

Darwin Plus: Overseas Territories Environment and Climate Fund Annual Report

Important note *To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders:
it is expected that this report will be about 10 pages in length, excluding annexes*

Submission Deadline: 30 April

Darwin Plus Project Information

Project Ref Number	DPLUS039
Project Title	Sustainable development and management of St. Helena's fisheries and marine tourism.
Territory(ies)	St Helena, South Atlantic
Contract Holder Institution	Environment and Natural Resources Directorate, St Helena Government
Partner Institutions	Plymouth University, South Atlantic Environmental Research Institute, Georgia Aquarium, Mote Marine Laboratory, Ascension Island Government Conservation Department (AIGCD),
Grant Value	£141,230.00
Start/end date of project	April 2015 – June 2017
Reporting period (e.g., Apr 2015-Mar 2016) and number (e.g., AR 1,2)	Apr 2015-Mar 2016
Project Leader Name	Mrs Elizabeth Clingham & Mr Gerald Benjamin
Project website/Twitter/Blog etc	Facebook pages: Nature conservation, St. Helena, Georgia Aquarium and St. Helena Government
Report author(s) and date	Mrs Elizabeth Clingham

1. Project Overview

St Helena is one of the most remote islands in the world. It is situated in the South Atlantic Ocean 1200 miles from Southern Africa and 1800 miles from South America.



The island's economy is dependent of British Aid. Access to the island is currently only possible by ship, but the British government has recently facilitated the construction of an airport to create easier access to the island to help support economic development. Two important sectors in the island's long-term goal of self-sufficiency are marine tourism and commercial fishing. The island has long been protected by its isolation, if development is not properly informed and managed the island's relatively pristine environment is in jeopardy of being impacted. This Darwin Project is ambitious and aims to achieve the development of monitoring tools, protocols and procedures to support the sustainable management of these two key economic sectors. It aims to fill data gaps that currently exist so that management decisions are made on evidence based advice appropriate to St Helena's marine ecosystem, society, economic growth and changes that St Helena will be subjected to in the very near future.

2. Project Progress

2.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

Please see updated project workplan/timeline Annex I as result of change requests approved in August 2015 and January 2016 (Ref. 15-017 &15-033)

Output 1: Capacity building - Marine section staff trained as local fisheries observers.

- 1.1 Activity completed. Fisheries scientist post terms of reference were drafted and the post advertised in June 2015. None of the five applicants met the full criteria for the post. Change request submitted to Darwin in August 2015 (Ref 15-017) to extend fisheries scientific work and to request that project post be changed to consultancy. Consultant contract in place by October 2015.
- 1.2 Activity completed. Terms of reference drafted and local post advertised April 2015. Attracted 3 applicants two of which were interviewed. Post holder successfully appointed in July 2015.
- 1.3 Activity partly completed. Successful in-house and on the job training conducted by fisheries consultant (see Annex 2). Training is planned with AIGCD in August 2016 for St Helena staff to learn otolith sectioning and reading techniques and gonad histology preparation and interpretation.

Output 2: Assessment of commercial fisheries undertaken.

(Change request submitted and approved in Jan 16 (Ref15-033) no longer assessing ground fish species)

- 2.1 Historical data collected but no real effort data exists. Limited data on location of fishing activities are available. This work area has been conducted as per revised project implementation timetable.
- 2.2 Observer database established in December 2015 and revised in March 2016. (Annex 3 pages 32 - 43)
- 2.3 Logbooks issued to all offshore vessels and, when returned, data are added to the database.
- 2.4 Observers deployed on inshore and offshore vessels as relevant to the local capacity (offshore – once per month since November 2015 to present; inshore (commercial/sports)- 4 times/ month).
- 2.5 Geospatial analysis not yet conducted. The existing data are not georeferenced, so geospatial analysis is not possible. Once the vessels are required to complete log-sheets much better data will be available. Activity is to be addressed in year two of project, if possible.

- 2.6 Limited by the quality of the data. Very simple analysis of the monthly landings and SST will be possible. It may be possible to undertake some analysis of ICCAT data on a broader scale.
- 2.7 Tuna tagging program commenced in November 2015 and is on-going. To date 96 tuna have been tagged.
- 2.8 Fisheries Management Plan and licensing activity to be addressed in year two of project.

Output 3: Age, growth and reproductive biology of main inshore and offshore commercial fish species is significantly advance

- 3.1 Otoliths have been collected. Sectioning, processing and reading to be conducted in August 2016 as per revised project implementation timetable.
- 3.2 Gonads assessed on observer trips for maturity, subsamples collected will be analysed August 2016.
- 3.3 Growth curve, reproduction maturity work area to be addressed in year two of project.

Output 4: Bycatch risk assessments for seabirds, turtles and sharks in commercial fishing fleet are established.

- 4.1 Seabird interaction with fishing activity recorded during observer trips and documented in observer reports.
- 4.2 Seabird tracking data collected. Geospatial analysis not yet conducted. Activity to be addressed in year 2 of project.
- 4.3 Only pole and line fishing currently being undertaken. A protocol has been developed for longlining trials if and when they take place.
- 4.4 No bycatch recorded to date. Section will be addressed in year two of project.

Output 5: A strategy for on- going monitoring and management of St. Helena's fishery is developed and implemented.

- 5.1 A plan for monitoring and management will be prepared and discussed with stakeholders later in 2016.

Output 6: Reporting by observer of marine based tourism compliance and human interaction with marine species

- 6.1 Three current marine conservation section staff that helped to establish the marine environment tour operator accreditation scheme have been deployed as observers. The accreditation scheme includes a detailed checklist of environment related criteria which operators are assessed against (as per training delivered to all marine tour operators in February 2016). (see Annex 4 Part B).
- 6.2 All local marine tour operators have been initially assessed through multiple choice, oral assessment and spot checks on board tour vessels.

Output 7: Establish comprehensive information regarding whale shark and cetaceans in St. Helena's waters (including data on identification photos (eco ocean), biological data and tagging (whale sharks only))

- 7.1 30 PAT sat tags have been deployed on Whale Sharks since January 2016.

- 7.2 All whale sharks sighted during dedicated survey timeframe in January 2016 have been photographed and sexed where possible and a small proportion biopsied. All photo ID records have been submitted to Wildbook for Whale Sharks (previously, ECO OCEAN) (see Annex 5).
- 7.3 PSAT tags have been programmed for release from whale sharks from April 2016 until January 2017 so no data analysis can be conducted until this time.
- 7.4 All existing humpback whale records have been properly catalogued. Dolphin IDs are still to be processed.

Output 8: Deployment of mechanical & PSAT tags on marlin and tuna.

- 8.1 Satellite tagging of tuna is scheduled for September 2016 (per change request submitted in January 2016 (Ref 15-033) Marlin have not been caught recently, so tagging is unlikely to be possible. Mechanical tags have been deployed on yellowfin and skipjack tuna.
- 8.2 Species action plan for marlin to be addressed in year two of project. No marlin have been caught since the project started.

Output 9: Application of marine ecosystem services assessment

- 9.1 A full ecosystem service assessment has been completed for fisheries and tourism activities on St Helena. September 2015 fieldwork visit included a stakeholder workshop (agenda included in annex 6 of report noted in 9.2) and meetings with key representatives to access data sources.
- 9.2 A report has been produced that describes the methods and the results of the ecosystem service assessment. This includes a qualitative assessment of social and economic benefits associated with fisheries and tourism activities, the significance (or importance) of these ecosystem services to the local community and the identification of pressures and vulnerability to 'change'. The full report is attached (Annex...).

Output 10: Development and application of future marine management scenarios

- 10.1 A second fieldwork visit in March 2016 enabled the gathering of primary and secondary economic data from key stakeholders in tourism and fisheries. Valuations were presented to a representative group (Annex 7). The select group took part in a future scenario management planning workshop (Annex 8).
- 10.2 A report is currently being prepared to provide recommendations for future marine management measures to protect the marine ecosystem whilst supporting the realisation of social and economic benefits. Report due in Q2 Year 2. August 2016. This will be delayed until September/October to provide ample time for stakeholder feedback on the draft report.

Output 11: Marine Ecosystem Service Assessment and Marine Planning capacity building programme.

- 11.1 Written guidelines to support the future application of social and economic assessment methods to inform marine management and planning will be included in the report submitted for 10.2.
- 11.2 Plymouth University are currently in discussion with project lead to decide how output might best be achieved given the current status of the marine management plan for St Helena and remaining budget.

2.2 Project support to environmental and/or climate outcomes in the UKOTs

This project has facilitated the commencement of a fisheries science program which was limited before now. Local capacity has been significantly increased as all marine conservation staff have acquired the necessary practical skill to collect and collate high quality data sets and biological samples.

A marine tourism environmental accreditation scheme and assessment has been created which is a tool designed for long-term management of marine tourism and the impacts.

We have been able to compliment both sectors with eco-system services assessments with a view to supporting marine planning on St Helena to protect biodiversity and the associated human wellbeing. The ecosystem service assessment has been designed to be transferable to other UKTOs.

2.3 Progress towards project outputs

Outcome:	Paste here		
	Baseline	Change by 2016	Source of evidence
Output 1: Capacity building - Marine section staff trained as local fisheries observers.	<p>No fisheries science expertise on island. Local staff only have basic fisheries science skills</p> <p>No fisheries observer program in place. No observer data</p>	<p>Fisheries science consultant in place.</p> <p>Local marine conservation worker (fisheries) engaged in employment in July 2015.</p> <p>Training for local staff</p> <p>Observer training and sample collection training complete.</p>	<p>Marine science contract dated 23/10/2015</p> <p>Marine conservation worker letter of appointment dated 22/7/2015.</p> <p>Annexes 2 & 3.</p>
Fisheries stock assessment undertaken	No fisheries stock assessment data present.	<p>Historical fisheries data have been collated, but there is no effort data and limited data on location of fishing. Monthly SST data obtained for St Helena inshore area and Cardno seamount from 1980 to 2014</p> <p>Fisheries Sampling protocol document prepared. Database established with basic manual (Observer database incorporated into main database and observer</p>	<p>Annex 2 & 3.</p> <p>Annex 3</p>

	<p>No fishing effort data reporting requirements imposed on fishing community.</p> <p>No observer presence on local fishing vessels.</p>	<p>guidance notes included in sampling protocol). Training is planned with AIGCD in August 2016 for St Helena staff to learn otolith sectioning and reading and gonad histology</p> <p>Offshore log-books are in use by most vessels.</p> <p>Observers have been deployed on offshore and inshore vessels where possible. There is currently no obligation for inshore vessels to take observers and some are unwilling to do so voluntarily. No observers yet on sports fishing vessels.</p>	Annex 2
<p>Age growth and reproductive biology of main inshore and offshore commercial fish species is significantly advanced.</p>	<p>Grouper data exists. Little/no data available on other inshore species or offshore commercial species for ageing or reproduction for St. Helena</p>	<p>Otoliths have been collected from over 200 fish. The main target species is Yellowfin tuna and various bait fish species</p> <p>Over 300 fish have been assessed for reproductive status and gonads of more than 30 gonads fixed for histology in August 2016.</p>	Annex 2
<p>By catch risk assessments for seabirds, turtles and sharks in commercial fishing fleet are established</p>	<p>Levels of seabird, turtle and shark by-catch in St. Helena commercial fisheries is unknown</p>	<p>No formal training has been undertaken, but observers are required to collect seabird data, particularly any interactions with fishing gear. Whilst the fishery is</p>	Annex 3 section 4 of report.

		pole & line only, there is no need for any by-catch mitigation other than catch and release requirements for sharks and marlin.	
A fisheries management plan for management and on- going monitoring of St. Helena's fishery is developed and implemented	No data recording forms or detailed long term methodology/management available	A plan for monitoring and management will be prepared and discussed with stakeholders later in 2016.	
Reporting by observer of marine based tourism compliance and human interaction with marine species.	Best practice guidelines available including policy on whale shark and cetacean interactions however currently no observations of marine tourism compliance with these or mandatory data collection.	Marine Environmental Accreditation scheme launched in Feb 2016.	See Annex 4
Establish comprehensive information system regarding whale shark and cetaceans in St. Helena's waters (including data on identification photos (eco ocean), biological data and tagging (whale sharks only)	Limited resources, no capacity on island for dedicated monitoring or compliance or data collection towards a management information system.	Dedicated whale shark research conducted in January 2016. 31 whale sharks tagged with acoustic (archival and live data) and satellite tags. Eco Ocean populated with over 280 entries of whale sharks from St. Helena. I3S program populated with all archived Humpback whale photo ID records.	See Annex 5
Deployment of mechanical	No data on migration routes of these	Tuna tagging programme	

& PSAT tags on marlin and tuna	species available	commenced. Despite considerable time and effort only 96 of the mechanical tags have been deployed so far on small yellowfin and skipjack tuna. PSAT tags are on order and will be deployed in collaboration with experienced US research team.	
Application of marine ecosystem services assessment (incl. social and economic benefits)	No data currently exist on the relationship between the marine ecosystem functions, the services they generate, and the social and economic benefits to St. Helena.	Ecosystem Services assessment completed. This including a workshop to provide a qualitative evaluation of the significance of the ecosystem service provision to St Helena and vulnerability to 'change'. Report written describing the social and economic benefits associated with fisheries and tourism activities.	Workshop agenda included in annex 6 of report (9.2) Final report
Development and application of future marine management scenarios	There is no mechanism at present to model the likely impacts of management measures on the social and economic benefits generated by fisheries and tourism.	Primary economic data collected. Secondary data consolidated. Workshop convened with key representatives with an interest in marine resource use management Report currently being prepared due Yr2 Q2.	Workshop agenda (see Annex 8). Primary valuation studies (see Annex 6).
Marine Ecosystem Service Assessment and Marine Planning capacity building programme	There is no capacity for ecosystem services assessment to support marine planning and management.	Currently discussing option for delivery with project lead to best meet local need and available budget.	

		Planning for incorporation into 10.2	
--	--	--------------------------------------	--

Overall the significant progress has been made towards delivering all project outputs in line with project activities. It is safe to assume that based on the progress made to date, the limitations as outlined below and the changes that have been made to the project will ensure that we achieve project outputs. In the section above it clearly describes the tools that have already been established - Capacity building, protocol and procedure, databases, schemes etc.

2.4 Progress towards the project outcome

Outcome:	Paste here		
	Baseline	Change by 2016	Source of evidence
<i>Establish the local capacity to conduct fisheries science, facilitating the collection the collection of necessary data for comprehensive stock assessment contributing to a well managed fisheries</i>	Limited fisheries science capacity, basic data collection	<p>Four local staff trained in practical collection of comprehensive fisheries science data, biological sampling and data management.</p> <p>Fisheries science consultancy supporting the above to ensure integrity and understanding.</p> <p>Good local stakeholder engagement and buy in to fisheries science.</p> <p>This outcome has already been met to a degree in terms of capacity building and in that the data collected will significantly contribute to informing future stock assessments.</p>	Observer reports, summary of data collected to date.
Monitoring and compliance of established marine tourism management	No monitoring of marine tourism activities	Marine environment tour operator accreditation pilot scheme in place and operational. All local marine	Observer reports, operator logbooks, operator assessments, accreditation

<p>scheme. Research will be conducted on anthropogenic influences on the marine ecosystem from tourism activities.</p>		<p>tour operators trained and assessed. Regular tour assessment conducts as per success indicators to date.</p>	<p>database.</p>
<p>Assess the ecosystem services and quantify the social and economic benefits associated with developing marine based industries to pre-empt potential risk and facilitate proactive management strategies.</p>	<p>No data currently exist on the relationship between the marine ecosystem functions, the services they generate, and the social and economic benefits to St. Helena.</p> <p>There is no mechanism at present to model the likely impacts of management measures on the social and economic benefits generated by fisheries and tourism.</p> <p>There is no capacity for ecosystem services assessment to support marine planning and management.</p>	<p>Delivery of an ecosystem services assessment, including an estimate of the social and economic benefits derived from the ecosystem services.</p> <p>Management measures that protect ecosystem function whilst generating enhanced social and economic benefits are identified.</p> <p>A minimum of 10 people trained in ecosystem service assessment to support marine planning and management.</p>	<p>Ecosystem services assessment report</p> <p>Ecosystem services assessment report (valuation)</p> <p>Report presenting recommendations for future marine management measures.</p> <p>Production of a concise guide to ecosystem service assessment.</p> <p>Certificate of attendance at capacity building activities</p>

2.5 Monitoring of risks

The biggest risk to the project was in relation to recruitment of our fisheries scientist. Nevertheless this has been overcome through the appointment of Dr Martin Collins as our Fisheries Science Consultant, which, in hindsight has worked in our favour. As an SHG section we have evolved far quicker than envisaged in the fisheries science capacity building element of the project. In the long-term this is more sustainable as we have been forced to accelerate and adapt the learning process more efficiently. Dr Collins mentorship can be assessed and evaluated upon his return trips and we are still seen locally to be leading on work areas.

The next biggest risk to the success of this project is local stakeholders potentially failing to provide assistance. This has been a risk that has required tactful management especially within the fishing community. Below are examples of how stakeholder engagement has been conducted and what changes have been required to minimise the effects of this risk.

Examples

- In an effort to keep the fishing community informed and up to speed with project development, initially engagement was in the form of meetings with the Fisherman's Association and other fisheries stakeholder groups (Fish processing plant, St. Helena Fisheries Corporation, Enterprise St. Helena etc) however, key stakeholder groups appeared not to be effectively disseminating information to all fishermen on the ground making compliance with some of our work programs difficult as they did not understand what was required and why. So we had to backtrack and engage with each fisherman independently.
- The fishing industry was disturbed when the longstanding fisheries cold store company (ARGOS) withdrew their management. This disruption impacted the staff at the complex, which had a knock on effect on the reception to our work requirements. Nevertheless, we have re-established our working relationship under new management with success.
- The tuna tagging programme has made a slow start, partly due to the late delivery of the 150 mm tags, which are suitable for the larger tuna. Despite considerable time and effort only 100 of the mechanical tags have been deployed so far on small yellowfin and skipjack tuna. This is due to the unpredictable nature of tuna catches. Fishermen are also understandably reluctant to return tuna alive, so tagging larger fish will be difficult and probably best done with the sports fishermen.
- The fisheries licensing system, which was envisaged to be in place early in the project has been delayed by the complexity of St Helena's political structures and the departure of key staff (e.g. the Attorney General). This means that the data reporting requirements are not yet mandatory. However, by direct engagement with many fishermen, we have been able to continue with data collection, sample collection and tagging on a voluntary basis with a view to licensing being formalised in project year 2016 – 17.

The failure of the Island airport to be certified as intended poses potential to impact on the PSAT tagging plans, Ascension Island training plans and visits of our fisheries consultant and other project partners. To date no travel can be organised beyond July 2016. It is hoped however that the SHG will be announcing alternative arrangements in the not too distant future.

3. Project Stakeholders/Partners

Since the start of the project we have conducted regular formal and informal meetings with key stakeholders. There have also been workshops in support of the ecosystem services parts of the projects. There was also a series of public talks on the project as part of the “Making March Marine” initiative.

Within the local marine tourism community the implementation of the marine environment accreditation scheme initially involved one-to-one sessions with each tour operator so each could independently feed back into the proposed scheme and its working system. The scheme was officially presented with little-to-no resistance, as they had been involved throughout the development of the scheme. The scheme was informally presented to local council and taken forward formally and endorsed with no hesitation. A training workshop was hosted in February 2016 which was attended by all local active tour operators supported by the St Helena Tourist office and Enterprise St Helena. Local marine tour operators and other stakeholders have now taken ownership of the accreditation system and are proud to be associated with it. All operators are continuing to work well with us in delivering the project aims and objectives and, most importantly, have accepted that this is a system that has now set the tone for sustainable management of marine tourism.



Photos of local tour operators receiving certificates of attendance and participating in marine environmental accreditation training

The fisheries community is rather more complex, but our one-to-one approach to engagement with the fisherman has proved highly beneficial. The majority of local fishermen are complying voluntarily with observer presence on boats and facilitated tagging and as a result our working relationship has improved and we are seen as part of the fishing community.

March was a month dedicated to raising awareness of the marine environment; the marine section conducted school assemblies and contributed to various lessons which cover every school child from the age of 3 to 18 years old. We conducted various public talks, made two project themed videos for local TV (Ref <https://vimeo.com/156234839>), did numerous radio interviews and supported various marine inspired activities (water sports, craft sessions, reading sessions etc).#MakingMarchMarine

Each project partner has delivered in their work areas as proposed. Despite the wide geographic spread of project partners communication has not been an issue. The various partners have added quality to the project outcomes to date and this has already significantly contributed to the long-term sustainable management of St Helena’s Marine environment.

4. Monitoring and evaluation

Financially the project is managed within the SHG finance regulations which allows for accurate management of accounts.

With the creation of the fisheries database and marine accreditation database queries are run on a need bases and compared against set project targets to ensure that minimum data requirements have been met each month.

The original Darwin application is used a reference document and regularly reviewed by the project manager to ensure an up to date status. Project status is also reviewed with senior ENRD management.

There has been no effort in this year in co-ordinating all project partners as one group but rather as groups appropriate to the work area that has needed to be undertaken. This is something that will be addressed in year two of the project.

5. Lessons learnt

Overall the project has been running rather smoothly, almost to plan except for the initial recruitment of a fisheries scientist and of course the subsequent delay in the commencement of fisheries science works areas.

In terms of lesson learnt I think that for the future, any project that St Helena submits should always allow for the first three months as preparation time for logistics etc. St Helena's ability to recruit people, procure goods etc. is always hindered by our isolation. Additionally, technical projects such as these will always change once the necessary "expert/ expertise" is recruited as often methodology or outputs will change based on the support or input facilitated by new or proposed project staff. Finally, once the project commences and work areas develop often it is at this point that we realise that other work areas require additional technical support which on St. Helena is not easily available and can come at a cost to the project either in time or money.

Better methods for quantifying M&E are required for year 2 of project.

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

N/A

7. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

This project has been significantly enhanced by the engagement of the fisheries science consultancy because they are able to take a more holistic approach to our work programmes and the fishing industry as a whole. This has added value and respect to the nature of our work and changed perception of marine conservation within the fishing industry and the future of these work areas.

This project has had the added advantage of being able to assess risk based on the experience of the Darwin Plus funded "Ascension Island Marine Sustainability (AIMS) – a fisheries and marine biodiversity project" (DPLUS 021) project based in Ascension island and we have been able to pre-empt required changes in a timely manner as a result of our liaisons with them.

8. Sustainability

With the social economic element of the project we have had to ensure that all people, interests and uses of the marine environment are considered together. Through the workshops/presentations conducted we have been able to demonstrate the project strategy to key groups which has laid the foundation that we are as much as possible trying to manage our marine environment taking all into account.

Locally the project profile has been high. Within the local community the various schemes (tuna tagging, Whale Shark photo ID submissions) have created much interest. The marine section has built stronger working relationships with the fishing industry as we have been able to communicate the importance of science in



Tuna tagging scheme logo

the development of the sector. Many fishermen often see team members and ask for updates. The Marine tourism community has accepted the accreditation scheme and proud to be a part of it.

Most importantly the project outputs to date have given marine conservation and fisheries a stronger voice within the SHG and political arena. The project outputs have facilitated the development of four key members of staff in being confident and competent fisheries scientists. The establishment of the tuna tagging scheme has been a significant achievement. This programme links to similar initiatives in the Atlantic as a component of the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas tagging programme and will be maintained beyond the life of the project. Once the pilot is completed the marine tourism management scheme will be made a legal requirement under legislation and will be on-going post project. Fisheries science has added to the profile of the St. Helena fish product and has now been seen as a necessary tool in developing the industry sustainability but also adding value.

9. Darwin Identity

The Darwin logo has been used on all published material (posters, press releases, local TV educational videos) as well as in newspaper articles. When radio interviews were given reference was always given to the work being funded by the Darwin Initiative. The project continues to be referred to as the Marine Darwin project locally, and the project vehicle is also referred to as the “Darwinator”.

Due to the small population of St Helena and outreach of the project a large percent of people on island will be familiar with the Darwin Initiative from Government staff, councillors, the general public, school children and stakeholders for the project.

More specifically new work areas such as tuna tagging and whale shark photo ID submissions has required public participation for those that have contributed to our appeals. T-shirts bearing the Darwin logo and scheme logo have been offered as thank you gifts and often worn with pride by recipients.

Social media sites such as Facebook etc. have been an avenue for posting any of the above publications (see Facebook pages: Nature conservation, St. Helena, Georgia Aquarium and St. Helena Government).

Links:

- <http://voices.nationalgeographic.com/2016/04/11/worlds-largest-fish-and-one-tiny-island-studying-whale-sharks-on-st-helena-island/>
- <http://georgiaaquariumblog.org/georgia-aquarium-blog/2016/3/5/expedition-week-it-takes-a-village-dr-al-dove.html>
- http://georgiaaquariumblog.org/georgia-aquarium-blog/2016/3/1/expedition-week-whale-shark-research-in-st-helena-al-dove.html?utm_source=20160301_expweek-blog-1&utm_medium=socialmedia&utm_content=twitter&utm_campaign=20160301_expweek-blog-1

10. Project Expenditure

Table 1 Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016)

Project spend (indicative) in this financial year	2015/16 D+ Grant (£)	2015/16 Total actual D+ Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs			1%	
Consultancy costs			0.2%	
Overhead Costs			0%	

Travel and subsistence			13.8%	Due to current access problems with St. Helena advance booking have been made to support work for 2016-17 in an effort to ensure works will be undertaken. Not discussed with Darwin.
Operating Costs			-7.6%	
Capital items			-32.8%	Grinder polisher for fisheries lab only cost £3800 which was significantly less than the £5500.00 originally budgeted. Software for project computer allocated as an other cost rather than as part of capital item. Laser not purchased project partner supplied item as in kind to project. Not discussed with Darwin
Others (Please specify)			-1.3%	
TOTAL				

Highlight any agreed changes to the budget and **fully** explain any variation in expenditure where this is +/- 10% of the budget. Have these changes been discussed with and approved by Darwin?