

CEPF Final Project Completion Report – EMI Small Grants

Please complete all fields and respond to all questions below.

Background Information

Organization Legal Name	<i>Tawi Asi Resource Management Network</i>
Project Title	Empowering the people of Pobuma to design conservation actions on Manus Island Papua New Guinea.
Date of Report	11 th December 2017
Report Author	Pongie Kichawen/Marinda Sapak
Author Contact Information	pkichwen@gmail.com , maryndasapak@gmail.com
CEPF Region	East Melanesian Islands
Strategic Direction	Strategic Direction 1 which aims to empower local communities to protect and manage globally significant biodiversity at priority Key Biodiversity Areas under-served by current conservation efforts.
Grant Amount	\$19,750 USD
Project Dates	01 st July 2016 – 31 st May 2017

1. Implementation Partners for this Project

(please list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project)

TNC – To co-facilitate workshop with WCS on designing local conservation actions through identifying and discussing threats that would negatively impact the marine biodiversity environment in Pobuma LLG. This was however, not achieved.

WCS – To co-facilitate workshop with TNC on designing local conservation actions through identifying and discussing threats that would negatively impact the terrestrial and water environment and habitats in Pobuma LLG. This was however, not achieved.

Pobuma LLG – To approve the conservation actions and notify communities through awareness.

Landowner Group Company – To note the conservations actions and apply them as and when needed to reduce the negative impacts.

Conservation Impacts

2. Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of CEPF's Ecosystem Profile for the East Melanesian Islands. For example, you may refer to the Strategic Directions that your project has contributed to.

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

particular investment priority 1.3 Support local communities to design and implement locally relevant conservation actions that respond to major threats at priority sites.

3. Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in your approved proposal.

There were a few consultative meetings conducted in four communities of Mbuke, Wal, Powai and Peli-Patu. The meetings were held to 1) identify individual coordinators to identify individual stakeholders from their communities that would attend the workshop and 2) to make these communities aware of the proposed workshop and what the workshop will be about. These were informal meetings in communities that did not require minutes and attendance. We collected names of coordinators Bernard Chantong (Mbuke island), Litau Pokanau (Wal Island), Fred Kupe (Powai) and Grace Pasuk (Peli-Patu). Timoenai and Kupano (TARM Executive). As a result of the community consultations conducted, the establishment of a rubber plantation said to be an agro-forestry project was put on hold.

4. Please describe any successes and/or challenges faced towards achieving the expected short-term and long-term impacts of the project work.

Successes

- Consultative meetings were conducted with four communities. Two communities Timoenai and Kupano are in the same LLG ward.
- Purchase of equipment was necessary for use at the workshop.
- Getting support from communities about the awareness on the negative impacts on the biodiversity and environment therefore, resulting in putting on hold the establishment of a rubber plantation which was supposedly an agro-forestry project.

Challenges

- Logistics, getting around to the communities and to and from Lorengau town for purchase of supplies is quite expensive and challenging.
- Availability of community members to attend the consultative meetings.
- Availability of professionals/experts to assist the organization in designing local conservation actions.

5. Were there any unexpected impacts of your project (positive or negative)?

The same Powai tribes involved in the rubber development are also involved in mine prospecting in the same area as the rubber development. This poses a serious threat to the biodiversity and environment in this area.

6. If you did not complete any project components or activities, how did this affect the overall impact of the project?

Hiring of the accountant from TNC and or WCS to set up financial management systems and train TARM staff was not achieved. This resulted in TARM staff not providing financial reports on time. The main component of the work plan which was to carry out a workshop facilitated by TNC and WCS to develop local conservation actions was not achieved. This may result in organizations such as TNC and WCS not having confidence and trust to collaborate in future activities with TARM.

Products/Deliverables

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

- it is normal to hold public consultative meetings without minutes and attendance as the intention of the community meetings was to create awareness on the project and identify community coordinators which the meeting achieved.
- A video already with CEPF shows how communities are engaged in discussions with us and landowner group.

CEPF Global Monitoring Data

Respond to the questions and complete the tables below. **If a question is not relevant to your project, please make an entry of 0 (zero) or n/a (not applicable).**

8. Did your organization complete the **CEPF Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT)** at the beginning and end of your project?

(Please submit the final CSTT document to IUCN Oceania if you have not already done so).

	Date	Composite Score
Baseline CSTT	19 th March 2017	4
Final CSTT	3 rd May 2018	4

9. Please list any **Vulnerable, Endangered, or Critically Endangered species** conserved due to your project.

N/A

10. Hectares Under Improved Management

Project Results	Hectares*	Comments
11. Did your project strengthen the management of an existing protected area?	N/A	N/A
12. Did your project create a new protected area or expand an existing protected area?	N/A	N/A
13. Did your project strengthen the management of a key biodiversity area named in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile (hectares may be the same as questions above)	N/A	N/A

* Include total hectares from project inception to completion

14. In relation to the questions above on protected areas, did your project complete a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), or facilitate the completion of a METT by protected area authorities? If so, complete the table below. (Note that there will often be more than one METT for an individual protected area.)

Protected area	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

15. Direct Beneficiaries: Training and Education

<i>Did your project provide training or education for . . .</i>	Male	Female	Total	Brief Description
16. Adults for community leadership or resource management positions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
17. Adults for livelihoods or increased income	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18. School-aged children	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
19. Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

20. Please list the name and approximate population size of any “community” that benefited from the project.

Community name	Population size	Surrounding district	Surrounding province	Country
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

If you marked “Other”, please provide details on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit

Lessons Learned

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

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

- Involving partners and stakeholders such as the LLG, TNC and WCS in the beginning to ensure commitment from these partners to carry out planned activities is important.
- Identifying coordinators in the affected communities to carryout awareness and work towards implementing the outcomes of the project.

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

- Most of the activities carried out were community consultations that did not lead to the development of conservation actions. However, issues and threats to biodiversity such as mining and rubber development were raised.
- The awareness done earlier during community consultations may have had some impacts on the delay in the operation of the rubber estate/plantations, hence, the project is yet to commence clearance of forests.

24. Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

Sustainability/Replication

25. Please summarize the success or challenges in ensuring that the project will be sustained or replicated in the future.

- There has been no documented fundraising in order to ensure that this project continues beyond this grant.
- The interests and the enthusiasm shown by the organization as the proposed mining in the same area and further along central Manus is a real threat would encourage us to look for assistance elsewhere.

26. Please summarize any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability of your project work.

- Unplanned activities have not resulted in increased sustainability or replicability of the project

- The mining is very critical as the entire area will lose the forest and all its biodiversity including some local species endemic to Manus like the green snails, admiralty cuscus and Chauka bird.

Safeguards

Please provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies for this project.

This may be attached in the form of an updated Social Safeguards document.

N/A

Additional Comments/Recommendations

27. Please use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF.

This is a great project which may extend to the proposed mining in this project area and central Manus where CEPF objectives will be achieved but unfortunately, it will come to an end.

Additional Funding

N/A

Please provide:

28. details of any additional funding that supported this project
29. details of any further funding secured for this project, your organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF's investment in this project

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

** Categorize the type of funding as:*

- 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)*

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 website, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below if different from what has already been provided:

Name: Marinda Sapak

Organization: TARM

Mailing address: PO Box 320, LORENGAU, Manus Province, Papua New Guinea

Telephone number: (675) 73740826

E-mail address: maryndasapak@gmail.com