

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Kaday Community & Cultural Development Organization
Project Title:	Nimpal communities – Protecting the Yap Flying Fox
Date of Report:	4/30/13
Report Author and Contact Information	Berna Gorong – info@kadayvillage.org / b.gorong@yahoo.com

CEPF Region: Federated States of Micronesia

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 3 - Build awareness and participation of local leaders and community members in the implementation of protection and recovery plans for threatened species

Grant Amount: \$19,030

Project Dates: June 1st to Dec. 31st, 2012

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

Conservation Impacts

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

This project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile by supporting the ongoing community-led resource management efforts of the traditional villages of Okaw and Kaday on Yap's main island within the Federated States of Micronesia. Through this project, the communities' managed species target list was expanded to fully protect the Yap Flying Fox, within the Maa Mangrove Sanctuary.

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

This project has ensured the ongoing activities and empowerment of local decision making of traditional community-led efforts of natural resource management. Through this project, the managed target list was expanded to include the Yap Flying Fox as a fully protected species within the managed areas of the community and allowed for greater awareness of keystone species and the important role they play within the ecosystem. Community signed declaration on protection of Yap Flying Fox.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected: approximately 92 hectares (near-shore marine 77ha/mangrove 15ha)

Species Conserved: all species within managed areas; full protection for Yap Flying Fox

Corridors Created:

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

The main challenges of the project are:

- **Competing priorities** – conservation is often not the most “in your face glaring” priority for most local traditional communities. It’s a priority, however, when there are other community activities ongoing or planned, often time conservation meetings and decision making priorities takes the back burner.
 - *To address this challenge, the communities need to be supported to carry out holistic community planning that incorporates all the sectors of community living (health, education, resources, economic, disaster/risk) into a plan. This then helps the communities in seeing the linkages between the different activities/sectors and how one is supportive of others. This can go a long way in facilitating change of the perspective of community members from seeing various activities as ‘competing’ for their time and commitment to instead be or rather be ‘complimenting’ priorities that achieves a holistic community vision and aspirations.*
- **Lack of fulltime and skilled management level staff** – The communities since the initiation of their work in 2008 till present has operated with only part-time staffing of project management and depends a lot on volunteer time from community members to undertake management activities. Community members who are skilled have fulltime responsibilities/commitments to their day jobs. At the level that the project has reached, it is becoming more difficult to rely on community volunteer efforts when members have need for income earning to meet family goals and also expected to volunteer efforts for the well being of community.
 - *To address this challenge, there needs to be a conscience effort within the community to identify and train up other key community member(s) to take on these responsibilities on a fulltime scale and creating management level job positions within the community.*

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

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)

The project design depended on volunteer aspect of community member(s) in development of outcome documents of the project with support of government line agency team. The documents entail the skill sets of technical writing and report writing, planning skills, etc... The project also depended on local scientific expertise on the Yap Flying Fox.

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

Due to above mentioned, during implementation of project, the only skilled community member in facilitation and planning is also fully engaged in regional efforts and thus the volunteer time didn't

materialize for successful implementation of various planning activities at the community level. The local scientific expertise on the Yap Flying Fox was also unavailable during project implementation timeframe due to other personal and professional commitments to assist community in designing and developing a monitoring plan for the Yap Flying Fox.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

For conservation and community planning efforts within Micronesia, it is important that capacity building at the grassroots level (traditional communities) is supported to enable and equip community members with planning facilitation skills, report writing, and management/organization skills for true improvement and advancement of local resource management efforts. These need to be based within traditional communities who fully understand the local context and can implement strategies and activities that are within community norms and practices, sensitive to cultural and traditional practices.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

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

- A*** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF 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 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.

Capacity building needs to continue at the traditional community level to equip community members with facilitations skills, report writing skills, and management/organizational skills. The community focused toolkits designed for the Micronesia Challenge in addressing climate change adaptation planning is a good example of tool that can be utilized to further build capacity at local grassroots level. The success of Nimpal community member(s) who have participated in these capacity building has contributed greatly to the success at the community site; however, this has also allowed for trained members to be moved up or engaged in state wide and region wide activities that has taken time away from community site volunteerism.

More passionate and trained individuals (local champions) ensures sustainability and replicability of project success at any site.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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: Berna Gorong
Organization name: Kaday Community & Cultural Development Organization
Mailing address: P.O. Box 996, Yap FM 96943
Tel: 691 350 8000
Fax: 691 350 8000
E-mail: info@kadayvillage.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 June 1, 2012 to Dec. 31, 2012. (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.	Yes	92 hectares	15 hectares	Nimpal Channel Marine Conservation Area – 77.5 ha. Maa Mangrove Sanctuary (Weloy) – 15 ha.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	n/a			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.	Yes	15 hectares	15 hectares	Maa Mangrove Sanctuary (Weloy) – 15 ha.
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	n/a			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	n/a			

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													
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased income due to:				Improved 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
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
Total																					

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

