Helena and UK to conduct inspection visits and communicate new import procedures with main importers		One member of AIG staff travelled to St Helena and the UK in May/June 2019 to discuss new import requirements with major importers
Activity 1.5 Communicate new biosecurity restrictions to SA Airlink for inclusion in passenger information and include biosecurity declaration in		Biosecurity declaration prepared. COVID restrictions on incoming flights mean entry procedures have changed, but declarations will form part of

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements for the life of the project
entry visa		normal procedures when these resume.
<b>Output 2.</b> On island inspection regime initiated	<p>2.1 By Y1Q1 3 AIG staff trained in inspection techniques by ANRD</p> <p>2.2 By Y1Q2 6 further AIG staff trained in inspection techniques by AIG staff who visited St Helena</p> <p>2.3 By Y1Q3 inspections carried out on all high risk and proportion of all cargo and passengers at entry</p> <p>2.4 By Y1Q4 inspection regime able to detect contaminated cargo in two simulated exercises</p>	<p>3 AIG staff trained in St Helena inspection techniques (Annex 12)</p> <p>6 AIG staff trained on island to carry out inspections Jan-March 2020.</p> <p>Inspections being carried out on a proportion of cargo entering Ascension based on risk assessment (Annex 13)</p> <p>Simulated incidents demonstrated effectiveness of inspections on break bulk cargo</p>
Activity 2.1 Three AIG staff travel to St Helena to receive training in inspection techniques	3 AIG staff were trained on St Helena by ANRD in May/June 2019	
Activity 2.2 Trained AIG staff in turn train 6 staff on Ascension in inspection techniques	6 AIG staff trained by those who visited St Helena following adaptation of inspection protocols	
Activity 2.3 Inspection protocol designed and tested	Inspection protocol has been created and used on containerised and break bulk cargo entering Ascension	
Activity 2.4 Inspections carried out on all shipments	Inspections being carried out on shipments with the agreement of 2 importers. AIG will have the power to inspect all cargo from November 2020	
Activity 2.5 Two simulated incident exercises to test effectiveness of inspections	Two simulated incidents carried out using small objects hidden in break bulk cargo	
<b>Output 3.</b> Rapid response capability operational	3.1By Y1Q2 4 Incidence response plans in place and understood by key AIG personnel	<p>Emergency response plans have been prepared for the different categories of introduction that will be encountered (Annex 14).</p> <p>Two members of AIG staff is now trained in the safe use of pesticides and</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements for the life of the project
	<p>3.2 By Y1Q1 3 AIG staff gain qualifications in safe use of pesticides</p> <p>3.3 By Y1Q4 appropriate treatment identified and deployed within 1 hour of detection in two simulated incidents</p>	<p>further pest control techniques (Annex 15).</p> <p>Simulated incidents were not carried out because inspections resulted in detections that allowed the response capability to be tested under real life conditions. The response procedures worked well and have improved with the delivery of training and equipment.</p>
Activity 3.1 Purchase of container, equipment and pesticides	Equipment and treatment containers have been purchased and delivered to Ascension.	
Activity 3.2 Three AIG staff travel to St Helena to receive training and gain qualification in safe use of pesticides.	The pesticide training course on St Helena was cancelled. Two members of AIG staff received training in the safe use of pesticides in the UK.	
Activity 3.3 Biosecurity incident plans created, tested through two exercises then refined	Emergency response plans have been created and tested following real life detections. Simulated exercises were not felt to necessary as responses to real life detections provided better training opportunity.	
<b>Output 4.</b> Effective surveillance monitoring for high risk threats	<p>5.1 By Y1Q2 traps appropriate for high risk species deployed and checked at 5 key locations</p> <p>By Y1Q2 effective procedures in place to identify any novel organisms</p>	<p>A post-border surveillance monitoring protocol has been put in place to include all high risk potential introductions and is being carried out by AIG staff.</p> <p>It has not yet been possible to establish procedures for the identification of species caught during the monitoring. We are exploring ways to increase expertise on Ascension and use crowd-sourcing to identify more complicated taxa.</p>
Activity 4.1 Devise surveillance monitoring strategy to capture high risk species identified in horizon scanning project	Surveillance monitoring protocol has been produced including all high risk species (Annex 16)	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements for the life of the project
Activity 4.2 Deploy traps at five locations on island to cover points of entry and different habitat types. Begin monthly checks	Sampling is taking place at 10 locations every 2-3 months. A lower frequency of sampling over a greater area was felt to be a better use of resources.	
Activity 4.3 Review and strengthen existing sample preparation protocols and relationship with FERA to ensure ongoing identification of specimens	Unable to establish procedures to allow identification of samples during project	
<b>Output 5.</b> Raised public awareness of non-native species and actions to prevent the	<p>5.1 By Y1Q3 500 copies of a leaflet and four banners highlighting biosecurity risks on Ascension produced and distributed online and displayed at key locations</p> <p>5.2 By Y1Q3 at least 25% of people living on Ascension aware of non-natives</p> <p>1. 5.3 By Y1Q4 10 Volunteers trained to spot potential new introductions</p>	<p>The banners, leaflets and posters have been produced and displayed at key locations around the island. The leaflet is sent to all visitors and new recruits to the island.</p> <p>Public meetings, workplace briefings, press articles and social media have been used to raise awareness of biosecurity on Ascension. A total of 76 people attended the meetings (approximately 10% of the population).</p> <p>Volunteer training has not begun due to the delay in introducing the legislation and restrictions due to COVID. This will take place in late 2020</p>
Activity 5.1 Creation of leaflets and signs be available at entry ports, online and provided to all visa and import applicants	Leaflets, banners and posters have been produced (Annex 17)	
Activity 5.2 Meetings with island employers and open public meetings	Meetings with island employers and individuals took place during the strategy consultation work (Annex 11). Two public meetings and workplace briefings with AIG and Interserve staff took place in August 2020 prior to the introduction of the legislation. In total 76 people attended these meetings.	
Activity 5.3 Dedicated biosecurity themed activities with school and community groups and focus on	This has not taken place due to the delay in getting approval for the strategy and legislation and then restrictions on public events due to COVID-19. Now scheduled for late 2020	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements for the life of the project
biosecurity at AIGCFD visitor centre and event stalls		
Activity 5.4 Recruit and train volunteers to be vigilant for new introductions		Volunteers have not been recruited yet due to the delay in getting approval for the strategy and legislation and then restrictions on gatherings due to COVID-19. Now scheduled for late 2020

## Annex 3 Standard Measures

Code	Description	Totals (plus additional detail as required)
<b>Training Measures</b>		
1	Number of (i) students from the UKOTs; and (ii) other students to receive training (including PhD, masters and other training and receiving a qualification or certificate)	
2	Number of (i) people in UKOTs; and (ii) other people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification	
3a	Number of (i) people in UKOTs; and (ii) other people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (i.e. not categories 1-5 above)	i) 2 people gained formal qualifications (Safe use of pesticides and pest control qualifications)  9 people gained informal training in inspection and response techniques
3b	Number of training weeks (i) in UKOTs; (ii) outside UKOTs not leading to formal qualification	i) 8 ii) 10
4	Number of types of training materials produced. Were these materials made available for use by UKOTs?	Training presentation, inspection protocols and response procedure documents produced. These are held in the AIG management system and available to all AIG staff involved in biosecurity duties.
5	Number of UKOT citizens who have increased capacity to manage natural resources as a result of the project	9
<b>Research Measures</b>		
9	Number of species/habitat management plans/strategies (or action plans) produced for/by Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the UKOTs	
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work in UKOTs related to species identification, classification and recording.	
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals written by (i) UKOT authors; and (ii) other authors	
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere written by (i) UKOT authors; and (ii) other authors	
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information). Were these databases made	1

<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Totals (plus additional detail as required)</b>
	available for use by UKOTs?	
13a	Number of species reference collections established. Were these collections handed over to UKOTs?	
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced. Were these collections handed over to UKOTs?	1
<b>Dissemination Measures</b>		
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops/stakeholder meetings organised to present/disseminate findings from UKOT's Darwin project work	2
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops/stakeholder meetings attended at which findings from the Darwin Plus project work will be presented/ disseminated	
<b>Physical Measures</b>		
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to UKOT(s)	
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisation established in UKOTs	
22	Number of permanent field plots established in UKOTs	
23	Value of resources raised from other sources (e.g., in addition to Darwin funding) for project work	

## Annex 4 Publications

Type *	Detail	Nationality of lead author	Nationality of institution of lead author	Gender of lead author	Publishers	Available from
(e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	(title, author, year)				(name, city)	(e.g. weblink, contact address, annex etc)
Policy	Ascension Biosecurity Strategy, Diane Baum, 2020	British (living on Ascension)	Ascension	Female	Ascension Island Government	<a href="http://www.ascension.bov.ac/travel/biosecurity">www.ascension.bov.ac/travel/biosecurity</a>
Legislation	Ascension Biosecurity Ordinance, St Helena AG's Chambers, 2020	British (living on Ascension)	St Helena	Male	St Helena Ag's Chambers	<a href="http://www.ascension.bov.ac/travel/biosecurity">www.ascension.bov.ac/travel/biosecurity</a>



## Annex 5 Darwin Contacts

<b>Ref No</b>	DPLUS096
<b>Project Title</b>	Building Ascension Island's Biosecurity Capability
<b>Project Leader Details</b>	
Name	Diane Baum
Role within Darwin Project	Project Lead
Address	Conservation Office, Georgetown, Ascension Island
Phone	
Skype	
Email	
<b>Partner 1</b>	
Name	Julie Balchin
Organisation	St Helena ENRD
Role within Darwin Project	Training and mentoring
Address	
Skype	
Email	
<b>Partner 2 etc.</b>	
Name	
Organisation	
Role within Darwin Project	
Address	
Skype	
Email	

## Checklist for submission

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