

CEPF Final Project Completion Report – EMI Small Grants

Please complete all fields and respond to all questions below.

Background Information

Organization Legal Name	<i>Partners With Melanesians Inc.</i>
Project Title	The Derimbat Community Reforestation Project
Date of Report	12 th March 2017
Report Author	Cecil Senive & Kenn Mondiai
Author Contact Information	Csenive@pwmpng.org.pg / kmondiai@pwmpng.org.pg
CEPF Region	East Melanesian Islands
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	US\$8,000.00
Project Dates	21 st March 2015 to 1 st April 2016

1. Implementation Partners for this Project

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

Two activities were captured under the Reforestation Project activities: 1. Nursery Training; and 2. GPS Training.

1. **Nursery Training** – Derimbat Community School was our leading implementation partner on site. With the authorization of the school board to use part of their land allocated to them in the school yard, we were able to construct a nursery shed in the school's yard and also able to plant seedlings in there.
The trainings were conducted to the locals to help them utilize the knowledge and assist the students to plant and raise seedlings.
2. **GPS Training** – The local communities were our project partners as we undertook training for boundary mapping using GPS. They know their land boundaries very well so with the training and the equipment at hand, they are able to work collaboratively and mark their land boundaries.

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.

The Derimbat Community Reforestation Project in terms of its linkage to the CEPF Investment Strategy, falls in line with Strategic Direction 1, that is to Empower local communities to protect and manage globally significant biodiversity at priority Key Biodiversity Areas under-served by current conservation efforts.

The people of Derimbat, who settled along the coast of Manus have seen logging, El Nino events and forest fires destroying their forest land. The only viable option moving forward is to reforest and restore the degraded forest land areas. The planned way forward was to set up nurseries together with the affected Derimbat Community, and eventually start replanting these vulnerably exposed areas with trees.

Technically, this would not only prevent landslides or erosion during heavy precipitation but also the replanted forest would regain ability to absorb heat or solar energy and prevent massive evapotranspiration from the soils. This reforested area could then be converted to a wildlife management area for a greater environmental outcome. As part of the 'Ridge to Reef' initiative, reforestation is crucial to addressing climate change impacts especially to lowland and coastal dwellers.

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

Even though it's not a fully-fledged conservation work as yet, most of what we intended for Derimbat as a vulnerable community was to reforest their land and later convert this to a Wildlife Management Area. However, some social issues exist within Derimbat and the lack of mutual interest and cooperation shown to PWM led to the project not progressing as well as planned.

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

The project started off well in the beginning with both trainings (Nursery and GPS) carried out for the local communities. The locals went on to build nursery sheds, used proper techniques for sieving soils, sowed seedlings, and even tracked and marked features well using GPS. But the lack of cooperation and differences halted the progress of the project. PWM encountered a challenge of convincing people to continue working on the project. Even though the project won't directly benefit PWM, we feel that the community didn't take heed of the importance of restoration for their future livelihoods.

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

These were mainly negative in terms of convincing people to continue working on the project. As expected they thought also that some form of payment would be made to them for the work they did. We made it absolutely clear to them that it is a community project for their own benefit and they should not expect any monetary payment.

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

The reluctance to work together in the community for their own benefit because of their prolonged differences is obviously not a positive sign for further continuity of the reforestation

project. Reforestation is a process and if the interest in initial activities like nursery establishment and boundary mapping is not there, then the whole process is affected making them even more vulnerable to what they are currently experiencing at the moment.

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.

Due to internal issues in the community, the project was not completed. Therefore other planned activities did not eventuate. No maps were produced after the GPS training was conducted.

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

	Date	Composite Score
Baseline CSTT		
Final CSTT		

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

The cuscus is in danger due to the forest harvested from portable sawmill and also from shifting cultivation and hunting. During the period of engagement with the community of Derimbat, we have seen a lot of cuscus being eaten and hunted.

10. Hectares Under Improved Management

Project Results	Hectares*	Comments
11. Did your project strengthen the management of an existing protected area? n/a		
12. Did your project create a new protected area or expand an existing protected area? n/a		The initial plan was to designate a new wildlife management area. However, due to community differences, this component of the project was not completed. 1200 seedlings planted but no further work was carried out due to land issues and community differences

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		The initial plan was to designate a new wildlife management area within the Central Manus KBA. However, due to community differences, this component of the project was not completed.
--	--	--

** 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).* **n/a**

Protected area	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score

15. Direct Beneficiaries: Training and Education **n/a**

<i>Did your project provide training or education for . . .</i>	Male	Female	Total	Brief Description
16. Adults for community leadership or resource management positions				
17. Adults for livelihoods or increased income			36	Training related to nursery establishment and GPS use
18. School-aged children				
19. Other				

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

Community name	Population size	Surrounding district	Surrounding province	Country
Derimbat	850	PNKA	Manus	PNG

21. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Using the communities listed above; please complete the table below, inserting the name of the communities in the left column, and placing an X in all relevant boxes in the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit. **n/a**

Community Name	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 line	Other	Increased income due to:				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 (please provide details below)	
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services										
Derimbat	x	x	x											x	x							

No socio-economic study was done as the project was terminated due to community reluctance to work together

If you marked "Other", please provide details on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit. **n/a**

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.

1. The communities of Derimbat are educated about environmental issues - the village has 1 PhD Holder and several MSc Holders and many civil and public servants. Social and environmental issues are well known by the community.
2. Land issue is a major concern for the project. PWM noted that land issues must be discussed first and prior to any project, as the majority of the people are not the real landowners while the real land owning clan is small. The majority will want any project. As projects are implemented on land owned by the few, when activities like planting trees or building infrastructure are proposed, the consent and agreement of the real land owners must be sought first. In this case, due to land not being made available, the school offered to help by allowing the nursery to be built at the school.
3. There are underlying social issues in this community which has caused the spread of mis-information, and has made it impossible for PWM to continue with the proposed work.
4. The local CBO partner DCDF is based in Port Moresby and they have no representative or communication to people in the village, so project implementation was difficult. PWM dealt directly with the Village Councilor and the Clan Leaders and not with DCDF without understanding the complexities that existed.

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

The local CBO partner Derimbat Community Development Foundation (DCDF) is based in Port Moresby and they have no representative or communication to people in the village, so in terms of activity implementation, it was difficult and PWM dealt directly with the Village Councilor and the Clan Leaders and not with DCDF.

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

PWM is based in Port Moresby and this project began as a result of the Derimbat Councilor initiating the request as a result of PWM carrying out work for TNC in Manus. Since PWM has no officer on the ground based in Manus, it was difficult to manage the project from Port Moresby. The local CBO partner DCDF is also not setup well in Manus and at the village of Derimbat.

If PWM is to continue with this project in the future, it will carry out a formal community entry process and do a lot more awareness and community mobilization to ensure that the community are in agreement on the process and outcomes, and to ensure that they work together and out aside internal differences. The environmental issues regarding their future wellbeing as a community is under threat from unsustainable practices of hunting, an increase in human population, shifting cultivation, trees being cut for gardening and rapid climate change impacts.

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

Ensure that Free Prior informed Consent is obtained prior to the project starting, and make sure that PWM does its Community Entry process to decide on setting up the project. Although the Derimbat community has serious deforestation going on, deeply rooted social issues came out later as the project was implemented, which meant that it was not possible to continue with this work.

Sustainability/Replication

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

As explained above, any future activities in Derimbat must start with a proper community entry process and community taking ownership. Nowadays people want to do work for money and so any future work must start with a clear awareness about roles and responsibilities of all parties and what any project is able to do and not do.

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

Although P3DM (3D land modelling) was not on the list of activities under this project, as it was funded by another donor in the same LLG, Derimbat LLG Ward was also included. A P3DM model was developed at a scale of 1:10,000 meeting the requirements of the landuse plan.

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.

Land issues and internal differences is a major obstacle to project development.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

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

The general idea for the reforestation project embarked on in Derimbat Community was to reforest most of the bare land left by natural hazards and logging activities in the 90s and

eventually work on having the area declared as a Wildlife Management Area once the trees continue to grow and replenish the ecosystem. However, now that this project has stopped due to social conflicts, the activities and components of the reforestation project were not completed.

Additional Funding

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.cepfn.org, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

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

Name: Kenn Mondiai

Organization: Partners With Melanesians Inc. (PWM)

Mailing address: Section 36 Allotment 03 Croton Street, Hohola NCD - Papua New Guinea

Telephone number: + 675 3236344

E-mail address: infor@pwmpng.org.pg or kmondiai@pwmpng.org.pg