CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Wildlife Conservation Society
Project Title:	Participatory Rural Appraisal and Rapid Biodiversity Assessments of Manus and Mussau Islands in the Northern Bismark Sea
Date of Report:	27 August 2015
Report Author and Contact Information	Richard Cuthbert rcuthbert@wcs.org

CEPF Region: East Melanesian Islands

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 1: Empower local communities to protect and manage globally significant biodiversity at priority Key Biodiversity Areas under-served by current conservation efforts

Grant Amount: USD 170130

Project Dates: April 2014 – June 2015

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):

PNG Institute of Biological Research – WCS subcontracted Junior Novera as a field mammalogist

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):

"The short term impacts (see below) in conjunction with future planned clan tenure mapping should form the foundation for long-term land-use planning in these communities. In the long-term the Wildlife Conservation Society Papua New Guinea (WCS PNG) program will be working alongside these communities to help develop community driven laws and to have them enshrined legally."

Actual Progress Toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:

The biodiversity work on Mussau and Manus islands recorded 440 species including 13 new and undescribed species. Not only are the participating communities now aware of the special nature of their environment but so too are the local, provincial and national governments of Papua New Guinea.

The biodiversity work has been permanently documented in an 85 page book and as a freely accessible PDF document. To date 25 books have been disbursed to Papua New Guinean universities, libraries, research and conservation organizations, museums, and government

departments to safeguard the knowledge. Additionally, copies of the book have been gifted to various key universities and research institutions within the Pacific including (the Bishop Museum, South Australia Museum, James Cook University, and the University of Queensland). Participating communities on Manus and Mussau islands and their provincial governments have also received the final copies. The availability of the book has also been widely advertised through social media and press releases. Electronic copies are freely available on the WCS-PNG program website (http://wcspng.org) and at Researchgate: (http://is.gd/rPPe9d).

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):

"The Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) in the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) of Central Manus (106,565 ha) and Mussau Island (34,071 ha) will result in heightened awareness amongst local communities about the degree of control they have over their environment, the threats and drivers which affect their resources and what tools they already have to ameliorate those threats.

The PRA in combination with a qualitative spatial mapping in Central Manus and Mussau Island will result in maps of local knowledge and in combination with the biodiversity surveys will highlight what elements of their environment are locally important, globally special and at risk. The PRA process, in particular, will empower the communities to identify and tackle those issues.

The mapping, biodiversity surveys and satellite imagery of Central Manus and Mussau Island KBAs will form a permanent record against which future changes in the environment can be compared and provide a level of documented evidence against which potential resource extractors will be judged."

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:
The participatory rural appraisal work has identified key environmental issues for both Manus and Mussau islands. For Mussau these are unsustainable fishing practices, a problem with feral pigs, and burgeoning conflict between communities and turtles over diminishing seaweed beds. For Manus: Piri villagers are concerned about a decline in reef fish, mud crabs and estuarine shellfish while Tulu1 villagers are particularly concerned with climate change, forest clearance and issues of overharvesting generally. Qualitative mapping also identified deteriorating quality of reefs in Manus (particularly around Piri) as an additional cause for concern. The biodiversity survey identified the Mussau Triller, an as yet unnamed *Rattus* species on Manus, and Admiralty cuscus (Manus) as key species requiring further attention. Additionally, qualitative mapping also identified that the Manus melomys is either extremely cryptic or now very rare. Subsequent community meetings (undertaken outside the CEPF project) have indicated that some Manus communities are concerned about the disappearance the island's bandicoot species (which was not detected during the biodiversity survey). As a result we are now in a good position to develop follow up projects which address key environmental and biodiversity issues in the region.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.
The main challenges faced by this project were logistic. Communication with Mussau Island is particularly challenging given the absence of telephone and cellular coverage and the 165km open water journey between the provincial capital of Kavieng in New Ireland and Mussau. Stakeholders from Mussau based in Kavieng are effectively estranged from the island and consequently have little ability to accurately represent the interests of the islanders. Indeed, none of the information shared at the meetings involving the Kavieng based Mussau stakeholders and WCS ever made it back to the community. This highlights that the Kavieng based population is not a useful communication conduit and that all future project notification requires direct communication with the resident islanders rather than surrogates.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

There were no negative impacts of these CEPF activities. The Biodiversity report was gratefully received on Manus but the response from the residents of Mussau was much greater due the comparative low media profile of the island. The discovery of new species, the publication of the report, and interest over the interaction of religion and nature led to wide media coverage (both national and international) for Mussau Island. The residents felt that WCS had raised the profile of the island dramatically and thus the survey and the publicity it created was a source of pride.

Project Components

Project Components*: Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

Component 1 Planned (as stated in the approved proposal):
1. Stakeholder meeting for Mussau stakeholders resident in Kavieng completed [20+ Mussau Islanders present, meeting report produced detailing attendees and meeting notes]

2. Scouting visit to Mussau Island undertaken and Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) process completed and further work agreed for Mussau Island [dates of trip verified, 4 communities and sites visited and documented, meeting attendance records kept during visit, stakeholders agreement to FPIC process recorded, trip report produced and reported to CEPF]

3. Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) & Qualitative Spatial Mapping (QSM) completed on Mussau Island [Reports of PRA process completed for each community detailing approach, methods, results and signed list of all people interviewed and involved in this process. Maps from QSM produced along with information on stakeholders taking part in mapping process]

4. PRA & QSM on Manus Island [Reports of PRA process completed for each community detailing approach, methods, results and signed list of all people interviewed and involved in this process. Maps from QSM produced along with information on stakeholders taking part in mapping process]

5. Report and papers PRA and mapping results produced and published [2+ WCS reports written, produced and printed and delivered to CEPF and Manus and Mussau stakeholders and relevant Provincial and National government partners]

6. Compliance with CEPF Social Safeguard Policies monitored and reported to CEPF [Reports produced from WCS PNG visits to project sites to undertake stakeholder meetings (20+ participants) to monitor and evaluate project impacts and listen to grievance. Reports produced and sent to CEPF]

Component 1 Actual at Completion: the relevant file names are given in bold.

1. Stakeholder meeting for Mussau stakeholders: Initial meetings with Mussau representatives (mayor, councilors and LLG President) conducted completed on 5 August 2014. 26 people attended.
Social safeguards Consultation Mussau stakeholder meeting.pdf

2. FPIC Mussau process completed
Social safeguards FPIC Mussau (Lolieng).pdf
Social safeguards FPIC Mussau (Nae).pdf

3. PRA & QSM completed for Mussau: PRA carried out for Nae and Lolieng.
PRA Mussau (Lolieng) – 23 people participating
PRA Mussau (Nae) – 16 people participating
Social safeguards PRA Mussau (Lolieng).pdf
Social safeguards PRA Mussau (Nae).pdf

4. PRA & QSM completed for Manus: PRA carried out for Piri. As a PRA had already been carried out for Tulu1 in 2011 WCS worked with the community leaders to encapsulate community concerns within a draft a ward plan rather than repeat a PRA.
PRA Manus (Piri) – 32 people participating
Draft ward plan Manus (Piri) – 10 people participating
Social safeguards PRA Manus (Piri).pdf
Social safeguards Tulu1 Ward plan workshop.pdf

5. PRA & QSM reports completed. See attached…
Report PRA Manus (Piri).pdf
Report PRA Mussau (Lolieng).pdf
Report PRA Mussau (Nae).pdf
Draft Ward Plan Manus (Tulu1).pdf
Report Qualitative mapping.pdf

6. CEPF Social Safeguard Policies monitored
Social safeguards comments Manus June-Dec 2014
Social safeguards comments Mussau June-Dec 2014

Component 2 Planned (as stated in the approved proposal):

1. Equipment and supplies purchased for biodiversity surveys [Purchase list and full equipment list of all supplies prepared].

2. Biodiversity survey on Manus Island completed [WCS fieldwork report detailing trip dates, staff, sites and initial results written, prepared, and printed and delivered to CEPF and project partners].

3. Biodiversity survey on Mussau Island completed [WCS fieldwork report detailing trip dates, staff, sites and initial results written, prepared, and printed and delivered to CEPF and project partners].

4. Taxonomic identification of specimens from surveys completed [List prepared of all species recorded from biodiversity surveys. Preparation, submission and acceptance* of peer-reviewed papers on new taxonomic records]

* N.B. taxonomic identification and publication is likely to extend beyond the life of this CEPF application due to the necessary time for species identification and peer-review process

5. Production of report, tok pisin summary and preparation of scientific papers for open-access journals [1 x WCS report for each of Manus and Mussau surveys written, produced and printed and delivered to CEPF and on WCS PNG website. 1 x tok pisin summary report and materials for each of Manus and Mussau produced and printed and on WCS PNG website. Records of submission of scientific papers to open-access journals and pdfs of papers sent to CEPF, government partners and on WCS PNG website].

6. Information from surveys repatriated to partner villages [Short report of documenting repatriation process prepared for all project sites, including attendance lists and photos from villages present at repatriation meeting]

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

1. Equipment and supplies were purchased in advance of the biodiversity survey.

2 & 3. Biodiversity survey of Manus and Mussau took place in October 2014

4. Taxonomic identification of specimens: a full list of all species encountered can be found in the final biodiversity report. The formal descriptions of new species are ongoing.

5. A singular biodiversity report was made and published both as pdf as well as 100 hardcopy versions. Hardcopy versions have been disbursed (free of charge) to Papua New Guinean universities, libraries, research and conservation organizations, museums, and government departments to safeguard the knowledge. Additionally the book has been gifted to various key universities and research institutions within the Pacific including (the Bishop Museum, South Australia Museum, James Cook University, and the University of Queensland). Electronic copies are freely available on www.wcspng.org and at Researchgate: http://is.gd/rPPe9d. A Tok Pisin summary version was also created of the book for distribution to the communities.
Report Biodiversity Survey of Manus and Mussau Islands.pdf
Translation Biodiversity Survey summary Tok Pisin final.pdf

6. Repatriation of the results of the biodiversity and PRA activities have occurred for Lolieng and Nae. For Manus the repatriation to Tulu1 is currently being undertaken (from 24 August 2015), but due to delays arising from threats against WCS staff (from a pro-logging contingent on the south coast of Manus) and the postponement of a co-funded trip to Piri – the repatriation trip to Piri has been rescheduled for September. However, a report presentation was conducted with Manus village officials (from Tulu1 and Piri) in the provincial capital of Lorengau in late July (see photo images in file below).
Social safeguards Stakeholders receiving the report.pdf

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

The final repatriation of the PRA and Biodiversity survey is yet to take place for Piri on Manus. However, a report presentation was conducted with Manus village officials in the provincial capital of Lorengau in late July. WCS, however, has on going work with the community and the activity will take place in September coinciding with our next scheduled visit.

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

The following reports highlight our methods and include the published biodiversity survey report book:
Report Biodiversity Survey of Manus and Mussau Islands.pdf
Report PRA Manus (Piri).pdf
Report PRA Mussau (Lolieng).pdf
Report PRA Mussau (Nae).pdf
Draft Ward Plan Manus (Tulu1).pdf
Report Qualitative mapping.pdf

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

For Mussau Island the project could have been improved if the CEPF funding call for the biodiversity survey came after the development of a good foundation of community engagement. Doing both in close succession means that the organization of the logistic elements of the biodiversity study had to get underway prior to survey locations being approved by the community (due to the lack of infrastructure in PNG). Such a design is inherently risky should community consent not be obtained. This issue was not encountered on Manus, where WCS has had a long-term presence and has built a good relationship with participating communities.

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

Not being able to be in direct communication with the Mussau islanders was an impediment to the project and messages passed to Kavieng based stakeholders were never delivered to the islanders. We need to be cautious of working with estranged stakeholders in the future as their perception, and motivations my not be reflective of that of the islanders.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

NIL

Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
DFAT (Australia)	A	45482	
USAID/IUCN	A	8394	
WCS (unrestricted)	A	16986	

***Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

A *Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*

B *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*

C *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

Both the PRA and biodiversity surveys are broadly replicable by similar institutions and the publication and delivery of the biodiversity report means that this information is available to a wide audience and now safeguarded within institutions across PNG and the Pacific. We managed to partner with some Mussau communities despite the remoteness of the island (12-16 hour boat ride). A risk factor that emerged was that some communities did not want to engage with WCS as a consequence of the behavior of archaeological researchers some 40 years earlier.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

It appears that WCS has now earned the trust of the islanders. Recently a contingent from one Mussau community who initially refused consent has recently approached WCS to partner on a project. This trust appears to have come as a response to the way that WCS undertook the PRA and biodiversity survey work on Mussau and repatriated this information, the extensive media profile that the CEPF project brought to the island, and the kudos that the publication of hardcopy book gave to the islanders.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

The process that WCS has gone through of: initial consultation – free and prior informed consent – survey – repatriation has served the project well. Such a mechanism empowered the Tulu1 community to raise concerns regarding the use of specimens and payments – and these misunderstandings were then quickly addressed (aided by the existence of a permanent WCS office on the island).

Additional Comments/Recommendations

N/A

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Richard Cuthbert
Organization name: Wildlife Conservation Society
Mailing address: PO Box 277, Goroka, Eastern Highlands Province, Papua New Guinea
Tel: + 675 532-3494
Fax:+ 675 532-3180
E-mail: rcuthbert@wcs.org

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2013 to May 30, 2014. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	No			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1below.	No			

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table

Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
									Increased Income due to:												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services	Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other
Total																					

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit: