

**SOUTH PACIFIC BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION
PROGRAMME (SPBCP)**

END OF PROGRAMME REPORT

By

THE PROGRAMME MANAGER

November 2001

TABLE OF CONTENT

Page Number

1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. PROGRAMME CONCEPT AND DESIGN	7
2.1 CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND	7
2.2 THE UNDP/GEF SPBCP PROJECT DOCUMENT	7
2.2.1 Introduction	7
2.2.2 Project duration and extension	8
2.2.3 Definition of and Approach to the Problem	8
2.2.4 Identification of Beneficiaries and Users	8
2.2.5 Development Objectives	9
2.2.6 Immediate Objectives	10
2.2.7 Outputs	10
2.2.8 Assumptions	10
2.2.9 Monitoring and Evaluation Provisions	11
2.2.10 Work Plan	11
2.2.11 Summary	12
3. PROGRAMME APPROACH	12
4. PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION	12
4.1 PLANNING PROCESSES AND DOCUMENTATION	12
4.1.1 Introduction	12
4.1.2 Project Document Approach	13
4.1.3 Project Proposal Approval	13
4.1.4 Project Implementation	14
5. SUMMARY OF PROGRESS	14
5.1 OBJECTIVE 1: ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSERVATION AREAS	14
5.1.1 Identification of CAPs	14
5.1.2 Selection of CAPs	15
5.1.3 Number of CAPs	15
5.1.4 Quality of CAPs	15
5.1.5 Ecological Viability and Sustainability	16
5.1.6 Economic Viability and Sustainability	17
5.1.7 Socio-cultural Sustainability	18
5.1.8 Income Generating Activities	18
5.1.9 Business Development and marketing	19
5.1.10 Adequacy of baseline data	20
5.1.11 Relationship with other regional conservation programmes	20
5.2. OBJECTIVE 2: SPECIES PROTECTION	21
5.2.1 Regional Marine Turtle Conservation Programme (RMTCP)	21
5.2.2 Regional Marine Mammal Conservation Programme (RMMCP)	22
5.2.3 Regional Avifauna Conservation Programme (RACP)	22
5.2.4 Other Species Conservation Initiatives of Interest	23
5.3. OBJECTIVE 3: IDENTIFICATION OF NEW CAPS	23
5.3.1 Development of selection criteria for new CAPs	23
5.3.2 Review of potential CAP candidates	24
5.3.3 Assistance to non-SPBCP sites	24
5.3.4 Development of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans	25
5.4 OBJECTIVE 4: RAISING CONSERVATION AWARENESS	25
5.4.1 Publicising the SPBCP and CA concept	25
5.4.2 Information on CAPs	25
5.4.3 Regional Awareness Campaigns	26

5.4.4	<i>National Awareness Campaigns</i>	26
5.4.5	<i>SPBCP Publications and Reports</i>	27
5.4.6	<i>CALL Newsletter</i>	27
5.5.	OBJECTIVE 5: CAPACITY BUILDING AND COOPERATION	27
5.5.1	<i>Community participation and involvement</i>	27
5.5.2	<i>Effectiveness of CACCs</i>	28
5.5.3	<i>Effectiveness of CASOs</i>	29
5.5.4	<i>Effectiveness of Lead Agencies</i>	30
5.5.5	<i>Role of women</i>	30
5.5.6	<i>In-country training</i>	31
5.5.7	<i>Regional training</i>	31
5.5.8	<i>Study tours</i>	32
5.5.9	<i>Policy advice</i>	32
5.5.10	<i>Database development</i>	33
5.5.11	<i>CAP Network</i>	33
5.5.12	<i>NGO Participation</i>	34
5.5.13	<i>Support for Regional Conferences</i>	35
6.	PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT	35
6.1	WORK PLANNING	36
6.1.1	<i>Project Document</i>	36
6.1.2	<i>Annual work plans</i>	36
6.1.3	<i>Quarterly work plans</i>	36
6.1.4	<i>Field visits</i>	37
6.1.5	<i>Monitoring and evaluation</i>	37
6.1.6	<i>SPBCP and CAP Success Indicators</i>	37
6.2	FUNDING AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	38
6.2.1	<i>Project Document Provisions</i>	38
6.2.2	<i>Budget Revisions</i>	38
6.2.3	<i>Split budgets</i>	39
6.2.4	<i>Actual Expenditures</i>	39
6.2.5	<i>Financial Procedures</i>	39
6.3	QUANTITY, QUALITY AND TIMING OF INPUTS	40
6.3.1	<i>Documented Inputs</i>	40
6.3.2	<i>Requests for funds</i>	40
6.3.3	<i>Reporting Requirements</i>	41
6.3.4	<i>Equipment</i>	42
6.3.5	<i>Training</i>	42
6.3.6	<i>Use of consultants</i>	43
6.3.7	<i>Use of volunteers</i>	44
6.4	STAFFING AND STAFF MANAGEMENT	45
6.4.1	<i>Project Document Provisions</i>	45
6.4.2	<i>Job Description</i>	45
6.4.3	<i>Recruitment and retention</i>	46
6.4.4	<i>CA Personnel</i>	46
6.4.5	<i>SPBCP Staff</i>	47
6.5	SPREP AS THE EXECUTING AGENCY	47
6.5.1	<i>The role of SPREP</i>	47
6.5.2	<i>The SPREP Action Plan</i>	48
6.5.3	<i>The Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region</i>	48
6.5.4	<i>Relationship with other programmes of SPREP</i>	49
6.5.5	<i>Logistical support and cost to SPREP</i>	49
6.6	UNDP AS THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	50
6.6.1	<i>The role of UNDP Apia</i>	50
6.6.2	<i>The role of UNDP Suva</i>	50
6.6.3	<i>UNDP Reporting Requirements and Report Formats</i>	51
6.6.4	<i>Assessment of programme performance</i>	51
6.6.5	<i>Perception of SPBCP and programme staff</i>	52

6.7	MONITORING AND BACKSTOPPING	52
6.7.1	<i>The Technical and Management Advisory Group (TMAG)</i>	52
6.7.2	<i>The Multipartite Reviews</i>	53
6.7.3	<i>The Mid-term Review</i>	53
6.7.4	<i>GEF Operations Performance Evaluation Mission</i>	54
6.7.5	<i>Field visits by UNDP staff</i>	54
6.7.6	<i>Internal SPREP Reports</i>	54
6.7.7	<i>SPREP Annual Work Programmes and Budgets</i>	55
6.7.8	<i>Professional backstopping</i>	55
6.7.9	<i>Benchmarks</i>	55
6.7.10	<i>Final Evaluation</i>	55
6.7.11	<i>Post ex-SPBCP Evaluation</i>	57
7.	SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES	57
7.1	WEANING THE CAPS FROM SPBCP	57
7.1.1	<i>Transition strategies for the CAPs</i>	57
7.1.2	<i>The SPREP/SPBCP Transition Strategy</i>	57
7.2	LINKS TO OTHER NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PROGRAMMES	58
7.2.1	<i>National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans</i>	58
7.2.2	<i>Other SPREP-executed programmes</i>	58
7.3	LEVERAGING OTHER FUNDING SUPPORT	61
7.3.1	<i>Regional Initiatives</i>	61
7.3.2	<i>Regional Biodiversity Support</i>	61
7.3.3	<i>Leveraging other SPBCP and CAP support</i>	62
8.	PROGRAMME ACHIEVEMENTS	65
8.1	DETERMINING THE ACHIEVEMENTS	65
9.	MEASURING SUCCESS	70
10.	LESSONS LEARNED	77
10.1.	CA ESTABLISHMENT IS ONLY A MEANS TO AN END	78
10.2.	CONSERVATION IS ABOUT PEOPLE	78
10.3.	COMMUNITIES ARE UNLIKELY TO COMMIT TO CONSERVATION WITHOUT REASONABLE COMPENSATION	78
10.4.	LONG TERM INVESTMENT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL TO ACHIEVING CONSERVATION SUCCESS IN THE PACIFIC.	78
10.5	PROJECT DESIGN	79
10.6	PROJECT COORDINATION AND EXECUTION	79
10.7	REGIONAL VS. NATIONAL EXECUTION	79
10.8	INTEGRATION VS. A NARROW FOCUSED APPROACH TO CONSERVATION	80
10.9	DONOR REQUIREMENTS VS. COMMUNITY NEEDS	80
10.10	RESOLVING COMMUNITY CONFLICTS	81
10.11	EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES	81
10.12	OWNERSHIP OF CAPS	83
10.13.	PROJECT OWNERSHIP CAN MEAN DIFFERENT THINGS TO DIFFERENT COMMUNITIES.	83
10.14	SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION	84
10.15	GENDER BALANCE IN CAP MANAGEMENT	84
10.16	CAPACITY OF NGOS	85
10.17	DOCUMENTING LESSONS LEARNED	85
10.18	EVALUATING THE PROGRAMME	86
11.	RISKS	86
11.1	INADEQUATE ACCESS TO COMMUNALLY-OWNED LAND WHICH WOULD BENEFIT FROM CA STATUS.	86
11.2	INSUFFICIENT SUPPORT FROM GOVERNMENTS	87
11.3	INSUFFICIENT ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES	87
11.4	SPREP MAY BE UNABLE TO EFFECTIVELY USE THE GEF SUPPORT	88
11.5	THE SUCCESS OF THE SPBCP MAY BE SHORT TERM ONLY	88
11.6	INSUFFICIENT OR INAPPROPRIATE BIODIVERSITY RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OF PROSPECTIVE BIODIVERSITY SPECIALISTS.	88

12. ANTICIPATING THE FUTURE 89

13. THE TRANSITION FROM SPBCP..... 91

14. RECOMMENDATIONS 92

15. CONCLUSION..... 93

16. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 96

TABLE 1: SPBCP EXPENDITURES 1991 – 2001..... 98

TABLE 2: SPBCP EXPENDITURES BY CAP 99

TABLE 3: SPBCP EXPENDITURES BY COMPONENT 100

TABLE 4: ACTUAL EXPENDITURES VS BUDGET ESTIMATES..... 101

TABLE 5: LIST OF SPBCP STAFF..... 102

ANNEX 1: LIST OF SPBCP PUBLICATIONS AND REPORTS..... 103

ANNEX 2: LIST OF SPBCP EQUIPMENT..... 146

ANNEX 3: REGIONAL TRAINING BY SPBCP ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

ANNEX 4: STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL CAPS TO DATE..... 147

1. INTRODUCTION

Although not a prescribed requirement of the programme, this report aims to complement the Terminal Report of the SPBCP was used by the Multipartite Review meeting as the basis for its evaluation of the programme. This report should therefore assist UNDP-GEF, SPREP, AusAID and the participating countries with their final review of the programme, especially from the Secretariat's viewpoint. The report covers a wide range of issues that, because of its limited scope and structure, were not addressed by the Terminal Report.

A draft copy of this report was made available to the team of consultants who carried out the final evaluation of the SPBCP. The report provides a Secretariat perspective of the overall management and administration of the SPBCP, from in-country implementation to regional coordination. It also provides an objective assessment of various components and activities of the CAPs and SPBCP based on staff experience with each of the 17 CAPs under the programme.

The first part of the report (section 2) provides an assessment of the programme concept and design. The second part (sections 3, 4 & 5) looks at the approach, progress with implementation of programme objectives, and management issues (section 6). Sustainability issues are discussed in section 7, while section 8 provides a summary of the main achievements of the programme. The final parts of the report provide a summary assessment of how success was measured (section 9) and what key lessons have been learned from the SPBCP and the CAPs (section 10). It also includes an assessment of the risks (section 11) as projected in the Project Document and a vision for the future is contained in section 12, and some recommendations for SPREP and other interested organisations.

As much as possible, the report tries to provide an assessment of how the programme had fared against its stated objectives, outputs, planned activities and the anticipated risks associated with programmes of this nature and magnitude. This was not such a difficult task, firstly because the programme's objectives, outputs and activities remained unchanged for eight years despite the fact that the programme was extended twice – from 1996 to 1998, then to 2001.

Being involved in a programme such as the SPBCP is an experience of a lifetime. The number of different people, organisations and communities involved is a challenge in itself. The diversity of cultures, languages, attitudes and behaviors make the job of conserving biodiversity difficult but challenging and exciting. The opportunity to work with different people under different situations will not be easy to forget. The ease with which the conservation message was accepted by most of the village communities was amazing. The speed with which they acted on the conservation message made it all worthwhile.

The SPBCP has been hailed by many as a success. It made a significant contribution to the protection of critical biodiversity in the region. It empowered local communities to take on the challenge of being responsible custodians of biological diversity, and it ventured to demonstrate that conservation and development are not mutually exclusive, but are inter-dependent elements of "sustainable living".

There is no doubt that many people and programmes will benefit from the experience and lessons learned from the SPBCP. That is the intention of reports like this – to document and make such experience widely known so that others can learn from our experience. Unfortunately, due to time constraints and other factors, this report is being written ahead of the end of the programme. Consequently, some important developments and lessons are likely to be left out. Our hope however is to revise the report at the end of the programme especially if there are new developments and information to be included.

2. PROGRAMME CONCEPT AND DESIGN

2.1 *Context and Background*

The context and background of the SPBCP are well described in the May 1993 UNDP/GEF Project Document¹ (referred to elsewhere in this report as the “Project Document”) which forms the basis for the Programme. In brief, the key points are:

- The biodiversity of Pacific island countries are under threat from human activities;
- Species diversity and endemism are very high in the Pacific region;
- Large scale logging, land clearing, fires, dredging, pollution and over-fishing are destroying important habitats and ecosystems;
- Pacific people and communities depend on natural resources for their economic and subsistence lifestyles;
- Many land and marine natural resources are held under customary ownership systems which limit the power of governments to alienate in conventional national parks and protected areas;
- Communities and governments are under great economic pressure to allow unsustainable exploitation of natural resources;
- Past attempts to protect natural resources in conventional national parks and nature reserves have largely been unsuccessful, often because of conflicts with local resource owners;

It was in this context that the SPBCP was launched with a primary objective of creating Conservation Areas “*incorporating development activities, which respect and enhance the natural environment while providing for the economic well-being of the local resource owners and communities*”. The emphasis was on facilitating local communities, NGOs and government agencies to work together to establish viable sustainable management systems.

The mid-term evaluation² agreed that a programme based on these principles was very appropriate and in fact essential as a response to the important issues and problems outlined above.

2.2 *The UNDP/GEF SPBCP Project Document*

2.2.1. Introduction

These comments are made with the benefit of hindsight. According to the Mid-term evaluation team, the Project Document was well conceived and professionally presented. The shortcomings identified stemmed largely from the difficulty of applying standard UNDP format and “aid-project” approach to a programme that does not fit well in that mould because of its innovative approach and Pacific land tenure and resource

¹ South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme, Project Document, signed between SPREP and UNDP in April 1993.

² South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme, Independent Mid-term Evaluation, August 1996.

management practices. Except for the programme budget which was reviewed and revised on an annual basis, the Project Document has never been revised despite the fact that the programme was extended twice!

2.2.2 Project duration and extension

Although the Project Document was completed in 1991, UNDP and SPREP did not sign it until almost two years later. As a consequence, the programme, which had an original lifespan of 5 years (1991-1996), was not implemented until May 1993. Except for the Programme Manager, the other professional staff did not join until six months later. Full implementation of the programme therefore didn't start until early 1994.

Although UNDP eventually granted extension for the programme to continue beyond 1996, the Project Document was never revised. It was however realised that to do so would require a substantial amount of effort for a document that, except for the schedule of activities, was largely viewed as still relevant and current. Since the SPBCP budget gets reviewed and revised on an annual basis, a complete review of the total budget as contained in the Project Document was also not considered necessary.

The extension to December 2001 was the second of such extensions granted the SPBCP following decisions of the Technical and Management Advisory Group and the Multipartite Reviews of the programme. The first extension was granted in 1996 to allow the programme to continue until 1998.

2.2.3 Definition of and Approach to the Problem

The Project Document clearly identified and described the problem of threats to biodiversity in the Pacific region, and the need to explore conservation models and techniques that respect the rights and needs of communities. The key issues of customary land and resource ownership, the dependence of Pacific communities on natural resources, and the unsuitability of conventional conservation techniques such as state-owned national parks were identified.

The Mid-term review believed that this approach to the problem was sound. However, it also considered that certain aspects of the approach outlined in the Project Document were overly influenced by the rigid format of UNDP project development, and the norms of more conventional projects.

This anomaly was rectified for the in-country projects when TMAG, in recognising the concern raised by the Mid-term review recommended that “documentation and reporting procedures be simplified, with a focus on community-generated action plans”³.

2.2.4 Identification of Beneficiaries and Users

The Project Document identified local land-owning groups, concerned community groups, government officials and NGOs who are involved in managing the conservation areas as the beneficiaries of GEF assistance through their involvement in management and training activities of the programme. It also identified SPREP, as the executing agency for the SPBCP as a direct beneficiary of GEF assistance. This presupposes that SPBCP was a SPREP programme whereas in fact, the SPBCP was treated quite

³ Report of TMAG 1997.

differently from other SPREP-executed projects as was evident in the following exceptions granted the SPBCP:

- SPREP does not charge SPBCP its normal 10% administration fee as required of other donor-funded programmes and projects executed by the organisation;
- The SPBCP staffs were not core staff of SPREP and would leave the organisation at the end of the SPBCP.
- SPREP was mainly a conduit for GEF assistance to participating countries.
- UNDP, who received 10% of the total budget, was itself, not listed as a beneficiary.

SPREP benefited from the SPBCP in terms of the enormous contribution the programme made towards the achievement of one of the SPREP Action Plan's key objectives. There was also the opportunity to share information and expertise between the SPBCP and other programme officers of the organisation. However, compared to the UNDP, the financial returns to the SPREP from the SPBCP were far less than from other donor-funded programmes and projects.

2.2.5 Development Objectives

The overall goal of the SPBCP was *“to develop strategies for the conservation of biodiversity by means of sustainable use of biological resources by the people of the South Pacific”*.

The concept embodied in this objective that conservation was to be achieved *“by means of”* sustainable use was cause for some intensive discussion between the Mid-term evaluation team, the secretariat and TMAG. While the mid-term evaluation team acknowledged that the underlying goal of the programme was biodiversity conservation, it believed that for the SPBCP, this was to be achieved entirely through the implementation of sustainable use activities by local people and communities.

TMAG agreed with the secretariat that the interpretation of the development objective should not exclude areas that are important for biodiversity but may not have the potential for sustainable use or income generating activities. This is reflected in the “end-of-project situation” statement⁴ where the weight given to development and sustainable use was the same if not less than traditional conservation activities.

Concern was raised particularly by CASOs and lead agencies that the emphasis on income generating activities could result in less attention to the ultimate goal – the sustainable conservation of biological diversity. Furthermore, it was argued that income generation could create false expectations of communities which, if not met, could result in dissatisfaction and discontent with the projects. When confronted with situations like this, the primary objective of each CAP should determine the need or otherwise for income generating activities in a project, not the overall goal of the SPBCP. This would be a good lesson for any other similar programmes in future.

⁴ Page 14 & 15 of Project Document

2.2.6 Immediate Objectives

There were two primary objectives of the SPBCP. The first was “*to facilitate the initial establishment and management of a series of Conservation Areas that demonstrate protection of biodiversity, ecologically sustainable use of resources, and community economic development*” The second primary objective was “*to protect terrestrial and marine species that are threatened or endangered in the Pacific region*”.

The three secondary objectives deal with “the identification of new important areas for the conservation of biodiversity” (Objective 3); “improving awareness of the importance of conserving biodiversity” (Objective 4); and “improving capacities and cooperation between different sectors contributing to conservation of biodiversity” (Objective 5).

The secondary objectives were to be pursued largely in connection with individual Conservation Area projects. As the Mid-term review pointed out, this was an important qualification because Objectives 4 and 5 in particular would otherwise imply major region-wide programmes.

In past reviews of the programme, major focus has always been on Objective 1. At times, Objective 2 was treated as either it did not belong, or that everything was fine that there was no need to dwell on the matter. Perhaps, a contributing factor to this attitude was the difficulty in measuring progress or success in this objective in quantifiable terms. For example, how do we know that the programme had helped increase the population of marine turtles when these animals move freely within and outside the region where some of them are caught and killed en masse? Also how should we go about measuring increased awareness when people’s attitudes and actions do not appear to have changed? Questions like these suggest that there is a need for more work in developing indicators of change that are easily measured and understood by local communities.

2.2.7 Outputs

The outputs as stated in the Project Document were generally clear and concise. They related well to the objectives, which they were designed to achieve. Additional outputs were identified and achieved through the implementation of annual work plans, hence a major revision of the Project Document to incorporate these was not considered necessary.

The outputs for CAPs on the other hand were identified through their annual work plans and were reviewed and revised as necessary through quarterly reports. For many CAPs, the outputs as contained in the work plans closely reflected the priorities as identified in their PPDs, but for some, the outputs were very different from those in the PPDs suggesting two things: 1) that the priorities have completely changed since the PPDs were developed; or 2) that the PPDs were totally ignored as irrelevant and out of date by the time CA implementation started.

2.2.8 Assumptions

The underlying assumption of the Project Document that a long period of time will be required to negotiate and agree on Conservation Area proposals was strongly disputed by the Mid-term review who believed that local communities, at the time of their visit, were keen to participate and anxious to make progress. Had the team stayed around long enough, they would have realised by now how easy one can jump to the wrong conclusion if s/he is unable to read the situation correctly.

Getting two or more communities to agree on such an important issue as conservation has and continues to be the greatest challenge for many CASOs, project managers and lead agencies. After almost eight years of SPBCP support and training in capacity building and conflict resolution, some CAPs have yet to command the full support and cooperation of the concerned communities. Field operators (CASOs, project managers, etc) have often referred to the short period of time allowed under donor-funded projects to be able to carry out fully involved participatory community meetings to resolve key social, cultural and economic issues. Although it was important to comply with and respect the deadlines set by donors, the risk of losing community control and therefore sustainability of projects when they are implemented at someone else's pace could be so great that even future proposals could be affected.

The mid-term review also assumed that communities were "ready" but were losing patience with the late start of project activities. This "readiness" has not been evident in a large number of communities who have been demanding compensation for their time before they could even lend a hand to help. It appears that what the team referred to as readiness was "anxious to see what happens and how one might benefit from the project" - a common attitude which does not necessarily translate to a willingness to get involved in any major way in project implementation.

2.2.9 Monitoring and Evaluation Provisions

Several provisions have been made in the Project Document for the monitoring and evaluation of the SPBCP⁵. They include:

- Establishment of regular, consistent and systematic monitoring and review of CAPs;
- A procedure for reporting from CACC and CAP personnel to the Programme at 4-6 month intervals;
- Establishment of a Technical and Management Advisory Group to advise on programme implementation;
- Tripartite/multipartite reviews;
- Preparation of annual work programmes;
- An independent mid-term review;
- Regular reporting by staff and consultants;
- Annual, six-monthly and quarterly reports by the Programme Manager.

Comments on the impact and effectiveness of these comprehensive monitoring and evaluation provisions are given in latter parts of this report.

2.2.10 Work Plan

The Project Document⁶ provided a draft work plan for the first two years of the Programme which guided programme staff in programme implementation during the first years of the programme. Work plans for the following years were prepared by the Programme Manager and approved by annual meetings of TMAG.

The CASOs in consultation with the lead agencies and CACCs prepared annual work plans of the CAPs. If necessary, revisions to these plans could be done through quarterly work plans, which are submitted,

⁵ Pages 19 and 20 of Project Document.

⁶ Annex 2.

with quarterly requests for funds to the secretariat. In many cases, revisions were often found necessary as CAPs switched priority from one aspect to another depending on local circumstances and conditions.

2.2.11 Summary

In general, the basic objectives and concept of the programme have been well expressed by the Project Document despite the limitations imposed by the rigid content and format requirement for UNDP Project Documents. With its community focus, greater emphasis should have been placed on the grassroots-based orientation of the programme and less on conventional conservation management techniques and procedures and on agency-based formal documentation procedures. The often-vast gap between donor requirements on one hand and community capacity/needs on the other was amply demonstrated in this case. It followed through to the final evaluation of the programme where performance was critically assessed on what was prescribed by the Project Document, and not by what was achieved on the ground.

3. PROGRAMME APPROACH

The SPBCP used a community-based participatory approach that involved all the stakeholders (communities, government agencies, relevant NGOs, etc) while at the same time recognising the needs and rights of land and resource owners. It is believed that the programme has achieved a great deal in creating support at all levels for the concept of biodiversity conservation through sustainable uses, and has laid a solid foundation on which future activities could be launched from.

The participatory approach to community consultation and decision-making took time – time that was often not allowed for in donor funded projects. To ensure that the momentum was not lost while consultations were progressing, the programme was able to launch a small number of activities (establishment of CACCs, appointment of CASOs, resource surveys etc) that had already received the blessing of the communities while the more substantive issues were being discussed and resolved. There was always the risk of misjudging a situation, and of committing some mistakes during this process. However, the option of moving towards action at a pace that the communities would consider painfully slow, could have resulted in the loss of interest and possibly, the conversion of the project area to some other form of use.

Having communities commit to the CAPs was the ultimate aim of the SPBCP approach to achieving sustainability for the country projects. Empowering local communities as owners and managers of the CAPs was crucial to the long term success and survival of these projects. The task was not easy for many reasons including the all so common attitude that SPBCP should pay communities for their participation in the projects. If this one problem could be resolved, then the community approach of the SPBCP could be easily adopted by other programmes who might wish to emulate it in the years ahead.

4. PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Planning processes and documentation

4.1.1 Introduction

There is no denying the fact that the initial process of documentation and approval that was required before practical action could begin was tedious and counterproductive to achieving results on the ground. For a number of CAPs, the preparation of concept and design documents (PPDs)

dragged on for far too long leading to frustration and loss of interest by some members of the communities. It also created tensions between the CAPs and headquarters.

Tensions between projects and headquarters are not unusual in any programme. For community-based programmes like the SPBCP, the likelihood of such tensions was extremely high. In view of the need to achieve results on the ground and to maintain community interest in the projects, TMAG recommended that the documentation requirement of the programme be relaxed to allow resources to be released as soon as possible for the achievement of practical progress. This was a perceptive and timely recommendation from the TMAG. For the latter two projects (Jaluit and Kiritimati), PPDs were not prepared. Instead, the concept proposals were considered adequate for their approval and immediate implementation.

4.1.2 Project Document Approach

The Project Document proposed a process for the implementation of the SPBCP. It involved the preparation of a concept proposal, the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SPREP and the proponent, and the preparation of a project design document called the Project Preparation Document (PPD).

The concept proposal provided just sufficient information to enable the programme and TMAG decide whether the proposal meets the selection criteria of the SPBCP. If it did, then an MOU was signed between SPREP and the proponent to signal the acceptance of the proposal for SPBCP funding. Up to \$10,000 was then made available for the preparation of the PPD which was to form the basis for determining future funding for the CAPs.

The preparation of comprehensive and often very technical PPDs has been blamed for the delay in achieving practical progress on the ground. These documents were often prepared by outside consultants whose desire to provide as much information as possible to assist CA management may have clouded their perception of the CAPs as community-owned and managed projects. Here, the common dilemma in the contrasting needs of donors for comprehensive management plans and timelines and the subtle needs of local communities for simple and non-technical “plans” was clearly evident. It took many communities as much time to approve their PPDs as it took to prepare the PPDs themselves. Even after approving these documents, there was not much commitment on the part of the communities to their implementation.

The PPDs were heavily criticised by both the mid-term and final evaluation teams. Neither teams had however really addressed the root cause of the problem, i.e. the lack of local capacity to prepare and develop meaningful management plans which the communities could identify with.

4.1.3 Project Proposal Approval

As indicated above, for many CAPs, obtaining community approval of the PPDs was a long process. In some instances, communities saw these documents as SPBCP reports solely for the use of the secretariat. To remedy the situation, annual work plans by the CAPs, which have been largely based on the PPDs, substituted for the PPDs and were approved by the CACCs and lead agencies as the basis for implementation of their projects.

Community approval of reports and other project documentation was essential, but can be a long drawn out process. Simplified versions of the reports would have been preferred for the local communities. Some awareness raising would have been important prior to the discussion of such reports. Experience has shown that action on the ground, rather than impressive technical reports, was the quickest way to convincing communities to put their support behind the projects.

4.1.4 Project Implementation

If there was a flaw in the original programme design, it was the failure to provide for capital equipment (vehicles, computers, etc) for the CA projects. Given their isolation from the main centers of commerce and lead agency headquarters, the projects suffered from lack of transport, communication and other support services that are normally available to other donor and government-funded projects. Although computers and other less costly essential equipment were provided later in the life of the programme, transportation remained an inhibiting factor for many CASOs.

Heavy reliance by CAP staff on SPBCP personnel to assist implement projects in-country was a feature of the early stages of CAP implementation. The preparation of PPDs, the conduct of resource surveys and the training of local staff typified the needs of CAPs at this stage. As local capacity improved, there was a corresponding decline in requests for headquarters staff time except in cases where technical expertise was not available locally. We now have in the Pacific in the form of the CASOs some of the best trained people who should be able to take biodiversity conservation in the region to the next level up. These people represent a “new” caliber of conservation practitioners whose skills and training empowers them to work and live with the people who really count when it comes to conservation in the Pacific – the resource owners and users. There is a possibility that some of these people will be lost to the CAPs when the SPBCP support that has been paying for their wages ends. We can only hope that they will still be able to make sometime available to help the communities or the new CASOs in the management of the projects post SPBCP.

5. SUMMARY OF PROGRESS

5.1 OBJECTIVE 1: ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSERVATION AREAS

5.1.1 Identification of CAPs

More than 20 CA proposals were received from all 14 participating countries of the programme. They included some existing projects although most were for new areas. 17 sites in 12 PICs were eventually approved for SPBCP support. All these sites met the SPBCP Selection Criteria and exceeded the SPBCP criteria for success⁷ of “CAPs established in at least 15 locations”.

Proposed areas were mainly identified through resource surveys carried out by other donor-funded programmes or by an institution for various reasons including conservation. The proposals included description of the biodiversity of the site, which must meet the SPBCP criteria for selection and an indication of community support before they are approved for SPBCP funding.

⁷ Page 32, Project Document

The latter was considered extremely important particularly in view of the complex issues of land ownership and access rights in the Pacific context.

5.1.2 Selection of CAPs

The Criteria for Selection of Conservation Areas are contained in page 17 of the Project Document. To be selected as a CAP, a proposal must meet all criteria listed under Category I and some of the criteria of Category II.

What is interesting is the listing of the commitment of landowners, residents and resource users and other potential partners in category I. It reaffirmed the need for community consultations to take place well before the projects are approved for SPBCP support. It presupposes that such consultations would have occurred before the proposal is submitted to SPBCP, whereas in reality, such consultations would normally only occur when there was a positive indication of support for the project from the community concerned.

The few proposals that were not approved for SPBCP support suffered from the lack of resources to carry out pre-SPBCP consultations required to ensure the commitment and support of local resource owners and users. However, most of those that were declined were submitted after TMAG had decided that the programme should not take on any more new projects but to concentrate resources on achieving sustainability for the already approved projects.

5.1.3 Number of CAPs

The 17 CAPs supported by the SPBCP cover an estimated 1.5 million hectares of land and marine areas of the Pacific region. This is by far, the largest contribution by any one programme to the conservation of the natural resources of this region.

Aside from the 17 projects it directly supported, the SPBCP also provided indirect assistance to other projects outside the SPBCP. It was encouraging for the region that a number of other programmes by governments and NGOs have together established another 17 protected areas in the last decade following the SPBCP CAP concept. All these efforts would augur well for the effective conservation and management of the region's unique but fragile environment.

Some have argued that the SPBCP would have done better had its resources been concentrated on a smaller number of large projects. Be that as it may, the politics of the regional programme suggested that the larger number of projects was the more acceptable approach although it was argued by the final evaluation that the number (i.e. 17 CAPs) was too much for the Secretariat to manage from a distance.

5.1.4 Quality of CAPs

All the CAPs are at different stages of development; some more advanced than others. Those that existed before the SPBCP (Koroyanitu, Pohnpei and Arnavon Islands) were able to make immediate progress although some of the new ones (especially Takitumu, Vatthe, Ngaremeduu and Funafuti) were able to quickly catch up on them.

Both the mid-term and final evaluations agreed that except for one CA, all met the selection criteria of the SPBCP. In fact, it was also suggested that some CAPs include the most critical habitats and ecosystems in the countries concerned which means that the programme is playing a key role in protecting important biodiversity in the region.

Only Takitumu, Arnavon, Funafuti and Uafato projects have monitoring programmes that enabled them to determine the status of resources within their CAPs. Other projects have undertaken to do the same following training received through the SPBCP Success Indicators workshops⁸.

The terrestrial CAPs (Koroyanitu, Uafato, Vatthe, Pohnpei, Takitumu, Huvalu, and Komaridi) cover either the best or even the last remaining habitat of their type in the countries concerned. They clearly meet the biodiversity criterion, if only because of their “last survivor” status. The mangroves of Sa'anapu and Sataoa fall within this category although there are doubts as to whether the area was large enough to be viable.

Except for North Tarawa where biodiversity information is still scarce, the other marine areas (Arnavon, Rock Islands, Ngaremedu Bay, Jaluit, Ha'apai, Funafuti, Utwa-walung and Kiritimati) have outstanding values that would rate them amongst the best sites in the region, if not the world. By and large, the qualities of the CAPs are quite good and there are possibilities of some areas extending to cover pristine areas that are currently outside the boundaries of the CAPs.

5.1.5 Ecological Viability and Sustainability

- Viability

Viability implies that the area is sufficiently large and secure to sustain in perpetuity the full range of species and population densities that would normally be present without human interference. It further implies that there are no apparent inevitable threats to the CA that would alter this position.⁹

The Sa'anapu/Sataoa CAP (75 ha.) is not large enough to ensure viability. In addition, the difficulty in getting the two communities to work together also poses a major challenge for the project. On the bright side, there are plans to extend the project area to about 12,000 ha, and the proposal to integrate the project into the Safata district component of the Samoa-IUCN Marine Protected Area would secure it a good future.

A number of other projects share the same concern as the Sa'anapu/Sataoa project. There is however reason to be optimistic that the threats currently faced by some of the projects will be resolved. The pledges made by government officials at the 2000 Multipartite Review Meeting¹⁰ that governments will absorb the cost of the CAPs must be taken seriously. This will certainly ensure the funding sustainability for the projects, at least in the next few years. Building confidence and capacity of local communities will contribute to the viability of the projects and everything must be done to ensure that this remains a high priority for the CAPs post SPBCP.

⁸ Apia, Samoa 14 – 25 August 2000 and 18 – 22 June 2001.

⁹ Keith Garrat, et, al. SPBCP Independent Mid-Term Evaluation, August 1996.

¹⁰ 7th Multipartite Review of the SPBCP, Wellington, New Zealand, 16 November, 2000.

- Sustainability

Sustainability refers to the continuing capacity of the community's natural resource management processes to meet the reasonable socio-economic aspirations of the community without degrading the resources.

Management processes and personnel ability in most if not all CAPs have improved considerably through on-the-job and regional training provided by the programme. Local communities are taking the lead in decision-making and in implementation of CA activities in many project sites. With the help of CASOs and CACCs, communities have been able to identify other sources of support for their projects and this will place them in good stead for the post-SPBCP phase.

The preparation of transition strategies for the CAPs should help them achieve a smooth transition from SPBCP support. As part of this process, a number of projects have decided to review the compositions and role of their CACCs while others are considering alternative measures altogether. Whatever the outcome of these reviews, the need for an effective management structure involving as many stakeholders as possible was seen as vital to the long term sustainability of the CAPs.

The status of each CAP to date is summarised in Annex 4.

- Threats

The external threats to the viability and sustainability of the CAPs appear to be well under control for many CAPs. Logging, conversion to other uses, and the use of destruction practices have largely been curtailed through decisions of local communities and to some extent, the law.

The major threat to the viability and sustainability of the CAPs lies with the ability (or lack thereof) of local communities to work hand-in-hand in the interest of the projects. Where more than one community is involved in any one CAP, the lack of trust between the communities often result in demands for each community to "do its own thing". Unfortunately, this could lead to other previously dormant conflicting issues such as area boundaries, the right to collect revenues and so forth, resurfacing.

Even if only one community was involved in a CAP, internal conflicts between members of such community could lead to problems for the project. Returning residents and non-residents of the CAPs for example may try to prove their authority over the area by opposing previously agreed decisions of the communities although this would make them very unpopular with the local population.

For the CAPs to be viable and sustainable, these issues they will have to dealt with. They pose a far greater threat than external ones, such as commercial logging and others.

5.1.6. Economic Viability and Sustainability

From the economic and financial standpoint, CAPs need to be financially viable in order to be sustainable. From the sustainable development perspective, a project that relies on natural

resources for its business, in particular renewable resources, must ensure that it does not extract more than the resource base is capable of reproducing over time.

It is hard to envisage any of the 17 CAPs becoming financially viable by the end of the SPBCP. If it is impossible for government-owned and government-managed protected areas to become financially viable, it would be even more difficult for community-owned CAPs to do so. Some community projects should be able to raise some funds to maintain the projects, but it is unlikely that this will be sufficient for the upkeep of the projects. Additional sources of support will have to be identified either within the country or outside.

Lack of external funding may not necessarily result in all community projects folding up, although it will be extremely hard for any project to survive without it. Those that would be able to continue are likely to have the full support of the communities behind it. The CAPs that have benefited from the voluntary support of the local communities have been making impressive progress while those that depended solely on external support will feel the impact of the post-SPBCP era more severely.

Takitumu and Vathe should be able by the end of 2001 to raise sufficient funds from within their CAPs to meet much of the cost related to the management of their projects. The majority of the projects on the other hand may have to rely on government or other sources of funding for at least the next 2- 3 years before they are able to raise significant funds to pay for some of their maintenance costs. For some (Utu-walung, Ha'apai, Ngaremeduu, Rock Islands, Uafato, Funafuti, Huvalu, Jaluit), the promise of a successful income generating activity gives reason for hope. For all, the enthusiasm and commitment of local communities provides an inspiration to carry on come what may!

5.1.7 Socio-cultural Sustainability

The programme has done much to sustain the socio-cultural stability of some of the communities involved. The conservation of their surrounding forests has helped brought some previously rival communities of Vathe together, while the economic opportunities brought about by the CAPs have also enhanced social stability in other communities (Uafato, Niue, Takitumu).

Despite certain shortcomings, the management structures (the CACCs) that have been put in place to have overall responsibility for the CAPs have also been used for other decision-making needs of the communities. This resulted in further community support and appreciation for the projects. Given greater support and encouragement, these structures could have the potential to become the decision-making forum for environment and conservation matters in their respective countries.

Unity in local communities can be very volatile; they can be easily disrupted by any action or plan that is perceived to lack transparency and equity in the distribution of benefits. This is the biggest threat to the socio-cultural sustainability that the SPBCP-supported CAPs have yet to experience since the benefits have not begun to flow for most of them. SPREP and the CAPs themselves will do well to keep a close watch on this matter as the projects continue after SPBCP.

5.1.8 Income Generating Activities

Although the rationale for involvement in income-generating activities is clearly stipulated in the programme's basic objective, the emphasis of the programme in the first two years was in the

identification and establishment of CAPs. This drew criticism from the Mid-term Review team who believed that “*sustainable use of natural resources and community economic development*” should have also been a corollary criterion in the selection of CAPs in the first place. They argued that the programme should have been able to give income generating activities the same emphasis it gave CAP establishment during the early stages of programme implementation.

While the views of the Review team makes good sense, in practice it was difficult to identify potential income generating activities without a better understanding of the biodiversity of the proposed areas and their capacity to support any income generating activities, whatever they might be. Many proposed CAP sites did not have the required information to enable such decisions to be made. Even if the potential seemed clear for some CAPs, the need for feasibility studies to determine the impact and viability of the identified activity was an important prerequisite that needed to be undertaken prior to such activities being implemented.

The Mid-term Review, in their interpretation of the Development Objective of the programme may have given the impression that every CAP should have an economic activity in order to qualify for SPBCP support. On the contrary, some areas may not have these options or want these initiatives. According to TMAG, the key point to emphasise was that sustainable use was not synonymous with income generation, and that subsistence use was also an important component¹¹. Income generation was an incentive; the focus of the programme had been on conservation of biodiversity and should remain so. The success of the programme should likewise focus primarily on biodiversity conservation.

Notwithstanding the discussion above, the focus of SPBCP in the past three years has clearly been in support of income generating activities. Eco-tourism development was clearly the preferred option for many CAPs although bee-keeping (Uafato), coconut oil production (Huvalu) and diving (Funafuti, Rock Islands and Utwa-walung) have also been operationalised. In Takitumu and Vatthe, a certain percentage of the proceeds from eco-tourism have been reinvested for the future support of the CAPs. This should give them the edge over their other SPBCP-supported colleagues when SPBCP funding comes to an end later in the year. Finding the markets for some of these activities will be a major preoccupation for them in the years ahead.

5.1.9 Business Development and marketing

Business development and marketing skills are necessary in order for local communities to promote and market the products from their income generating activities thereby making them sustainable from a financial point of view. The business skills and acumen that must be nurtured have to be those that are relevant to the range of income-generating activities identified and implemented by the CAPs. It follows therefore that the training provided may have to be specific to the CAP and the type of activity undertaken although there will be elements of universality in some.

The provision of computers (not originally allowed in the programme budget) enabled a number of CAPs to promote and advertise their income generating activities on the internet. Other projects either have access to the web site of a partner organisation or are a member of a local tourist promotion organisation who undertakes the promotion on their behalf. Access to information

¹¹ Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Technical and Management Advisory Group, 26 – 28 August, 1996.

technology will continue to be an important aspect of the drive to achieve sustainability for the CAPs but it is noted that the bulk of the equipment provided by SPBCP are now nearing their useful life and will need to be replaced soon.

The training received from the SPBCP in small business enterprise management will serve the CASOs and project managers well in the day-to-day operation of income generating activities. The preparation of business management plans if implemented conscientiously will also ensure that income generating activities do not become the main preoccupation of the projects at the expense of resource conservation and sustainable use. The preparation of marketing strategies will be important for many CAPs and the labeling of CA products as “green products” will probably enhance their marketability. This will certainly be the next step in the development of income generating activities in most of the CAPs.

5.1.10 Adequacy of baseline data

The lack of baseline data affected the effective monitoring of progress and impact of the programme and CAPs on the biodiversity of the areas concerned and of the communities living in or near them. Although the situation has improved especially in biodiversity data collection and monitoring since the start of the programme, there is still a lot of work to be done. Socio-economic baseline information is still lacking for many CAPs although CASOs have been trained in the collection of this type of information and should be in a position to rectify the situation soon.

In some cases, baseline data are readily available for “flagship” or key indicator species. For example, in Takitumu, population census on the kakerori goes as far back as the 1980’s. Recent counts show significant progress in the recovery of the species. In the Arnavons, sightings of the hawksbill turtles have increased significantly compared to pre-SPBCP days.

The development of success indicators for the SPBCP and for the CAPs and the training provided CASOs in their application ensures that the projects are equipped with the skills and tools to monitor what goes on in their CAPs. The large number of resource surveys carried out during the lifetime of the SPBCP should provide the projects with the necessary information required for the design and implementation of their monitoring programmes. This information needs to be compiled and collated, analysed and recorded in a form that is easily accessible to all stakeholders.

5.1.11 Relationship with other regional conservation programmes

There is no other regional conservation programmes like the SPBCP operating in the Pacific region except those of The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and the World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF).

The TNC has country presence in Solomon Islands, Palau and Pohnpei and is an active partner in Arnavon, Rock Islands and the Pohnpei CAPs respectively. In fact, TNC is a key player in these three projects. SPBCP has enjoyed many years of a cordial relationship with TNC, not only in the CAPs as stated, but also in the Roundtable for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Region¹² and in the organising of Pacific conferences on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas¹³.

¹² SPREP and TNC are founding members of the Roundtable.

¹³ These conferences are held every four years. The last two conferences (1993 and 1997) were partially supported by the SPBCP.

SPBCP and WWF do not have joint projects on the ground. However, WWF is an active member of the Roundtable and a regular participant at the conferences on nature conservation. WWF is also actively assisting PICs in the preparation of their National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans (NBSAPs) and is playing an active role as a clearing house for biodiversity information.

The World Conservation Union (IUCN) does not have a regional programme in the Pacific although its World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) has a presence in Oceania. IUCN, with funding from the World Bank and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is however supporting a Marine Protected Area in Samoa, which comprises the Sa'anapu/Sataoa CAP, supported by the SPBCP.

The University of the South Pacific (USP) does not have projects on the ground but provides training to Pacific islanders in environment conservation and management. USP experts have been used in numerous occasions as consultants to the SPBCP and have used the Koroyanitu CA in Fiji as a study site for research and training activities by its students. USP, ICPL¹⁴ and SPREP jointly organised and conducted a regional training course¹⁵ for CASOs and other conservation practitioners from the Pacific early this year. It is possible that similar training will be offered in future.

5.2. *OBJECTIVE 2: SPECIES PROTECTION*

5.2.1 **Regional Marine Turtle Conservation Programme (RMTCP)**

Although SPREP has been assisting PICs with the implementation of the RMTCP before the SPBCP, the launching of the 1995 Pacific Year of the Sea Turtle campaign clearly made the most impact in terms of raising public awareness and action. Eighteen PICs carried out national campaigns and one country approved a moratorium on the harvesting of the species as a result. Turtle conservation posters are a common sight in many public places around the Pacific nowadays!

The Pacific campaign reached not only all countries of the region but also some outside the region. The campaign video was shown on ITV and CNN in addition to TV stations in many PICs. Publicity materials were distributed world-wide and many schools throughout the region held essay, poster and other competitions on the topic of turtle conservation. In 1999, the countries in the Indian Ocean decided to launch a similar campaign to promote turtle conservation in that part of the world.

The link between the species conservation and CAP development components of the SPBCP is amply demonstrated in projects such as Arnavon, Ha'apai, Ngaremeduu and Rock Islands where important breeding and feeding grounds for these endangered marine species are being protected. Other areas such as Funafuti CAP have reported recent sightings of marine turtles which, according to local sources, has not happened in a long time.

¹⁴ International Center for Protected Landscapes (a UK-based training institution)

¹⁵ The Pacific Island Community Conservation Course, USP, 12 February to 9 March, 2001

One can confidently say that there has been a considerable increase in public awareness about turtle conservation in the Pacific as a result of the RMTCP. There are also anecdotal accounts of increased sighting of turtles in places where the species has not been seen in recent times that can be attributed in full or in part to the success of awareness raising initiatives under the programme. However, it remains a difficult task to evaluate the real success of initiatives aimed at long-lived pelagic species such as turtles except by continuous surveys and monitoring over many years. What is certain however is that our understanding of the biology and movement of the species has increased immensely over the years and will no doubt increase further as the RMTCP continues.

5.2.2 Regional Marine Mammal Conservation Programme (RMMCP)

Unlike the turtle conservation programme, interest in the marine mammals conservation programme (RMMCP) has not been high in the region. This is mainly due to the fact that only a few countries are blessed with resident populations of some species of marine mammals. Except for modest assistance towards a dugong conservation project in Palau under the Palau Conservation Society¹⁶, the main activity under the RMMCP has clearly been the whale-watching project in Vavau, Kingdom of Tonga.

The RMMCP has been instrumental in assisting the government of Tonga develop its whale-watching industry by providing technical advice and support to the numerous whale-watching operators, fisheries and conservation officials. A decision by the government to extend an existing moratorium on the commercial harvesting of whales in the Kingdom was facilitated with advice from the programme. Today, the whale-watching in Tonga is growing. A recent study by Massey University¹⁷ suggests that revenues from whale watching to the Vava'u community exceeds T\$1,000,000 each year. SPREP support to whale watching in Tonga will continue after the SPBCP with funds received from other sources. The interest shown by neighboring islands (Cook Islands, Niue and American Samoa) in similar ventures could see expansion of RMMCP activities in the region.

In the last two years, the RMMCP has been actively involved in the region's efforts for the establishment of a South Pacific Whales Sanctuary comprising the EEZ of PICs south of the equator including Australia and New Zealand. The SPWS, if approved will nicely complement the Southern Ocean Sanctuary thereby gaining greater level of protection for whales and endangered or threatened small cetaceans in this part of the world. SPBCP staff assisted in organising a Pacific island delegation to the 52nd Meeting of the International Whale Commission (July, 2000 Adelaide, Australia) to lend support to the SPWS proposal. Unfortunately, despite considerable support, the SPWS failed to obtain the 75% majority vote required for a schedule amendment to adopt such a conservation measure. PICs have pledged to pursue the proposal at future meetings of the IWC.

5.2.3 Regional Avifauna Conservation Programme (RACP)

The SPBCP provided, on average, \$50,000 p.a. to SPREP in support of the RACP. The RACP provided technical assistance to PICs in support of programmes aimed at the conservation of rare

¹⁶ Palau Conservation Society is Non-Governmental Organisation with a conservation objective. It is also the lead agency for the Rock Island Conservation Area under the SPBCP.

¹⁷ The Economic Benefits of Whale Watching in Vava'u, The Kingdom of Tonga, Mark B. Orams, Center for Tourism Research, University of Massey at Albany, New Zealand, November 1999.

and endangered bird species. Early activities focussed primarily on awareness raising including national campaigns for the conservation of flagship species or “national birds”.

Activities however picked up in 1998 with a changed focus to preparation of recovery plans for endangered bird species of the region when a new Invasive Species and Avifauna Officer position was established by SPREP with primary responsibility for these two programmes. A recovery plan for the kakerori in the Cook Islands was developed through a sub-regional workshop in Polynesia as a model for other countries in the sub-region. Similar workshops were also held in Micronesia and Melanesia thereby enabling a full coverage of the Pacific island countries.

As in other species conservation programmes, the link between birds’ conservation initiatives and CAP establishment has been strong. The RACP work hand-in-hand with the Takitumu CAP staff in the kakerori recovery programme within the CAP. Likewise, the CAPs provide effective sanctuaries for other endangered bird species such as Pacific pigeon (Uafato, Vatthe, Huvalu) and megapodes (Vatthe, Arnavon, Rock Islands). Other organisations like RARE have also supported bird conservation initiatives in the region.

5.2.4 Other Species Conservation Initiatives of Interest

In 1998, SPREP launched its Invasive Species programme with funding from the government of New Zealand and the United States of America. This programme has direct relevance to the SPBCP and the CAPs as it deals with the identification, control and eradication of invasive species that have the potential to destroy or degrade the biodiversity of CAPs.

The brown tree snake has been responsible for the extinction of nine of Guam’s thirteen endemic bird species. It has the potential to invade and cause similar damage to the bird resources of neighboring countries such as Palau, FSM and Marshall Islands. If quarantine and conservation officials are not vigilant enough in their duty to stop its deliberate or accidental introduction into these countries, this single pest alone could destroy not only the bird resources of these islands, but their economies as well.

The biodiversity of the island of Tahiti in French Polynesia has been decimated by a miconia species introduced in the 1800’s as an ornamental. It now covers 75% of the island and is threatening to invade neighboring islands including the Cook Islands. Similar tales of invasion can be heard from many islands of the region. The problem is so widespread that it is believed that invasive species now pose one of the greatest threat to the biodiversity of the Pacific. CAP personnel will need to pay particular attention to this problem if the biodiversity of the CAPs are to be effectively protected from invasive species. Preliminary assistance was made available by the SPREP Invasive Species Officer to some CASOs in this regard, but there is a lot of work to be done before they have the skills to deal with this threat in a more effective way.

5.3. OBJECTIVE 3: IDENTIFICATION OF NEW CAPS

5.3.1 Development of selection criteria for new CAPs

By 1998, 17 CAPs in 12 PICs have been inducted into the programme - the latest addition being the Jaluit Atoll CAP in the Marshall Islands. After reaching this number of projects, TMAG then recommended that the programme should not take on any more new projects but to concentrate on

making those already selected more sustainable. In accordance with this recommendation, no new proposals have been inducted since 1998.

Up until 1998, there was never a need to revise or change the SPBCP selection criteria for CAPs. Government and CAP personnel were generally happy with the criteria although some concern was raised with the very technical nature of the criteria and the vague definition of certain terms (e.g. how large should a CAP be in order to be viable?).

Of particular interest to PICs was the inclusion of “community commitment and support” in category I. To many local and government officials, this was the key to conservation success and sustainability. The inclusion of this criteria in this category was proof of the programme’s foresight and sensitivity to local cultures and traditions. There is reason to believe that the selection criteria of the SPBCP will be used as the basis for the development of selection criteria by other regional programmes in the region in future.

5.3.2. Review of potential CAP candidates.

Despite the inability of the programme to take on any new projects after 1998, it nevertheless continued to review and assist potential CA proposals by either refining them and / or referring them to other potential sources of support for consideration. With this sort of help from SPBCP, some financial assistance was secured from SPREP and other sources for the Cloudy Bay conservation proposal from Papua New Guinea and a new conservation area proposal near Vatthe in Vanuatu. Other proposals from Solomon Islands and Fiji received SPBCP assistance in their development but were referred to governments for submission to donors and follow up.

SPREP now has the capacity to review any additional proposals for CAPs from its member countries and any such submissions in future will therefore not be handled by the depleted SPBCP staff.

5.3.3 Assistance to non-SPBCP sites.

Although the programme has been able to obtain a geographic spread across the Pacific in as far as CAP establishment was concerned, its inability to support potential CA sites in the territories and other projects not registered with the programme left a few countries disgruntled and unhappy.

The SPBCP represented a major investment in biodiversity protection in the history of the Pacific region. However, it was never intended to be the only programme of assistance or a substitute for existing donor assistance programmes to the region. Unfortunately, in a number of instances, uninformed donors, on the assumption that the SPBCP was able to respond to all CA proposals from PICs have declined requests for assistance from some non-SPBCP sites. When informed of SPBCP’s inability to support such proposals and of the donors denial of support, proponents are left doubly frustrated and dissatisfied with the way outside assistance are being handled and managed. There is certainly a need for the donor community to better coordinate their programmes in the region to avoid these kinds of frustrations.

5.3.4 Development of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans

With UNDP funding and in collaboration with WWF and SPREP, about 15 PICs have or are in the process of developing National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) as blueprints for nature conservation in their countries. Some CASOs were able to participate in the development of these strategies and plans, sharing their experience with others on the steering committees and at the same time try to promote SPBCP concepts and ideas as appropriate.

The real value of the NBSAPs to the CAPs is the opportunity for these community-based projects to benefit from any donor funding intended for the implementation of the NBSAPs and the possibility of any protected areas created under the NBSAPs replicating the CA concept and approach. Should both of these be met, then the legacy of the SPBCP would live on for many years into the future.

At the final MPR, a number of participants stated that the SPBCP has been instrumental in the development of their NBSAPs. The consultative approach of the SPBCP has been adopted by the NBSAP and the lessons learned from the implementation of the CAPs have been useful in guiding NBSAP planning and development. These comments contradicted those of the final evaluation team who expressed disappointment at the missed opportunities for the SPBCP to influence NBSAP development.

5.4 OBJECTIVE 4: RAISING CONSERVATION AWARENESS

5.4.1 Publicising the SPBCP and CA concept

The mid-term review team was satisfied that community participation work sponsored by the SPBCP was effective and valued by the resource owners, CASOs and many government agencies. It reinforces for everyone the reality that effective conservation planning with resource owners cannot be undertaken in a paternalistic or domineering fashion. The community-based conservation area concept has largely been accepted as the most appropriate approach to successful conservation in the Pacific and there are unequivocal evidence that CA initiatives can be linked to successful economic development.

The SPBCP, its philosophy, concept and approach have been well publicised in SPREP and SPBCP reports and publications as well as in technical articles by non-SPBCP or SPREP experts. SPBCP presentations have featured in many Pacific meetings and conferences on nature conservation. It will no doubt continue to remain a yardstick for future conservation programmes in the Pacific. As the programme is now nearing its end, there has been a constant flow of requests for lessons learned from the programme by a wide range of organisations, institutions and individuals who would presumably, use some of this information in the design and implementation of their own programmes.

5.4.2 Information on CAPs

A large number of CAPs have developed information materials particular to their projects as a way of raising general awareness about the CAPs, their biodiversity, how they are being managed and what benefits are/will be generated. Materials include posters, leaflets, brochures, videos and radio

and TV programmes. At least six CAPs produce their own newsletters on a quarterly basis in addition to information published in the CALL¹⁸ newsletter.

With the provision of computers, a number of CAPs are now advertising on the internet. Takitumu, Vatthe and Utwa-walung are well advanced in this area and are gaining world-wide attention. Other CAPs have expressed interest in following the same path and have sought assistance from relevant national agencies such as tourism and/or environment agencies in setting them up. More information on each CAP are contained in Annex 4.

5.4.3 Regional Awareness Campaigns

In addition to the 1995 Pacific Year of the Sea Turtle campaign (see 5.2.1. above), the SPBCP was also involved with SPREP in organising the 1997 Pacific Year of the Coral Reef (PYOCR) in which 18 PICs participated.

The PYCR campaign was the Pacific's contribution to the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) and was touted as one of the most successful regional campaign undertaken under ICRI. Outputs from the campaign included the establishment of a Regional Coral Reef Task Force, the development of a Coral Reef Action Plan and the production of a series of coral reef videos for education purposes.

With two successful regional campaigns “under the belt”, SPREP is now well placed to organise similar campaigns in future. Feedback from these campaigns suggested that campaigning was a highly cost-effective means of awareness raising in a diverse region such as the Pacific. It is also an effective way of focusing attention on a particular conservation issue of real significance or urgency at any particular time.

5.4.4 National Awareness Campaigns

National awareness campaigns were carried out in conjunction with the 1995 and 1997 regional campaigns mentioned above. National coordinators for these campaigns received advice and assistance from SPREP especially in campaign design and implementation. Country-specific education and awareness raising materials were produced and disseminated widely and a variety of competitions based on the campaign themes were organised for school children.

Weekly to annual national campaigns to promote a particular conservation or environment topic are not unusual in the Pacific. For example, national campaigns for the protection of the national birds of Samoa, Palau and FSM have been launched with the help of RARE. Other focus of recent conservation and environment campaigns include rubbish collection and disposal; coral reef conservation; climate change and biodiversity conservation. National campaigns on health and social issues (e.g. HIV/AIDS, Diabetes, smoking and alcohol consumption) are commonplace.

In several cases, CAPs have been selected as sites for the launching of awareness raising initiatives by governments. This signals the increased recognition by governments of the important value of, and contribution by community-based CAPs and similar projects to meeting governments policies

¹⁸ CALL (Conservation Area Live Link) is a quarterly newsletter of the SPBCP. Prior to 1999, it was called the CASOLink.

and plans for the overall management and sustainable use of the country's natural resources. It also inspires the communities to take pride in their projects and to work diligently for their effective management.

5.4.5 SPBCP Publications and Reports

Despite the call by the mid-term review and others for less reports and technical publications in favor of more action on the ground, the programme continued to produce at least four reports each year. Since the beginning of 1998, the number of reports increased two-fold. This was due to the completion of a large number of studies, surveys and other technical reports commissioned during the earlier part of the programme. A significant number of these publications were produced through consultancies by SPBCP and by the CAPs. Together, they form an impressive source of information for biodiversity conservation and management in the Pacific. A list of SPBCP publications and reports is included as Annex 1.

5.4.6 CALL Newsletter

The CALL (Conservation Area Live Link) newsletter is produced on a quarterly basis by the programme as a "link" between all the stakeholders involved in biodiversity conservation in the region. The name was changed from CASOLink in 1998 at the recommendation of the CASO Workshop¹⁹ who decided that the newsletter should reach beyond the CASOs and SPBCP to all other people and communities involved in biodiversity conservation in the Pacific. The print run for the newsletter increased by almost 50% as a result of this recommendation.

Because of its ever-increasing workload, the Publication Unit of the SPREP has had enormous difficulties producing the newsletter on time. In many instances, issues come out three to four months late. In a couple of cases, the issues concerned were as much as eight months behind schedule. These delays were a major cause for frustration especially when consultants were involved in putting together the various issues of the newsletter.

If this newsletter is to continue as it should, to be used as the "link" for all conservation area practitioners in the Pacific after the SPBCP, then there is a need to seriously look at out-sourcing it from SPREP. There is of course the need to check on the cost of taking this option but I am sure that if there is an "extra cost", it will be a small price to pay to get the newsletter out to the countries on time, and not three or four months later.

5.5. OBJECTIVE 5: CAPACITY BUILDING AND COOPERATION

5.5.1 Community participation and involvement

Community participation is key to conservation success. In the case of the SPBCP, communities do not only participate, they were made to lead the conservation effort!

In its early years, the SPBCP was heavily criticised by its donors for not spending funds at the rate anticipated in the project document. It was implied that the low rate of spending was attributed to

¹⁹ CASO/CACC Project Management Training Workshop for SPBCP-supported Conservation Areas, 17 – 28 May, 1999. Suva, Fiji.

the absence of work on the ground. This could not be further from the truth! In fact, there was a lot of work happening on the ground, except that this work did not cost much despite its importance to the success of the projects. Community consultation was vital to enlisting their support, commitment and participation in the projects – the very foundation for project success and sustainability – had to be undertaken very early on in project implementation. It is risky business to start spending money on project implementation before these consultations are undertaken and completed satisfactory.

As the SPBCP departs the scene, it is fair to say that in the majority of CAPs, the level of community support and participation has been exceptionally high. However, ensuring that this support remains unchanged requires continuing untiring effort. It requires regular face-to face contact and encouragement. This will be difficult for SPREP to do after the SPBCP but it is hoped that the CASOs and lead agencies would see that the momentum built during the past eight years is not lost. It is vital to the CAPs and to any other future community-based initiative in the region that the camaraderie and rapport established with local communities under the SPBCP and CAPs is maintained. But what is more important is to increase efforts to ensure that the support that is there now is turned into real action and commitment. “Real” action is secured when all the stakeholders as discussed in the following paragraphs are committed to playing their role as agreed during project formulation.

5.5.2 Effectiveness of CACCs

Conservation Area Coordinating Committees (CACCs) can play a vital role in ensuring that local communities continue to support and participate in CAP management. This after all, is one of the main responsibilities for this group.

In general, CACCs have been effective in their roles as coordinating bodies, although some have obviously been more effective than others. The major obstacle for many CACCs appear to have been the lack of commitment by some members, believed to be related to the lack of compensation for time spent on committee meetings and other activities. Careful selection of members of these committees may resolve some of the problems but it is pertinent that consideration of a modest reward be offered if and when the CAP are able to do so from whatever sources including income generating activities.

For some CAPs, the option of utilising an existing coordinating mechanism (e.g. NEMS Task Forces) as the CACC was seen as less costly requiring less time and effort to revive and make operational. Obviously, while this option worked for some, it created problems for others. The most common complaints against the CACCs include:

- Too many members;
- Wrong people;
- Dominated by government representatives;
- Indecisive;
- Lacks commitment

There are efforts underway to improve the effectiveness of management structures for those CAPs who are not satisfied with what they have. In Ha'apai, the whole CACC is being restructured, to

have less members and greater community participation. In Sa'anapu/Sataoa there are plans to abolish the CACC to be replaced by a Tourism Coordinating Committee.

Whatever their shortcomings, the CACCs remain an innovative and practical approach to bringing the stakeholders together to discuss, decide, plan, implement and monitor activities of the CAPs. No doubt, their effectiveness will improve over time, and given adequate resources and support. There is concern that some CACCs may just fold over after the SPBCP unless governments once again agree to take over the task of supporting the CACCs until other options are identified. Whatever the case, maintaining the CACCs is an important priority for most CAPs after the SPBCP that serious consideration should be attached to ensuring their continued support, be that from government, an NGO or from a donor agency.

5.5.3 Effectiveness of CASOs

One of the most important legacies the SPBCP will leave behind is the CASOs. This group of highly trained and committed people will see community-based conservation through the next several years if they are retained in the projects they now serve.

As liaison and supporting officers for the local communities and the CAPs, the CASOs played an extremely important role in all facets of CAP establishment and management. They were responsible for the day-to-day management of the projects, consulting with communities, lead agencies and with SPBCP; managing project funds, and preparation of periodic reports to SPBCP. They often worked in very difficult circumstances and conditions and are often disadvantaged compared to their counterparts in similar positions in government or in other donor-funded programmes and projects.

The selection of a good CASO is crucial to developing good relations with the communities. There was a tendency - often preferred by local communities - to select from within the communities themselves. This was based on the assumption that a local person would be acceptable to his/her own community, would not spend too much time getting to know key individuals and decision-makers, and would normally do as the community says. There was also an underlying assumption that the employment of a local person would reinforce the local ownership of the projects.

While some of the above assumptions have proven correct in some CAPs, they were not true for others. In CAPs involving two or more communities, the appointment of the CASO from one community and not the other caused rifts between the communities, not to mention the risk of the other community refusing to cooperate with the CASO. There was also the danger of a locally appointed CASO being dictated to by community members of higher rank and status rather than following agreed procedures and using his/her best judgement for the benefit of the project. To add to the problems, someone who is acceptable to the communities may not necessarily have the best interest of the project at heart.

By and large, the 17 CASOs under the SPBCP have been well trained to cope with the challenges ahead. Most of them have had eight years of training to prepare them for the post SPBCP era. The real test of their skills, commitment and knowledge will come to the fore in the next few months when they are left to manage on their own. I am confident that many of them will pass the test. Sad to say, a small number will find this time a real struggle.

5.5.4 Effectiveness of Lead Agencies

Takitumu is the only project without a lead agency although the Environment Unit played this role very early on in the development of the project. The CASO and the CACC continue to receive the support of the Environment Unit to date, however the CACC doubles as the lead agency as well.

The rest of the projects have an agency of government or an NGO as the lead agency. These agencies usually provide the project manager, logistical support to the CASOs and CACCs and ensures a link between the project and the other conservation programmes of the country. It was also hoped that the CAPs would eventually be integrated into the work of the lead agencies and benefit from its human and financial resources.

With a few exceptions, the lead agencies appeared to have had a very clear understanding of their roles and functions. More importantly, there were positive indications of their continuing support for the CAPs after the SPBCP. At the 7th Multipartite Review of the SPBCP, all the government lead agencies present pledged their government support for the projects under their agencies post-SPBCP. This was great news for the CAPs who will no doubt find this support inspiring.

The small number of lead agencies that had difficulties with their roles and functions tended to see the CAPs as community projects that governments should not meddle with, except to provide advice when and if needed. If given the choice, these agencies would probably have chosen not to have anything to do with the projects at all. This attitude is partly attributed to the fact that the agencies have their own work programmes to attend to and that “other” projects and activities tend to take some of their staff and in some cases, funding away from them.

Having a lead agency is important especially for community-based conservation projects unless such projects are able to establish their own head offices with reliable communication facilities at their own cost. At the moment, no CAP except Takitumu have such facilities of their own. Takitumu has proven that communities can manage without lead agencies however, I do not believe that many communities would risk not having these agencies especially when they (the communities) lack confidence in their own ability to raise additional resources for the projects by themselves.

5.5.5 Role of women

It is hard to determine the exact role of women in CAP implementation on a case by case basis. We know for certain however that the women of Uafato have been involved in the replanting of pandanus in the CA so they could reintroduce some traditional artifacts not seen in the village many years ago. Female CASOs have also led CA work in Takitumu, Koroyanitu, Ngaremeduu and Rock Islands. In Vatthe, the eco-tourism project manager is an enthusiastic local woman.

To the degree possible, gender balance was the aim in the selection of participants to the CASO/CACC project management workshops. Although this increased the number of women participating, these meetings were still dominated by the opposite sex. This however was a reflection of the domineering role of men in project implementation and not a lapse in the selection process.

There is certainly a lot of work to do to encourage greater involvement by women in CA implementation. Designing specific activities for implementation by women may be possible and providing specific training for selected women or women groups would be a good way of making sure this actually happens.

5.5.6 In-country training

In-country training was seen as an extremely important component of the SPBCP. It was envisaged that at least one seminar or course will be held in each participant country per year on such matters as biodiversity conservation and CAP establishment²⁰.

It was clear in the early stages of the programme that resources will have to be reallocated to meet the high demand for in-country and regional training of the CAPs. This was not surprising as the majority of CASOs and project managers have had no prior training in resource management or CA establishment prior to the SPBCP.

Initial emphasis was on training the CASOs as future trainers and this involved much time in building their confidence to take over this key role. This was where regional training came in. They not only brought the CASOs together to share their experiences thereby helping each other in confidence building and team work, they also helped identify common issues which could be addressed through a regional rather than a national approach.

In the latter years of the SPBCP, in-country training have been undertaken mainly by the CASOs themselves with little or no support from SPBCP or other consultants. This was an excellent indication of the level of confidence the CASOs had acquired over the years and a good measure of the capacity that has been built to take projects further after 2001. A list of in-country training is given in Annex 2.

5.5.7 Regional training

More than 1,000 people, mainly from local communities and government agencies, have benefited from training courses organised and conducted by the SPBCP either alone or with other partners. Topics have ranged from an understanding of SPBCP procedures and processes to project management, small business enterprise management, eco-tourism, participatory rural appraisal (PRA) and monitoring and evaluation.

In February 2001, another significant step forward was achieved in capacity building when USP, ICPL and SPREP were finally able to hold the first Pacific Island Community Conservation Course (PICCC) at USP, Fiji after its postponement from June 2000 due to the political situation in Fiji at that time. About 20 participants attended the course from projects under the SPBCP as well as from other programmes in the region. The three phases of the course²¹, if satisfactorily completed would earn the participants a unit towards a graduate course at USP.

²⁰ Project Document, page 31.

²¹ Phase 1: a 4-weeks lecture and practical training at USP; phase 2: a field project back at home country on any topic relating to the topics covered in the course (4 months); and phase 3: a return to USP for 2 weeks assessment and evaluation.

Regional training courses are expensive to conduct. They are often generalised rather than being country or site-specific. Because of cost implications, they limit the number of participants from member countries, and where organising organisations have little or no say in the selection process, there are possibilities that the selected participants are those that will benefit the least from the training provided.

SPBCP training courses and programmes have been targeted mainly at the CASOs and CACC members although in some instances, managers from other projects outside the SPBCP have been involved at their own costs. Their participation provided an invaluable opportunity to share information and experience with SPBCP and CAP personnel and the relationship that developed through these opportunities have matured into a network of people who are constantly in contact with each other to share problems and knowledge pertaining to their respective projects. This network of people will have an important responsibility to train future CA practitioners in the region and to ensure that conservation efforts are properly coordinated and implemented..

5.5.8 Study tours

Study tours are a great way of getting local land-owners from different countries under a programme to meet and to share experiences and concerns. When the landowners from Vatthe visited their counterparts in Koroyanitu, “they sat up all night talking, not about conservation, but their cultures and communities²²”. Yet, when they returned to Vatthe, there was a remarkable change in their attitudes towards the CA project. Gone were the suspicions leveled at each other. Gone also were the skepticism about the real intention of government in the project. Instead, there was a willingness to work together in support of the project and to resolve some of their outstanding differences.

The above example is but only one of a few where local communities have benefited from study tours to other CAPs. Study tours provide participants with an opportunity to learn things by seeing and by doing. New initiatives or techniques observed during these tours are often tried out immediately upon the participant’s return to their home countries.

Any community-based projects or programmes would benefit from embarking on study tours for local communities. The benefits in terms of changed attitudes, greater commitment, increased confidence and feeling of ownership of the project would far outweigh the cost. For community people, formal workshops and training courses are of not much use unless they are conducted in their local languages. These kinds of courses are for the CASOs and project managers who are able to understand and appreciate what was being taught. For the landowners and the majority of people in the villages, there is no substitute to learning by observing and doing. That is why study tours have proven to be highly successful at this level.

5.5.9 Policy advice

Policy advice to PICs on biodiversity and conservation issues are normally provided by SPREP although in many cases, SPBCP staff contributed to the discussion and formulation of such advice from SPREP. Of great significance to biodiversity conservation – species conservation in particular – were the SPREP advice that assisted the governments of Fiji and Tonga in their

²² Report of the Study tour by Vatthe Landowners to Koroyanitu, Fiji 1994.

decisions to extend their moratoriums on marine turtles and whaling respectively. SPREP also provided advice to PICs in their participation and negotiations at the Convention on Biological Diversity and other conservation-related conventions and Agreements.

SPBCP policy-related advice have been provided directly to CAPs at that level on a request basis. However, the trend has been to ensure that the advice provided was consistent with national policies and plans. This opens up opportunities for better integration and coordination and paves the way for greater support for CAPs from national budgets and bilateral donor-funded programmes. As community-based projects, CAPs are not well placed to provide direct advice to national governments. However, governments can develop sound policies based on the experience and lessons learned from the SPBCP and the CASOs. But for this to happen, the onus is on CASO and community workers to be more proactive in making their voice heard by those who make decisions for governments.

The greater involvement of CAP personnel and collaborative agencies in the NBSAPs process has certainly facilitated their desired input to the development and implementation of these plans. Seen as the national frameworks for biodiversity conservation in the countries concerned, NBSAPs will provide policy guidance in the sustainable management and use of the biological diversity of the Pacific island countries. CAPs will benefit from their involvement in this process.

5.5.10 Database development

The lack of information on the biodiversity and socio-economic situation of many CAPs was reflected in the low priority assigned the development of databases by the projects. Only Pohnpei has a comprehensive database developed with funding assistance from the Asian Development Bank. Ngaremeduu is developing its database, otherwise the majority of the CAPs have relied either on national databases managed by agencies such as Forestry, Fisheries or others, or on agencies such as SPREP to provide data and information they required.

It is not expected that many CAPs would develop specific databases for their projects in future mainly because they lack the equipment, resources and skills to maintain such tools. It would make sense for these projects to link with national databases where they exist, or to request the assistance of regional agencies to provide the information required.

The SPBCP CA database contains information on each CAP gleaned from resource survey reports, regular reports of the CASOs and studies undertaken by other organisations on the sites. For most CAPs, this is the most up-to-date source of information they have on their projects. It is imperative therefore that this regional database be maintained by SPREP after the SPBCP but there will be a need to ensure that CASOs and project managers continue to provide information for its update.

To facilitate ongoing maintenance of the SPBCP database, copies were provided in CD-R format to all CASOs in 2000. A demonstration of how the database works as well as how to input or access data was given the same time. CASOs should now have the capacity to look after the database and to update their relevant sections. Their data should then be sent to SPREP for updating of the regional database.

5.5.11 CAP Network

At the recommendation of the 1998 CASO/CACC Project Management workshop, the CASO network was expanded to include other conservation practitioners outside the “SPBCP family”. The idea was to allow greater interaction between CASOs and other colleagues who are doing similar work in the region. The network is serviced by the SPBCP secretariat mainly through the CALL newsletter.

Immediately following the expansion of the network, the Roundtable on Nature Conservation established a similar network with a wider membership that included protected area personnel and organisations who are involved in nature conservation in the Pacific but may not necessarily be Pacific-based. By default, the SPBCP network has been integrated into this larger structure thereby providing some degree of assurance that the network will live on after the SPBCP. It is expected that the SPREP will continue to service the network through the newsletter and through its web page.

The 17 CASOs under the SPBCP have developed a very close relationship over the years that they are pretty much seen as “members of one whole family”. Building this relationship was essential as it enabled them to communicate and share concerns, experiences and knowledge with each other more freely. The outcome has been astounding! CASOs can now stand in front of any group and argue their cause with great enthusiasm and conviction – a huge contrast to what they were in their first few years of taking on the job.

There is still much to be done to ensure that the network of people and organisations now involved in biodiversity conservation in the Pacific continues to grow in strength. It should not be left to SPREP to provide the backup support the network will require. This is something the other organisation members should also help with. However, some staff time will need to be provided, probably by SPREP, so that there is a central coordinating point from where members receive information and other materials. If other organisations are able to contribute financially to support the network, then better coordination of conservation work in the region will be greatly enhanced.

5.5.12 NGO Participation

NGO participation in the SPBCP was not as high as expected with only three local NGOs²³ ending up with CAP lead agency responsibilities. But even these NGOs - considered to be better organised and financially supported than most – had problems carrying out their roles, mainly as a result of shortage of staff and over-commitment.

NGO participation was better at the CAP level where they had less responsibility compared to a lead agency. They participated in meetings of the CACCs, in community work within the CAPs, or in providing expertise especially in community training and consultations.

Because of their lack of resources, NGOs often expect to be paid for their time, unless an activity was also of direct benefit to another project of theirs. This can create problems with local communities who are often not compensated for the time they put into the projects.

²³ The NGOs are Palau Conservation Society and O le Siosiomaga Society for the Rock Islands and Uafato CAPs respectively.

Having government agencies and NGOs sitting together in a CACC or jointly implementing CAP activities can also create friction if the situation is not monitored closely. This is of course not true for all CAPs as there are several examples of projects where government and NGO personnel are, and have been collaborating quite well. The fact remains that when one or the other is given lead agency responsibility, it is not uncommon for the other to feel uncomfortable that the community had shown preference for which they wish to lead.

These kinds of feelings have their roots in the way NGOs were perceived by governments in the late 1980's as anti-government, radical groups whose only intention was to destabilize governments by criticising their policies and programmes publicly. This created an antagonistic attitude by NGOs towards governments, which can sometimes be fanned and fuelled by any slight misunderstanding between the two. The encouraging thing is that in most if not all PICs, relations between NGO and governments have improved tremendously that we can only be optimistic that the future will heal the problems of the past and that there will come a time when the two sectors will become effective and productive partners in conservation.

5.5.13 Support for Regional Conferences.

Recognising the potential contribution regional conferences on nature conservation can make in promoting the SPBCP, raising awareness about the CAPs, sharing knowledge and information amongst PICs, and in creating networks and partnerships for nature conservation in the Pacific, the SPBCP provided support for two regional conferences in 1993²⁴ and 1997²⁵. These conferences were specifically identified in the Project Document.

Of special interest was the role some of the CASOs played in the 1997 conference. They not only served as facilitators for the conference, they also played a key role in working groups, presenting examples from their CAPs, and encouraging others to share lessons learned that could be of benefit to others. The leadership they showed caused people who were familiar with the region to comment on the high quality of young people in whose hands the future of nature conservation in the region must now lie.

The investment in nature conservation conferences have been well worth the effort. The conferences reviewed progress with the implementation of the Action Strategy for nature conservation²⁶ and adopted “new” strategies for the proceeding four years. In this regard, the conferences provided excellent opportunities for showcasing the SPBCP and ensured that the next Action Strategy benefits from the lessons learned from the SPBCP. In fact, the current strategy endorses the SPBCP concept, philosophy and approach as the most appropriate for achieving biodiversity conservation objectives in the Pacific.

6. PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

²⁴ The Fifth Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in the Pacific Region, Nukualofa, Kingdom of Tonga, September 1993.

²⁵ The Sixth Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in the Pacific Region, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia, October, 1997.

²⁶ Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region. The strategy is the region's blueprint for action in nature conservation. It represents the region's consensus on the most urgent action to address conservation issues in the region.

6.1 WORK PLANNING

6.1.1 Project Document

The Project Document provides a detailed schedule of activities that were planned for the programme. The mid-term review correctly identified the cause for deviations from the plan of activities as being due to delays in programme implementation, the delay in staff recruitment and subsequently the high turn over of staff.

It is interesting to note that while the programme was initially to run from 1991 to 1996, the work plan for phase 1 that formed Annex 2 of the Project Document covered the period 1993 – 1994. This suggested that there was already an anticipation of a late start for the programme, which in fact turned out to be quite correct. Hence, despite the late start in programme implementation, activities on the work plan were mostly implemented according to schedule, at least for the 1993 – 94 period. But when the programme was extended to 1998, then to 2001, the Project Document remained unchanged. For this reason, it was necessary to develop annual work plans based not only on the original Project Document but also on new priorities as identified by participating countries through the Multipartite to make up for the shortcomings of the project document.

6.1.2 Annual work plans

Annual work plans were prepared by SPBCP, endorsed by TMAG and approved by Multipartite. They comprised mainly activities identified in the original Project Document and any recommendations of TMAG and Multipartite.

The programme manager reported annually to TMAG and Multipartite on the implementation of the work plans. These reports not only reviewed activities of the previous year, they also discussed issues that are likely to affect work plans for the subsequent years. From January 2000, the programme manager has been reporting to UNDP on a quarterly basis. Copies of these quarterly reports were also made available to SPREP.

Like the SPBCP, the CAPs also prepare annual work plans for their projects. They are then required to report on the implementation of these plans on a quarterly basis. These reports provide the means for assessing progress by the CAPs on a regular basis. Unfortunately, getting the CASOs to spare the time to write these reports can be an extremely frustrating experience.

6.1.3 Quarterly work plans

Quarterly work plans provide the flexibility for the CASOs to refine or revise their annual work plans as required. They normally accompany the progress report on the previous quarter and the requests for funds for the next quarter so that proper records of activities and funding are kept.

Quarterly work plans are an excellent way of monitoring progress with the implementation of CAP activities. However, some CASOs have found this to be too cumbersome and too much of a demand on their time. Six monthly work plans and reports were proposed and agreed as a result but even this did not improve the reporting back situation. If anything, it worsened the situation as CASOs tend to forget their obligation to report if left for too long.

6.1.4 Field visits

With a few exceptions, the staff, in response to requests for assistance from CASOs or lead agencies undertook field visits on a regular basis. The requests range from preparation of management plans, budgets and funding proposals to undertaking of resource surveys and review of project documents and plans. These kinds of visits were treated as country costs for they relate very specifically to a need of a particular CAP.

Other field visits by the staff relate to the regular monitoring of progress on the implementation of SPBCP-funded activities of the CAPs. They include review of actual progress on the ground and how funds are being used. In recent years, these types of visits have declined as a result of CASOs and project managers having improved their knowledge and skills to implement activities on their own. This is of course a good sign that investment in capacity building are paying off.

6.1.5 Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation of work plans have been done on a quarterly basis for most CAPs through their quarterly reports and requests for funds. Funds for the following periods are released after review of progress and financial reports for preceding quarters. Unspent funds are reassigned to the next work plan after the Programme Manager is satisfied with progress in the implementation of the previous plan.

Monitoring how the CAPs are spending resources was an important aspect of SPBCP implementation – one that required considerable time and effort in terms of training and travel. Experience over the past several years showed that keeping proper track of which budget lines funds were taken from for which purpose was not the CASOs strongest points. Oftentimes, financial reports were difficult to reconcile with headquarter records, or even those of government Treasuries. Processing of payments have often been delayed because of discrepancies in the reports although it was not uncommon for the CASOs to point the finger the other way for such delays.

Future regionally executed projects like the SPBCP are likely to encounter this same problem in the implementation of national activities. If they had their way, countries would rather prefer to be given the funds without SPREP interference as to when and how they spend the funds. SPREP however has a responsibility to the donors to make sure that resources were used for the purposes they were requested and in accordance with predetermined timelines. The lead agencies are best placed to ensure that monitoring and evaluation of community projects such as CAPs are carried out expeditiously and in accordance with agreed terms and conditions.

6.1.6 SPBCP and CAP Success Indicators

The lack of baseline data at the beginning of SPBCP and CAP implementation inhibited the ability to measure progress and impact of programme intervention on the biodiversity of the CAPs and the socio-economic well being of people depending on them. The development of SPBCP and CAP success indicators in 1999 was therefore a welcome step forward in the management of the CAPs.

The Success Indicators was a product of years of work involving three CAPs, Uafato, Koroyanitu and Vatthe. Field trials of the selected indicators were carried out in Uafato to check their

practicality and applicability and two regional workshops²⁷ were conducted to train CASOs and project managers in their application.

The development of success indicators was another ground-breaking initiative by the SPBCP, it being the first programme to have done so in the Pacific region. It is however not expected that the indicators as developed by the SPBCP will be restrictive in its use, for many other programmes could benefit from this work, not only in its application but also in terms of avoiding duplication of effort.

For many CAPs, the monitoring and evaluation of the biodiversity of the projects will be an important aspect of the CA management. There is a need for each CA to identify what indicators are practical and measurable for their projects. Designing appropriate monitoring programmes using these indicators will then be an important next step.

6.2 *FUNDING AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT*

6.2.1 **Project Document Provisions**

The Project Document went into some details concerning the spread and allocation of funds among the identified inputs and activities of the programme. However, as earlier mentioned, the Project Document only covered the period 1991 – 1996 – the original life of the programme. It does not cover the period 1997 – 2001 when the programme was extended. Further, the Project Document did not take into account the fact that the programme was actually started in 1993, not 1991 as anticipated.

The fact that the Project Document was not revised in accordance with the extensions granted the programme meant that the timelines previously set for the completion of work programme activities were no longer valid. In this regard, annual work plans and budgets prepared for and approved by the Multipartite and UNDP provided the necessary guidance to the Secretariat in its disbursement of programme funds.

6.2.2 **Budget Revisions**

The Secretariat and UNDP Apia carried out mandatory budget revisions on an annual basis. These revisions allowed for the reallocation of unspent funds from the previous year and made projections for the current year. Mandatory revisions are usually based on UNDP Country Delivery Reports (CDRs) that, because of the different time schedules, sometimes differ with SPREP's audited accounts of programme expenditures.

The extensions granted the programme in 1996 and 1998 made the programme budget as provided in the Project Document irrelevant. In the first place, the Project Document envisaged a 5 year life for the programme whereas in reality, the programme had 8 years of existence. Secondly, the Project Document anticipated a programme start in 1991. This did not happen until 1993. Thirdly, various decisions by TMAG and Multipartite resulted in the addition of new budget lines²⁸, which

²⁷ In August 2000 and June 2001.

²⁸ The new budget lines are:

11 08 Executive Officer

14 00 Volunteers

had to be financed from the same budget. Some of these facts were “lost” to UNDP in its review and comments on the performance of the programme.

6.2.3 Split budgets

Like the Mandatory revisions, the split budgets were prepared jointly by the Secretariat and UNDP. But unlike the Mandatory revisions, the split budgets only dealt with one year at a time. The split budgets also showed the 60/40 budget split between UNDP and Australia, the co-funders of the programme.

The preparation of split budgets have been a good means of keeping track of each year’s expenditures and of determining which components of the programme would require greater inputs the following year. Unlike the Mandatory revisions, which are endorsed by UNDP New York, the split budgets are jointly signed by UNDP Apia and SPREP and becomes effective immediately.

6.2.4 Actual Expenditures

Actual spending on funds released to SPREP for the implementation of the SPBCP are shown in Table 1. This Table does not include funds withheld by UNDP as its fees for administering the programme. The table also does not include in-kind contribution by SPREP and other organisations who are directly involved in CAP implementation in-country. All these contributions have been vital to the effective implementation of CAP work plan activities and will probably continue after the SPBCP.

Table 2 provides a breakdown of expenditures by CAP while Table 3 shows expenditures by programme components.

While Table 4 provides a review of actual expenditures against budgeted, this presents a distorted picture for the following reasons:

1. the original budget was for five years whereas actual expenditures were spread over a period of eight years. Budgets were reviewed and revised on annual basis, this would have been a more useful basis for review of actual expenditures.
2. although new items were added to the programme, the overall budget remained unchanged. Funds had to be taken from other budget lines to finance these new items.

6.2.5 Financial Procedures

By and large, UNDP procedures were found to be adequate for the purposes of the SPBCP although at times, there have been some confusion as to who really had control of the funds - UNDP or SPREP. UNDP financial regulations seem to suggest the latter although in only one occasion had UNDP sought SPREP approval for the use of programme funds for the purchase of equipment by UNDP.

The fact that UNDP and SPREP worked to different financial years also presented problems in terms of trying to reconcile the records of expenditures by the two organisations. UNDP's Country Delivery Reports (CDRs) are released six months after the audit of SPBCP accounts, hence there is always a six months lag behind the SPREP reports. Given that UNDP approval of the Mandatory Revisions of the SPBCP budgets are based on its own records, there has always been the need to ensure that the next budget allowed for enough resources to cover six months of expenditures not accounted for in the CDRs.

As the executing agency, SPREP applies to UNDP on a quarterly basis for the release of GEF funds for the implementation of the programme. Suggestions for six monthly or yearly advances were not pursued as it was suggested that UNDP could not agree to such an idea. In any event, quarterly installments were found to be satisfactory for the purpose of the programme although it involved more time and effort for staff in the preparation of reports every three months.

6.3 QUANTITY, QUALITY AND TIMING OF INPUTS

6.3.1 Documented Inputs

The levels of planned programme inputs were specified in the Project Document and were developed in line with resources made available to the programme. However, as discussed elsewhere in this report, some variations were made in accordance with recommendations of the TMAG and Multipartite Review meetings.

From the SPBCP point of view, the delivery of inputs to CAPs could have been better if the projects had the capacity to absorb and utilise programme resources in a timely manner. Release of funds have been based on CAP performance and the submission of expenditure reports that clearly set out how funds had been spent. In many cases, failure to satisfy this requirement affected the timely provision of programme inputs to the CAPs.

It was not uncommon for CASOs to point the finger at SPBCP for the delay in getting things done. Review and processing of RFPs usually take less than a day but can also take several weeks especially if the reports from CASOs do not clearly acquit previous funds or when funds identified for a particular purpose have been used for something that was not previously identified as a priority. The flexibility to change activities of the CAPs based on new circumstances meant that the level and timing of inputs also had to change.

6.3.2 Requests for funds

SPBCP inputs to CAPs were released on the basis of the Requests for Payments (RFPs) submitted to the secretariat on a quarterly basis. As explained earlier, the RFPs must clearly show how funds for the previous quarter were expended and for what activities the next lot of funds will pay for.

The preparation of RFPs has been a major source of frustration for many CASOs despite the amount of training provided. The main cause of frustration seems to come from the failure by CASOs to keep proper records of what funds have been used for what purpose. For example, it is common to use funds requested for income generation (or for any other activity for that matter) to pay for a piece of equipment that was not budgeted for by the CASO. When a similar request is made in the following quarter for the same activity from which funds were taken away the

previous quarter, CASO often fail to justify why previous funds were not used in the first place. Resolving these kinds of discrepancies can take a long time if the CASOs do not keep proper records of how their funds have been used.

RFPs are reviewed by the Executive Officer with assistance from the rest of the SPBCP staff to see that the funds being requested were consistent with the work plan prepared for the same period. SPREP Finance section then prepared the transfer of payment to the project accounts which for many CAPs, are located with their government Treasuries.

Getting Treasuries to release project funds as and when required by the projects was also cited as a frustration for a number of CASOs. For some CAPs, it was alleged that it could take up to three months to try to get Treasury to release the funds. When SPBCP staff had the opportunity to discuss this problem with officials from Treasuries concerned, the blame appeared to rest largely with the CASOs and lead agencies for a) not properly informing Treasuries about the project; and b) not accounting to Treasuries for funds already released. Interestingly enough, Treasuries appeared to be facing the same problem as the SPBCP secretariat in terms of improper reporting from the CASOs and lead agencies.

6.3.3 Reporting Requirements

Much has been said about this elsewhere in this report. The CASOs considered the production of four quarterly reports and an annual report too exhaustive; it demanded a lot of their time which they argued, could have been better spent on field activities. While there was merit in the argument, we found that relaxing the reporting requirement to six months intervals did not really make a big difference in terms of the timely submission of the reports or their quality.

At the SPBCP level, the UNDP reporting requirement was also considered to be too cumbersome. The following list of reports prepared for UNDP provides an indication of how much time was spent on report writing alone.

- Quarterly reports (prepared every three months outlining programme achievements in the implementation of the annual work plan. 10 – 15 pages on average).
- Six monthly reports (prepared every six months as a contribution to UNDP’s “Report to the Pacific Islands Governments”, Pacific Subregional Programme Progress Reports. 15-20 pages).
- Annual Programme Managers’ Report (annual report prepared for TMAG, UNDP and SPREP. 35-50 pages).
- Annual Programme Report (prepared annually for the Multipartite Review meetings. 35-45 pages)
- Project Implementation Report (prepared annually for UNDP/GEF. 50-60 pages)

In addition to the above reports to UNDP, the programme also prepare at least two reports a year for SPREP as part of its ongoing efforts to keep PICs informed and raise awareness about the programme.

As a community-based programme, the reporting requirements certainly look far too demanding. And whilst these reports often serve as an excellent way of monitoring performance by the programme, care must be taken to ensure that there is a good balance with the need to dedicate more time of project staff to project implementation. The SPBCP was fortunate to have a team of

staff who were able to spend much of their time with the CASOs leaving the Programme Manager with the unenviable task of report writing.

6.3.4 Equipment

SPBCP was criticised very early on for being insensitive to the basic needs of project implementation. This stemmed mainly from the failure to provide equipment, amongst other things. For projects that were often based in remote areas lacking communication, electricity, transportation means and basic goods and services, the inability of the SPBCP to help provide some of these facilities was seen as a major oversight. When staff of other donor-funded projects were seen driving around in project-funded vehicles, enjoying comfortable working conditions, and provided the luxury of computers, fax machines and other office equipment, CASO morale declines, and so does the image of SPBCP.

Although TMAG in its wisdom provided some reprieve in recommending flexibility with the provision of equipment for CAP use, for many projects, the decision did not go far enough, nor was it specific enough to say what type of equipment was allowed to be purchased and what was not! Vehicles, motor cycles, motor boats and computers were high on the CAP lists of equipment required. Assistance was provided with the rental of vehicles for project use rather than the purchase of new vehicles; purchase of a boat was made possible through the assistance of another donor; and a couple of motor cycles were provided for two CAPs. A large number of CAPs were provided with laptop computers while others were able to have access to equipment of the lead agencies.

It is important to note that the lack of equipment during the early stages of CAP implementation affected the rate of progress achieved at field level. Isolated from the center of commerce and their lead agencies, CASOs lacked the means to communicate with their headquarters and can lose a whole day to go shopping for a piece of tool or to arrange a required service. Any other programme that may be anticipating a similar approach to the SPBCP requires careful consideration of this issue.

The list of SPBCP equipment is provided in Annex 5. At the end of the SPBCP, it is proposed that equipment at headquarters remain at the custody of SPREP while those provided for the CASOs be officially transferred to the projects they work for.

6.3.5 Training

The need for training appeared to have been greatly underestimated by the project design team. With the dual focus on conservation and income generating of many CAPs, the diversity of training associated with CAP establishment and management, especially at the community level was immense. Not only were communities required to be trained in resource management principles and practices, they were also required to have some training in business management, book keeping and tour guiding.

On average, the SPBCP organised two regional training workshops a year for CASOs, community members and project managers from the 17 CAPs supported by the programme. The focus of training have centered on CAP and small business enterprise management although other aspects

such as resources surveys, eco-tourism and PRA have also been covered. The list of regional training workshops organised by the programme is shown in Annex 3.

In February 2001, SPREP, USP and ICPL jointly organised the Pacific Islands Community Conservation Course (PICCC) which aimed to provide those currently involved in managing protected areas in the Pacific the necessary skills to perform their responsibilities more effectively. Eighteen participants from projects around the region participated. The second phase of the course involves the implementation of a research project in the home country of the participants to be followed by the final phase, which is another two weeks of study and assessment at USP. Participants who pass the course will receive a credit unit towards a graduate course at USP.

The above course is a milestone achievement for the Pacific. It was the first time such a course – tailor-made for the PICs – was available for protected area practitioners to not only improve on their skills but also aim for higher education in their chosen profession. Unfortunately, the course faces an uncertain future for the lack of secured and long term funding. SPREP in particular is urged to consider the course as a high priority in its fund raising efforts.

The participation of personnel from outside the “SPBCP family of projects” in SPBCP organised training was an indication of the high regard other programmes had for the SPBCP. It was also a reflection of the appreciation of the SPBCP’s objectives and approach and the desire to learn from the experience of the programme.

In-country training was an extremely important element of the SPBCP and CAP implementation. Mid-way through the programme, there was already a significant increase in the number of in-country training courses conducted by the CASOs and other local staff for CAP communities and other interested people. The confidence with which the CASOs conducted these training was indicative of the success of the regional training courses in which they were trained as future trainers of their own communities.

Community training will be an ongoing priority for many CAPs, even after the SPBCP. But any future training should be well coordinated with other programmes and organisations (e.g. TNC, WWF) that are also involved in community conservation in the Pacific. The fact that many staff from these organisations are now part of the Pacific Conservation Area Network (PCAN) should make such coordination easier.

6.3.6 Use of consultants

Given the limited number of staff at headquarters and the multidisciplinary nature of activities, both at the regional and CAP levels, the SPBCP has relied heavily on the use of consultants for the delivery of some inputs. While this has worked well in many cases, the amount of time involved in managing the consultants and in following up on their reports, can be quite extensive. This monitoring capacity is often lacking in the CAPs and thus the involvement of headquarters staff in managing consultants on their behalf.

In most cases, consultants have been recruited based on an expressed need of a CAP. If the amount of funds involved was less than \$1,000, then the contract was issued and managed by the CAP. SPBCP handled all contracts above \$1,000.

The above distinction explain a few important observations during the life of the SPBCP:

- Local consultants rarely charge more than a \$1,000; are easier for project staff to recruit and supervise, but are notorious for not meeting contract deadlines. People who are in regular contact with them are in a better position to follow up on their contract obligations.
- Outside consultants are more professional in their approach, cost much more than local consultants, but on average, respect their contract obligations.

Outside consultants have been used by CAPs largely in the undertaking of resource surveys, the development of management plans and strategies, and the conduct of technical training. At the SPBCP level, consultants have been used mainly as resource people in the conduct of technical training courses.

The standard remuneration rate offered by SPREP for consultants is comparatively lower than those offered by many international organisations, but is not inconsistent with what the other regional organisations are offering. Hence, except in one or two cases, the recruitment of competent consultants have not been a major problem for the programme. In a number of cases, consultants who have worked for the programme before would do it again for the same rate for their interest in the programme and the people they worked with in the village communities. At the end of the programme, a good list of these people will have been developed.

6.3.7 Use of volunteers

The use of volunteers was not envisaged in the Project Document however, at the recommendation of UNDP, TMAG recommended that the SPBCP consider the use of volunteers in the implementation of the programme.

Volunteers were recruited by the SPBCP on behalf of the CAPs at their request. Volunteers were recruited either from the United Nations Volunteer (UNV) programme or from the Australian Volunteers Abroad (AVA) scheme. The contrast between the two schemes is worth noting.

The UNV advertises widely and the process takes several months. Only one volunteer was recruited through this scheme following the standard procedures. This volunteer was from Africa, who has had no prior knowledge or experience of the Pacific except “flying over the Pacific”. The second UNV was recruited through the AVA and took a lot less time to complete the recruitment process.

In general, the AVAs performed to a very high standard; their contribution to the CAPs was greatly appreciated by the local communities. Had they been able to extend their stay for longer periods of time, the impact of their contribution would have been far greater than was directly evident.

The recruitment of volunteers from two different sources with different terms and conditions created some discrepancies in terms of remuneration and other benefits. Those recruited under the UNV scheme enjoyed more benefits than the AVAs despite the fact that the AVAs had by far the greatest experience and expertise.

There is a need to pay closer scrutiny to volunteers recruited under the UNV scheme especially from outside the Pacific. They tend to take more time to settle into the jobs and lack the knowledge of Pacific island culture to fit into the communities they work for.

6.4 STAFFING AND STAFF MANAGEMENT

6.4.1 Project Document Provisions

Staff strength is stipulated in the Project Document, especially concerning the qualifications and experience necessary for the Programme Manager and three Programme Officers.

The SPBCP paid for the full costs of the Programme Manager, the CA Socio-economic position and the CA Biodiversity position. It also paid for 50% of the cost of the Marine Species Officer position of SPREP who was responsible for the implementation of programmes for the conservation of endangered species under Objective 2 of the SPBCP.

In 1997, TMAG considered that there was a need to have an Executive Officer position created for the programme to “free-up” more time for the Programme Manager to attend to the more technical aspects of the programme. This position was then filled in late 1997. The incumbent had primary responsibility for the review and processing of reports and requests for funds from the CAPs – a task that was critical to the smooth and effective operation of the CAPs.

The creation of this new position (and the addition of other unbudgeted activities) necessitated the revision of the original budget to allow for the funding of these activities.

6.4.2 Job Description

The job descriptions for the two Programme Officer positions (Socio-economics and Biodiversity) as contained in the Project Document were basically identical, with greater emphasis towards biodiversity. The mid-term review considered this a deficiency and thus recommended a change to the TORs. Accordingly, the TORs were revised and the Biodiversity position renamed “Resource Management” to better reflect the multi-disciplinary nature of the position.

In 1994, SPREP accorded the Programme Manager the honor of being Head of Division (HoD) for Conservation of Natural Resources (CNR). This meant that the Programme Manager had primary responsibility for coordinating all conservation programmes within SPREP - a task that was later considered by UNDP as detrimental to the performance of the Programme Manager’s responsibilities to the SPBCP.

The relinquishing of HoD responsibilities as demanded by UNDP denied the Programme Manager certain privileges that were considered instrumental to the performance of his duties to the SPBCP, for example creating linkages between the work of the SPBCP and other programmes of SPREP. Also, the Programme Manager was required to see that the work of the SPBCP was fully integrated into the work of SPREP by the end of the programme, thereby ensuring sustainability for the CAPs during the post-SPBCP era.

As HoD, the Programme Manager was ideally placed to pursue these essential goals. He was part of the SPREP Management where he was not only privileged to know what visions SPREP had in

terms of future conservation initiatives, but he was also ideally placed to influence and contribute to the shaping of regional policies for nature conservation in the Pacific. At the insistence of UNDP, the HoD responsibilities were removed from the Programme Manager in 1999 and his ability to contribute to policy and strategic decisions of SPREP subsequently became very limited and insignificant. Equally importantly, the ability of the programme to leverage additional resources through the traditional donors of SPREP became severely curtailed when the Programme Manager was denied access to the SPREP Management where matters of this nature were discussed and decided.

6.4.3 Recruitment and retention

Recruitment of SPBCP staff was made in accordance with UNDP procedures. Professional positions were advertised internationally. This attracted a great deal of people from all over the world, several with no or very little experience in the Pacific.

Retaining professional staff was a major problem for the SPBCP. In the space of eight years, six people were appointed to the two professional posts. On average, they last only 2.6 years in the positions. The more common reasons for staff leaving was: (1) offer of a better job elsewhere, and (2) the need to find better schools for the children.

Although not specifically cited as a problem, it is believed that the lack of a career future in SPREP also contributed to staff departing earlier. Staff become uncertain about their future close to the end of their first three years of contract with SPREP and will probably take the next best offer that comes around before someone else takes it. The end result for the SPBCP is months of waiting as the positions are readvertised and filled. A single, long term contract (say 6 years) as opposed to two short (3 + 3 years) contracts is probably a better option to overcome this problem. It removes the uncertainty of whether the contract will be renewed after the first three years. More importantly, it requires a longer term commitment by the appointee to the position.

The list of SPBCP staff is shown in Table 5.

6.4.4 CA Personnel

CA personnel include the CASOs, project managers and community people who work on the CAPs either as paid labor or as volunteers. The former are mostly paid by SPBCP while project managers are usually provided by the lead agencies from their existing staff.

CASOs played a key role in the implementation of the CAPs; they are largely responsible for the day-to-day operation of the projects including reporting back to the SPBCP and the lead agencies. Most CASOs had prior training in natural resource management fields although it was discovered that the training they had was not consistent with the requirements of the jobs they were doing. For example, a Training Needs Assessment carried out in 1996 found out that more than 80% of the CASOs come from a forestry background, yet the majority of these people were managing marine conservation areas.

Realising the key role of the CASOs in managing community-based CAPs, it should come as no surprise that most SPBCP-sponsored training was aimed at building the capacity of these people to undertake their responsibilities more effectively. It is now not uncommon to hear people saying

that CASOs are some of the best-trained people there are in the conservation field in the PICs today. It is also not uncommon to find CASOs representing their projects and governments in some of the regional meetings on nature conservation. Such is the respect these community-based workers have been able to achieve that they not only have the full confidence of the communities they work for, but also the lead agencies of governments they work with. The SPBCP is proud to have contributed so much to the building of local capacity especially at the CAP level. One can confidently say that the future of community-based conservation is in good hands and that the CASOs is one of the best legacies the SPBCP will be remembered for in the years to come.

6.4.5 SPBCP Staff

SPBCP staff were recruited under the SPREP's terms and conditions. Their main responsibilities were to ensure the timely delivery of SPBCP assistance (technical and financial) to the CAPs based on agreed priorities and timelines.

The team approach of the SPBCP was considered very effective; the Resource Management Officer and the Socio-economic Officer being able to complement each other's work as required. This approach ensured that the activities of the CAPs (i.e. resource conservation and income generation) are undertaken in a more balanced and timely manner.

As alluded to earlier, staff retention was a major problem for the programme. Within the first two years of existence, the programme had a 50% turnover of professional staff. This situation continued to 1999 when it was considered not cost effective to replace any departing staff during the last two years of the programme. By the end of 2001, the Programme Manager and the Executive Officer would have been the only remaining professional positions remaining within the programme.

Although SPBCP staff were expected largely to provide coordination and monitoring of CAP activities, it became very clear during the early days of the programme that the CASOs and CAPs saw the role of programme staff as more than that. Requests for staff assistance in the implementation of field activities or in the preparation of reports etc, were not uncommon. As a consequence, programme staff were seriously stretched trying to cover all 17 CAPs in any one year. CASOs have accused programme staff of not coming around to their projects often enough! This highlighted the lack of capacity at the CAP level during the early years of the programme, a situation that greatly improved as the years go by.

6.5 SPREP AS THE EXECUTING AGENCY

6.5.1 The role of SPREP

A number of factors stood out that made SPREP the logical choice for the execution of SPBCP. It is an organisation set up by its member countries to coordinate and conduct programmes in the areas of environment and conservation in the Pacific region. It has a membership that extends to all 14 countries targeted by the SPBCP. It has other programmes on-going in a range of related fields (species conservation, invasive species, coastal protection, etc) in countries that include those participating in the SPBCP, and has experience dealing with regional and international organisations. In addition, there is a level of professional interaction among SPREP staff that provide spin-offs for SPBCP staff.

The SPBCP operated as an integral part of SPREP. It operated as any other programme in the organisation. The Programme Manager was responsible to the SPREP Director for the effective execution of the SPBCP.

There were many advantages in having SPBCP operated as part of SPREP. It facilitated the voluntary contribution of other SPREP staff to the programme. It ensured that the activities of the SPBCP were fully coordinated and integrated with those of SPREP, and more importantly, it helped ensure that there was a responsible organisation to continue the work of the programme when GEF resources run out. This is critical to the long term viability of donor funded programmes in the Pacific!

There were also disadvantages in having the SPBCP operated as part of SPREP, the most important of which was the danger of having programme staff embroiled in the broader activities of SPREP. This concern was raised by UNDP when the Programme Manager was appointed HoD for Nature Conservation on top of his SPBCP responsibilities. As has been stated before, these concerns were negligible compared to the benefits to the programme arising from, amongst other things, the continuing support for the CAPs post SPBCP.

6.5.2 The SPREP Action Plan

SPREP's activities in the Pacific are guided by its Action Plan, which is agreed by SPREP Members every four years. The vision of SPREP's member countries is that SPREP should work towards achieving a community of Pacific island countries and territories with the capacity and commitment to implement programmes for environmental management and conservation. The SPBCP focus over the years has been consistent with the expressed desire of PICs. Objective 1 of the Action Plan reaffirms the importance of community participation as the key to the success of biodiversity conservation in this region.

6.5.3 The Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region

The Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region is the blueprint for implementing conservation action in the Pacific. It is also seen by SPREP as its guide for the implementation of Objective 1 of its Action Plan. The Action Strategy, like the SPREP Action Plan is reviewed and revised every four years thereby providing an opportunity for these regional plans to be kept current and responsive to changing country needs.

Unlike the previous versions, the current Action Strategy has been signed by seven regional and international institutions in addition to all member countries of SPREP. This is a clear indication of the wider acceptance of the Strategy by other stakeholders as a useful guide for their own activities in the region and is strong evidence of the desire for closer cooperation and coordination of conservation initiatives in this vast region. The SPBCP has been fortunate to be part of this collaboration especially in the Roundtable where it has been showcased as a successful model for conservation programmes in the region. At the end of the SPBCP, it is expected that the work carried out by the SPBCP will be fully integrated into the implementation of the Action Strategy by SPREP.

6.5.4 Relationship with other programmes of SPREP

The SPBCP contributed around \$150,000 each year for the implementation of three regional species conservation strategies²⁹ by SPREP. These strategies conform with, and satisfy Objective 2 of the SPBCP.

Other programmes of SPREP with relevance to the SPBCP include the Invasive Species programme, the Wetlands, Coral Reefs and Coastal Management programmes, the International Waters programme, and Environment Education and Information programmes.

The overall programme on nature conservation enabled not only the coordination and integration that is needed between the SPBCP and other SPREP programmes, it also enabled wider publicity of the work of the SPBCP especially through the Roundtable on Nature Conservation and the convening of the four-yearly conferences on nature conservation in the Pacific region.

The Roundtable provides a unique opportunity for regional and international organisations that are active in nature conservation in the Pacific to coordinate their work relating to the implementation of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific. The Roundtable now has more than 20 member organisations. The number could have easily increased two-fold but for the need to keep it manageable and restrictive to those who are active in the region.

6.5.5 Logistical support and cost to SPREP

As executor of the SPBCP, SPREP was a recipient of the GEF assistance, but was not a direct beneficiary of the GEF funding as was often alluded to by the project document, UNDP and others. Unlike other SPREP-executed donor-funded programmes, the SPBCP was not charged the usual 10% SPREP administrative fees. It therefore did not contribute to the core funding of the organisation like other programmes it executed. SPBCP staff were contracted specifically for the execution of the SPBCP and are not considered core staff of the organisation. Their employment shall cease at the end of the SPBCP.

Over the first five years of the programme, the Project Document listed SPREP inputs to the SPBCP as follows:

<u>SPREP Personnel</u>	<u>Salary for SPBCP Activities</u>	<u>Total Value (USD)</u>
SPREP Director	12,000	60,000
Deputy Director	10,000	50,000
Finance Manager	10,000	50,000
Information Officer	9,000	45,000
Programme Officer (Species)	32,000	32,000
Support staff	10,000	50,000
<u>Office Inputs</u>	<u>Average per Year</u>	<u>Total value</u>
Office space	24,000	120,000

²⁹ The strategies are 1) Regional Marine Turtles Conservation Programme; 2) the Regional Marine Mammals Conservation Programme, and; 3) Regional Avifauna Conservation Programme.

Office maintenance	1,000	5,000
Office security	1,200	6,000
Total Value of SPREP Contribution		<u>\$546,000</u>

Not included in the above estimate are costs for equipment maintenance, provision of furniture, IT, communication, and publication support. If the additional cost to SPREP arising from extending the programme for another five years is added, then total input by SPREP to the SPBCP would be well over \$1 million. Hence, given the fact that SPBCP does not contribute financially to the operation of SPREP, the assumption that SPREP is a beneficiary of the SPBCP is unfair and unjust.

6.6 UNDP AS THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCY

6.6.1 The role of UNDP Apia

The UNDP Office in Apia was primarily responsible on behalf of UNDP and GEF for the overall administration of the SPBCP. All communications with UNDP had to go through the Apia Office. There was no direct contact between the Programme Manager and any UNDP/GEF personnel in New York.

In the eight years of SPBCP, there have been five changes to the post of UNDP Resident Representative in Apia. But whilst this did not create any major concerns for the programme, the lack of continuity in terms of UNDP policies and participation in key programme meetings was unhelpful either. And when senior staff were changed around as a result of staff reshuffling within UNDP, the frustration of having to deal with different personnel once again increased.

On average, the relationship between the SPBCP and UNDP has been satisfactory. Some unfortunate misunderstandings had occurred mainly as a result of differences in how the two organisations perceived various priorities for the programme. The lack of direct access to the technical experts of UNDP also contributed to the misunderstandings. One thing was clear is that there certainly is a need for UNDP and SPREP to be fully aware of each other's role and responsibilities before they jointly undertake similar projects to the SPBCP.

6.6.2 The role of UNDP Suva

The absence of any clear role for UNDP Suva in the SPBCP is considered a major setback, especially since the majority of the participating countries in the SPBCP are in the UNDP Suva parish. The Suva office had complained a number of times of not receiving any materials on the SPBCP although these had been provided to the Apia office for onward transmission.

The confused relationship between the Apia and Suva offices in relation to the SPBCP was clearly evident in the recruitment of the two volunteers under the UNV programme. Because one of the countries concerned was under the Suva parish, the Suva office stepped in and took over the recruitment of the volunteer for the project in that country. Yet the Suva office has had no prior involvement in the implementation of the SPBCP, nor did it have any authority to expend funds of the programme! The end result was a single UNV who reported to the Suva office while every

other volunteer was reporting to the Apia office and SPREP. This situation should never have occurred.

Personally, I feel that the SPBCP had missed out by much in not having direct access to the Suva office. This office is supporting the development of NBSAPs in several PICs. These NBSAPs have much to learn from the experience of the SPBCP and the CAPs however, the only assistance towards pointing the PICs towards this direction has come from SPREP and WWF.

UNDP has shown preference for nationally-executed programmes as opposed to regional programmes. This appears to be a reversal of its earlier stance for “UNDP (to) continue to promote regional organisations for project execution and develop a standard agreement for regional project execution which requires the regional organisations to address (within UN-funded projects key UNDP concerns³⁰”.

The preference now shown by UNDP is not entirely inconsistent with SPREP’s approach that supports national implementation of regionally-coordinated programmes. This is the approach that was adopted in the execution of the SPBCP. The difference between this approach and that favored by UNDP appears to be the absence of a regional mechanism for the coordination of nationally executed projects.

This is fine for proposals submitted directly by national governments for projects specifically targeting national issues. Bilateral programmes are not a concern for SPREP whose major concern has to do with programmes that are regional in nature and of interest to more than one country. With this distinction, there should be no direct competition between national and regional projects for donor funding.

6.6.3 UNDP Reporting Requirements and Report Formats

It has been stated elsewhere that the excessive reporting requirement of the UNDP was a constraint to project implementation. In addition to the concern about the number of reports produced, there was also concern about the lack of comments on the reports submitted. It makes one wonder about the real need and value in spending so much time writing these kinds of reports.

Even UNDP staff have recognised the shortcomings of the UNDP reporting formats, especially that of the APR, formerly the PPER. Most if not all, are inappropriate for community-based programmes like the SPBCP as they tend to address issues that are common to the “average” UNDP programmes. It is appreciated that UNDP is addressing this matter as is evident in recent changes to some of the formats.

6.6.4 Assessment of programme performance.

Other than the periodic reports presented by the SPBCP and ad hoc country visits by some UNDP staff, there was no specific way for UNDP to assess the performance of the SPBCP. In fact, during the early years of the programme, the rate of spending by the programme was used by UNDP to assess performance. It was not surprising therefore that the performance of the programme in its

³⁰ Fifth Intercountry Programme for Asia & the Pacific: Issues Paper for the 1994 Mid-Term Review of UNDP’s Pacific Sub-Regional Programme. Meeting of Pacific Island Aid Coordinators, ‘Mini-MAC’, Papua New Guinea, 22-23 November 1994.

early years (when much time was dedicated to community consultations and negotiations, and when very little funds was disbursed) was assessed by UNDP as unsatisfactory. This was despite the enormous headway achieved by most CAPs in securing community support for the projects. These activities however did not cost much money and hence, didn't feature in the UNDP assessment.

The Annual Programme Report (APR) contains a matrix for the assessment of SPBCP performance. This matrix has to be completed by the Programme Manager, each participating country, the SPREP and UNDP before or during the annual Multipartite meetings. Very rarely have the countries and UNDP been able to complete this task before the meetings. As Programme Manager, it was frustrating to be pressured into completing the APRs so that the stakeholders, including UNDP, could carry out their assessment. When the other parties do not take this responsibility seriously, one is left with serious reservations about the real value of these kinds of exercises!

If UNDP and participating countries rely on SPREP to carry out a fair assessment of the performance of the SPBCP, then it is only fair that they accept the assessment of the Programme Manager and remove themselves from this responsibility as assumed in the APR format. The TMAG and Multipartite meetings should provide for them ample opportunity to take issue with the assessments of the Programme Manager in a more open and transparent manner.

6.6.5 Perception of SPBCP and programme staff

It was obvious that UNDP considered the SPBCP a programme of SPREP although at times, it also referred to SPBCP staff as TAs (Technical Advisers), the title it gives UNDP field officers. This perception underpinned some of the misunderstandings that existed between SPREP and UNDP

Like all other donor-funded programmes executed by SPREP, staff are treated as members of the "SPREP Family" despite the fact that these individuals are not core staff and will only be with the organisation for as long as the donor-funded programme they work for last. Hence, for all intents and purposes, donor-funded programme staff are pretty much SPREP staff for as long as they are with SPREP. This, I believe is behind UNDP's perception of staff working at SPREP.

Obviously, there is a need for SPREP and UNDP to agree on the status of staff contracted for the implementation of UNDP-funded programmes. Other donor-funded programmes do not appear to have similar problems so it might be worth looking at what could be learned from them.

6.7 MONITORING AND BACKSTOPPING

6.7.1 The Technical and Management Advisory Group (TMAG)

The TMAG provided a level of monitoring and technical backstopping for the SPBCP that was additional to that normally required for UNDP projects. TMAG met once a year to review progress with the implementation of the programme, and to provide professional, technical and management advice to the SPBCP. This was considered extremely important given the innovative and pioneering nature of the programme where a breadth of input and creative thinking was required.

The TMAG has been an invaluable forum for professional advice and guidance to the Secretariat. It was a real asset! Its members came from different backgrounds, ranging from the biological sciences to community and social workers. Together they represented a wealth of knowledge and experience that was so important to the effective implementation of the SPBCP.

The last meeting of the TMAG – its eighth – was held in Wellington, New Zealand in November 2000. The decision to make this the last meeting was made by TMAG itself in recognition of the fact that 2001 was to be the last year of the programme and that remaining funds should be better directed towards meeting the needs of the CAPs at this critical time of their existence. Decisions like this and many others attest to the sincere and dedicated commitment TMAG members had for the SPBCP. With the right people working in conducive atmosphere, TMAG is a model well worth replicating in similar programmes in future.

6.7.2 The Multipartite Reviews

Multipartite Review Meetings (MPRs) have been convened annually by UNDP to review progress on the implementation of the SPBCP. Participating countries of the SPBCP, together with representatives of UNDP, AusAID and SPREP attend these meetings. MPRs are usually held after TMAG meetings thereby allowing them to consider and endorse recommendations from TMAG. In this context, TMAG served a crucial advisory role to both the secretariat and the MPRs.

Whilst TMAG uses the Annual Report of the Programme Manager as the basis for its review of progress, the MPRs depend on the Annual Programme Report (APR) for its review. The two reports contain basically the same information but at different levels of details and in different formats.

Because they are paid by SPBCP, UNDP rules prevent the participation of CASOs in MPRs. However, realising the ineffectiveness of MPRs as a review mechanism without the participation of people who are closer to the action, UNDP later showed flexibility towards CASO participation at the meetings.

Because they are dominated by government officials who have little knowledge of what was happening in the projects in their countries, the MPRs have largely been ineffective – their main role being reduced to ‘rubberstamping’ recommendations of TMAG. The logical suggestion for future programmes would be to either include CASOs in the MPRs or otherwise, expand TMAG or their equivalents to include greater participation by government representatives. In the latter case, there should be no need to have MPRs.

6.7.3 The Mid-term Review

The Independent Mid-term Review of the programme was undertaken in August 1996, three years after the commencement of its implementation phase. (Note: according to the Project Document, this (1996) was to be the final year of the programme).

The interpretation by the review team of the overall goal of the SPBCP that “... the SPBCP is to develop strategies for the conservation of biodiversity **by means** of sustainable use ...” underpins much of its criticisms of the programme to that point. To the team, the programme had focused primarily on conservation at the expense of sustainable use and income generation. SPBCP refuted

this claim saying that CAPs were relatively new and required time to set up. Sustainable use and income generation was important and will naturally follow the establishment of the CAPs – they cannot proceed or start at the same time as CAP establishment! SPBCP was process-driven and events had to happen in their proper sequence.

If there was a lesson to be learned from the mid-term review, it was that the desire to have a team that was entirely independent of the SPBCP to carry out such review, can sometimes be more detrimental than helpful to the programme. This is especially so when such team is not given sufficient time to consult with all the stakeholders involved in the programme.

6.7.4 GEF Operations Performance Evaluation Mission

A two-man mission from the GEF visited Samoa on 21 – 25 May and took the opportunity to meet with SPREP and SPBCP and to visit the Uafato CAP on Upolu. The mission was important in that it helped clarify several issues relating to the GEF policies, some of which were often confused with those of the Implementing Agencies themselves. The visit to Uafato provided and invaluable opportunity for the team to meet with landowners and to have a better appreciation of the issues and constraints facing this rural-based project.

This mission was the first time GEF personnel have come to visit a community-based project under the SPBCP. It is hoped that the visit has given them a useful insight into the difficult task of protecting biodiversity in this region. Further, it is hoped the experience had brought home the important contribution the GEF has played in ensuring that the Pacific islands can continue to enjoy the resources of their land and waters for many years to come.

6.7.5 Field visits by UNDP staff

From time to time, UNDP staff in Apia undertake field visits to some of the CAPs. The exact purpose of such visits are not clear but it is understood that they were to do with “checking on progress” on the ground. UNDP have other projects on-going in the region and opportunities such as these are used to check on these other projects as well.

Wherever possible, SPBCP staff have been requested to assist organise programmes for UNDP staff during their country visits. This required making contact with CASOs and other CAP personnel to arrange visits to the sites and meet relevant officials of government, etc. If UNDP staff prepare reports on these visits to the CAPs, such reports have not been made available to the SPBCP.

6.7.6 Internal SPREP Reports

CASOs submit quarterly and annual reports to the SPBCP. From these reports, SPBCP prepare and submit its quarterly and annual reports to SPREP and UNDP. Six-monthly reports are also prepared at the request of the UNDP, Suva office although these have not been requested in the last two years.

Reports to SPREP are summarised for the purpose of the SPREP Meetings. In these summaries, member governments of the organisation are briefed of progress and developments relating to the programme.

6.7.7 SPREP Annual Work Programmes and Budgets

Although SPBCP budgets are approved by UNDP, they also receive the blessing of the SPREP Meetings through the SPREP annual work programmes and budgets. Budget revisions are undertaken jointly by UNDP and SPBCP at the end of each year. Savings, if any, from a previous year are usually rephased to the following year.

(See Table 3 for allocation of budget resources by work programme components.)

6.7.8 Professional backstopping

The level of backstopping activities by the programme has been very high and it involved both programme staff and consultants usually on the basis of CAP requests. Backstopping was recognised as a very effective way of providing technical assistance to the CAPs. It was not surprising therefore for the programme to be faced with a high demand for this kind of assistance especially during the early years.

Professional backstopping for the undertaking of resource surveys and other more technical aspects of CAP establishment and management have been on the increase as projects progressed from their establishment phases to their management and monitoring phases. However, it is not uncommon to find that the urgency with which the technical assistance was requested was not matched by immediate action following the findings and recommendations of the technical assistance. This is where constant monitoring is important; to ensure that resource surveys and other information gathering exercises are not undertaken merely for the sake of doing so, but that they provide vital information immediately required for the undertaking of a specific action or the development of a specific policy or plan.

6.7.9 Benchmarks

The lack of benchmarks or baseline information on both the biodiversity of the CAPs and the social and economic situation of the communities residing in or around the CAPs were major constraints to the determination of progress and impacts of CAPs. The large number of resource surveys undertaken within the lifetime of the SPBCP was indicative of the desire to develop such benchmarks against which, future progress could be measured. Further assistance may be required to ensure that the information arising from the surveys etc are properly collated, analysed and presented in a form that is easily understood and used by CAP personnel. Equally importantly, there is a need to ensure that follow up reconnaissance of the CAPs are undertaken at regular intervals, and the results compared against the benchmarks to determine the effectiveness or otherwise of conservation measures put in place.

Through the SPBCP, adequate information should now be available for the development of benchmarks by individual CAPs. This should be a priority activity for CAPs in the next few months. SPREP and other partners working in the region should be able to assist in this important task.

6.7.10 Final Evaluation

According to the Project Document, the final evaluation of the SPBCP was to be organised by UNDP three months after the completion of the programme³¹. This evaluation started seven months before the end of the programme instead!

The major advantage in having the evaluation before the end of the programme was that SPBCP staff were available to assist the evaluation team in this task. The disadvantages were: 1) that the programme was evaluated before its operations were completed; and 2) an additional burden was placed on the already dwindling programme budget to finance the evaluation.

Because the final evaluation was not envisaged until after the programme was completed, the programme budget did not allow for the funding of such evaluation. This situation has been changed and the programme therefore had to take funds from programme activities in order to support this evaluation. Like all other newly created budget lines, previously approved CAP activities suffered as a consequence of these additional decisions.

Detailed comments were provided by the Secretariat on the draft report of the evaluation team which was reviewed and discussed at the final MPR in November. At the time of writing, the final version of the report has not been received, hence it is not possible to provide elaborate comments at this stage without knowing how the previous comments have been treated. In any case, it is pertinent to point out here two important factors which I consider have been major differences of opinions with the evaluation team.

The first is to do with the allegation that, because only three of the 17 CAPs have developed management plans, the majority of the projects have failed to be formally established.

This assumption by the team suggests that the SPBCP and the CAPs have been evaluated as any other western type of protected area would have been. It fails to take into account the community nature of the CAPs and the need to have communities drive the development process. The need to have fixed plans and processes which are a feature of national parks and other government-owned protected areas underpins this suggestion. What this amounts to is that whilst the SPBCP has been hailed as a groundbreaking innovative programme focusing on local communities, its success is being assessed on the basis of western management concepts and principles which are often contradictory to local situations and conditions.

The second point relates to the finding of the team that because the programme did not do enough to build the capacity of lead agencies who supposedly will take over the projects after SPBCP, the CAPs are unlikely to be sustainable in the long term.

Again, this finding reinforces the belief that the team had failed to fully understand what was meant by community-based, community-owned and community-managed CAPs. Asking governments to invest in community projects like the CAPs is not an invitation for them to take over control of the projects but reminding them of their responsibility to support community projects for the overall good of the country. This is a responsibility given to certain agencies of governments by law but have not been fully realised mainly because those who make decisions in these agencies either do not comprehend the extent of their mandate or lacks the experience to work with local communities. It is unfortunate that donors, often because of their lack of

³¹ Project Document, Annex 4, page 51.

experience and understanding of how communities work, sometimes also contribute to this problem.

6.7.11 Post ex-SPBCP Evaluation

At the Multipartite Meeting last year, it was suggested that a post ex-SPBCP evaluation would be important to determine the real successes of the programme. It is assumed SPREP will take the lead in organising and resourcing such evaluation to happen no later than 2003.

7. SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

7.1 Weaning the CAPs from SPBCP

7.1.1 Transition strategies for the CAPs

Weaning the CAPs from SPBCP require careful and sensitive planning. This has been attempted with the development of transition strategies for each of the CAP. These strategies aimed to identify 'new' and key priority needs that would ensure a smooth transition for all CAPs from SPBCP funding to self-reliance.

The development of transition strategies required going back to consult with local communities and other stakeholders to discuss and agree on what was critical to achieving sustainability for the projects in the long term. This exercise was carried out mainly by the CASOs and lead agencies with SPBCP staff assisting with the write up of the strategies.

An important part of the consultations was the negotiation with lead agencies and other potential donors to see if they were prepared to pick up some of the costs relating to the projects that SPBCP had been paying for. The response, especially from the government agencies, has been very positive as was shown in the Multipartite meeting last year when the majority of government representatives pledged government support towards the salaries of CASOs and other CAP costs. This response was most encouraging and gave hope for a good future for the projects.

Twelve strategies have been completed and were at various stages of implementation by the end of the SPBCP. Other CAPs have opted for the implementation of management plans that are considered to be the equivalent of the transition strategies.

7.1.2 The SPREP/SPBCP Transition Strategy

Like the CAPs, a regional strategy that aimed to show how SPBCP activities will be fully integrated into the work of SPREP was also prepared, discussed and agreed with SPREP who will be responsible for the implementation of the strategy following the end of the SPBCP.

While it does not obligate SPREP to provide the same level of support to CAPs as had the SPBCP, this regional strategy provides a framework to guide future SPREP assistance to the CAPs. In this respect, the strategy is seen an important blueprint to steer SPREP and other programme assistance towards achieving sustainability for the CAPs. The strategy also ensures that the interest of the CAPs are well integrated into any future conservation programmes of SPREP, including the ongoing implementation of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation.

SPREP has already started implementing this strategy. An Action Strategy Coordinator has been appointed to have, amongst other duties, overall responsibility for the implementation of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation. He embodies the central coordinating point for conservation activities of the organisation including the integration of SPBCP work into its broader programmes. Other programmes of SPREP are also sharing the cost of a Divisional Assistant who was previously employed by SPBCP thereby ensuring that the expertise created and accumulated under the SPBCP is not lost to SPREP. In addition, other donors such as C-SPOD, NZODA etc are already contributing towards the cost of a number of activities previously funded by SPBCP.

Indications are that CAPs will continue to benefit from their continued relationship with SPREP. It is in the interest of SPREP to continue to stay in touch with these projects for they provide the best yardstick for monitoring and measuring the impacts of conservation initiatives on resources and people of the Pacific region.

7.2 *Links to other national and regional programmes*

7.2.1 National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans

NBSAPs are likely to be the single most important planning documents for the conservation and management of biodiversity in the Pacific islands in the next decade. Produced as an obligation under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the NBSAPs have been touted as comprehensive instruments that aim to achieve the much required balance between resource conservation and resource use in the islands. With funding from UNDP and UNEP, 15 PICs have, or will soon complete their NBSAPs. There is very high expectation that substantial financial support will be forthcoming from GEF in support of the implementation of these plans.

CASOs have been encouraged to become more involved in the development of their country's NBSAP to ensure that the needs of community-based projects such as theirs are taken into account as these plans are prepared and implemented. Indications are that most, if not all countries are committed to using the CA concept and approach as the model for any future biodiversity conservation initiatives either under the NBSAPs or some other programmes. There is much they could learn from the CAPs and CASOs. This should pave the way for closer and greater cooperation with communities and governments in as far as biodiversity conservation is concerned

Contrary to the findings of the evaluation team, a number of PICs confirmed during the final MPR that the SPBCP has been a major contributing factor to the successful development of the NBSAPs. While this may not be evident from the documentation at the disposal of the team, it is nevertheless a fact of life in the Pacific that much of the knowledge is still kept in peoples' mind and unless it is specifically requested to do so, are often not put in writing for others to see.

7.2.2 Other SPREP-executed programmes

a) Species Conservation Programme

SPREP executes three Regional Species Conservation Programmes from which, some CAPs have benefited.

The Regional Avifauna Conservation Programme provided additional technical and financial support to the Takitumu CAP in its rat eradication programme. It also carried out bird monitoring surveys in the Uafato CAP. A 2-year programme of assistance has been developed for the Kiritimati CAP in Kiribati and bird recovery plans for Polynesia, Micronesia and Melanesia have been prepared. This programme should be able to assist other CAPs who are in need of the expertise and other resources available through the programme.

The Regional Marine Turtle Conservation Programme has provided additional assistance for turtle conservation work in the Arnavon Islands CAP. Other CAPs are also able to access resources of this programme if required. The programme has provided general support to a number of SPREP member countries in support of their turtle conservation work. It is also possible for CAPs to access SPREP resources through their national focal points if this was a more convenient path to take.

The Marine Mammals Conservation Programme provided support to whale watching in Tonga and dugong conservation in Palau. Ha'apai CAP had expressed interest in the development of a whale watching enterprise for the island group but this has not been followed through.

In addition to the above programmes, the regional invasive programme has potential to assist CAPs monitor and control the introduction and spread of invasive species. Funding for the programme are limited but there is potential for more resources if current efforts by SPREP to raise donor interest in the programme are successful.

b) International Coral Reef Action Network

This programme is due to start soon following announcement of the successful bid by SPREP and its allies for funding from the UN Foundation. The programme aims to protect the coastal areas of Pacific island States through support for existing sites such as those established under the SPBCP. In fact, a number of marine conservation areas under the SPBCP have been targeted for support under this programme. This programme also include the establishment of demonstration sites which are again expected to closely follow the models set up under the SPBCP.

SPREP will execute this programme which will no doubt call on the expertise and know-how of in-country staff like CASOs for assistance in promoting the programme and in identifying suitable sites and communities as target beneficiaries.

c) Coastal and Wetland Conservation programmes

The Coastal Management Programme provide technical and sometimes limited financial support for national efforts relating to the conservation and management of coastal areas and resources. In-country training have been provided in marine survey techniques so that national officials are able to monitor the health of their reefs and marine resources.

This programme of SPREP will continue in future and there are possibilities for marine CAPs to benefit from the training and other forms of support available under this programme.

The Wetlands conservation programme has been focusing on the conservation and management of mangrove resources in a number of PICs. This has largely been done via educational and

awareness activities carried out with schools and other community groups. The programme however include work on coral reef conservation and in recent years, interest has shifted to the potential of coral reefs as eco-tourism sites.

A number of marine conservation areas have interest in marine eco-tourism activities as potential income generating activities for the communities. It would be in the interest of the CAPs and the communities to establish close links with this programme of SPREP.

d) International Waters

This programme has just started. Its four focal areas include marine protected areas. (The other three are marine pollution, sustainable fisheries and protection of international waters). A small number of marine protected areas are expected to be set up under this programme which are likely to benefit from the experience of existing areas under the SPBCP. For the SPBCP sites, the benefits from this programme could be in opportunities to participate in IW-sponsored activities, information exchange, and study tours.

e) Implementation of the SPREP Action Plan 2001-2004 and Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region 1999-2002.

When all other programmes of SPREP comes to an end, the SPREP Action Plan and the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation will provide the frameworks for SPREP's support to PIC efforts to conserve their natural resources now and in the future. Both plans are revised and endorsed every four years by PICs. They provide the mandates by which SPREP is able to seek donor funding in support of local and regional initiatives in resource conservation.

The Action Strategy has been signed by seven other organisations³² indicating their willingness to be guided by the Action Strategy when initiating conservation programmes in the Pacific region. The Roundtable on Nature Conservation comprise about 25 regional and international organisations³³ who are committed to assist PICs in their implementation of the Action Strategy. Some members of the Roundtable (e.g. WWF, TNC, FSPI) are directly involved in national programmes and will no doubt continue to do so in partnership with island countries in the years ahead.

f) Pipeline Proposals

Additional to on-going projects and programmes as discussed above, SPREP continues to explore other potential sources of support for biodiversity conservation in the Pacific. A small number of funding proposals are in the pipeline. They include:

- **Conservation and sustainable management of natural resources in the Pacific islands – A 4 –year proposal to AusAID in support of nature conservation in the region after SPBCP.**

³² The signatories are: World Heritage Center, UNESCO, Foundation for Peoples of the South Pacific-International, IUCN, World Conservation Union, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, New Zealand, The Nature Conservancy, University of the South Pacific, and World Wide Fund for Nature. The Chairman of the SPREP Meeting signed on behalf of the 26 member countries of SPREP.

³³ As of October 2001.

Initial comments from AusAID suggest full review of the proposal following the completion of the final evaluation of the SPBCP.

- **Forest Conservation in the Pacific islands** – the European Union was to consider this proposal in May 2001. It seeks support for the conservation of important forest areas in Pacific island countries that are members³⁴ of the ACP (Asia-Caribbean-Pacific) of the EU. Feedback from the EU is being awaited.

7.3 *Leveraging other funding support*

7.3.1 **Regional Initiatives**

➤ **The Pacific Islands Conservation Trust Fund Initiative.**

This initiative started in 1995 when TMAG recommended that the programme explore other funding mechanism for the long term support of biodiversity conservation in the region. The emphasis was to secure additional support for the CAPs after the SPBCP. With funding from New Zealand's Pacific Initiative on the Environment (PIE), a concept proposal was prepared through an involved-participatory process. Unfortunately, the UNDP was not supportive of this regional approach and more work is now required if PICs are still committed to the establishment of a regional mechanism.

If the Issues and Options paper now under preparation suggests a continuation of efforts for the development of a regional Trust Fund, it might be necessary to investigate other ways in which the initiative could proceed without getting botched down by excessive demands of any particular donor. In fact, it may be necessary to start without such donors until such time when they are convinced and appreciative of the importance of the regional Trust Fund idea. Informal discussions with UNEP and ADB suggest that they are prepared to assist with the Pacific Trust Fund initiative hence, it may be in the interest of the PICs to work through these agencies. In any case, the regional trust fund idea needs to continue after the SPBCP. It is expected that SPREP will continue to take the lead on this initiative until it comes to fruition.

7.3.2 **Regional Biodiversity Support**

Through SPREP, the SPBCP has been able to leverage additional resources especially from SPREP's traditional donors to support certain activities of the programme. Of particular importance was the substantial investment that the governments of New Zealand had made towards the development of the regional Trust Fund, eco-tourism and conservation training. The C-SPOD II is contributing to the cost of marine turtle conservation in the Pacific thereby relieving the SPBCP of much of the cost. This four-year support has come at a critical time when SPBCP funding is phasing out. It will certainly ensure the effective support for turtle conservation post-SPBCP.

The government of New Zealand was also able to contribute to the Pacific Island Community Conservation Course (PICCC) that was jointly organised by SPREP, USP and ICPL. It is

³⁴ The Pacific ACP members are: Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

expected that this partnership will be able to sponsor this course on an annual basis with the continuing support of its current benefactors (NZODA, USP and Darwin Fund).

UNEP, one of the Implementing Agencies for the GEF contributed financially towards the production of eco-tourism case studies involving five CAPs under the SPBCP. It also contributed through SPREP towards awareness raising for the conservation of marine mammals in the Pacific. In 2000, the programme was able to raise extra-budgetary support from the governments of Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom to support a Pacific Island delegation to the 52nd Meeting of the International Whaling Commission to lobby support for the proposal to establish a Whale Sanctuary in the South Pacific.

With assistance of the programme, the governments of Australia and New Zealand were able to commit support to other programmes of SPREP that complement and support the activities of the SPBCP. Of special importance were the positions of Invasive Species (NZODA), Wetlands Officer (AusAID) and Coastal Management Officer (AusAID). These positions provide the much needed technical expertise and advice required by the SPBCP and CAPs on issues relating to coral reefs, wetland management, coastal and marine resource surveys and management and invasive species management and control.

7.3.3 Leveraging other SPBCP and CAP support

Although the SPBCP was able to leverage other donor funding for direct CAP support, the more encouraging aspect was the extent that governments and CAPs themselves were also able to do the same with little or no assistance from the programme. This is an excellent indication of the success of capacity building work carried out by the programme, one that will no doubt continue to serve the CAPs in the years to come.

It should be noted that the success with which the SPBCP was able to leverage funding from SPREP's traditional donors (AusAID, NZODA, Canada, USA, etc) up to 1999 was due mainly to the fact that the Programme Manager, who was also Head of SPREP's CNR Division was able to participate in SPREP Management Meetings where funding priorities were often decided and agreed. The situation changed significantly when the Head of Division responsibilities were taken away from the Programme Manager at the insistence of UNDP. The following Table would indicate that for a very small investment of time in SPREP, the benefits have been far greater for the SPBCP!

Table 6: Additional Funds Leveraged by the SPBCP and CAPs.

Amount leveraged (US\$)	Source	Purpose
\$200,000 (approx.)	PIE (New Zealand)	Review of Community-based CA Approach and Development of a Regional Trust Fund. Funding was provided over a 5-year period.
\$19,320	PIE (New Zealand)	Eco-tourism Training Workshop, Kosrae, FSM 1997.
\$24,454	Canada (C-SPOD II)	Eco-tourism Training Workshop, Kosrae, FSM 1997.
\$25,000	PIE (New Zealand)	Eco-tourism Training Workshop, Vanuatu 1999
\$100,000 (approx.)	PIE (New Zealand)	Birds & Invasive Species. Funding was spread over 1997/8 – 2000.

\$200,000	Canada (C-SPOD II)	For marine turtles, coral reefs and coastal protection. Funding is spread over 3 years. Funding include support for marine eco-tourism training and workshops in conjunction with SPBCP.
\$150,000	U.S.A. government	Small Grant Scheme
\$19,000	Canada (C-SPOD II)	Purchase of outboard motor boat for Funafuti CA
\$25,000 (approx.)	PIE (New Zealand)	Purchase of new outboard motor boat for Funafuti CA.
\$10,000	Funafuti Town Council	Contribution towards the cost of new boat to be purchased in 2001 for the Funafuti CA (see above also).
\$50,000	U.K	To cover ICPL costs relating to the conduct of the PICCC at USP 2001.
\$10,000	Australia	In support of the Pacific delegation to the 52 nd IWC Meeting in Adelaide, Australia, 2000.
\$8,000	New Zealand	As above.
\$1,300,000 (est.)	UN Foundation	For the ICRAN programme in the Pacific. Funding is yet to arrive but will benefit most MPAs under the SPBCP. SPBCP and other SPREP staff worked together in the development of this proposal.
\$65,000 p.a. (starting 2000)	SPREP	In support of the Action Strategy Coordinator position who will be largely responsible for provision of SPREP support to CAPs after SPBCP. This is part of the transition strategy agreed to with the SPREP.
\$6,000	UNEP	Production and publication of 6 SPBCP eco-tourism case studies.
\$5,000 (approx.)	PIE (New Zealand)	Establishment of the DME coconut oil enterprise in Huvalu, Niue.
\$20,000	Kiedanren (Japan)	In support of eco-tourism infrastructure development in Sa'anapu/Sataoa CA, Samoa.
\$10,000	State Government of Kosrae	In support of the Utwa-walung CA 2000. This funding was provided at the initiative of the CA itself.
\$15,000 (est.)	Seacology Foundation	Estimated cost of provision and installation of solar panels at the Utwa-walung and surrounding communities as part of grant awarded the CA.
\$8,000	Government of Tuvalu	From Funafuti Town Council towards the project information center. This funding was provided at the initiative of the CA.
\$35,000 (est.) p.a.	PIE (New Zealand)	Contract funding by PIE to Tourism Resource Center who were contracted to manage eco-tourism development in Koroyanitu CAP, Fiji. Funding was for 3-year period to 2000. Further funding under negotiation.
\$5,000 (est.)	Japan	For the purchase of boat for the Arnavon CA Solomon Islands in 1998.
\$10,000 (est.)	Canada Fund	For the purchase of the existing boat for the Funafuti CA in 1997.

\$5,000 (est.)	New Zealand	To fund 20 pig fences for widows and elderly people of Pangai and Hihifo in Ha'apai CA in Tonga.
\$2,500	Canada Fund	For the establishment of tree nurseries at Uiha and Lofanga village in Ha'apai CA.
\$500	Cook Islands government	From Environment Service of government of Cook Islands to support awareness raising activities of the Takitumu CA.
\$10,000	Canada Fund	To fund Takitumu CA interpretation signs to be installed at Avarua township in Rarotonga.
\$4,000	Canada Fund	Cost of purchase and installation of water supply for the Vatthe CAP, Vanuatu.
\$2,000 (est.)	Energy Unit, Government of Vanuatu.	Estimated cost of solar power system donated to Vatthe lodge.
\$15,000 (est.)	Government of Australia	Estimated cost of Youth Ambassador assisting SPBCP for 8 months.

Note: The above list does not include in-kind contribution by so many individuals and organisations who generously contributed their time to the SPBCP and the CAPs. They include members of TMAG who did not charge for their time attending meetings, a number of SPREP staff who freely gave their time and advice to the programme and many others who are too many to name here.

8. PROGRAMME ACHIEVEMENTS

8.1 Determining the Achievements

Achievements of the SPBCP can be determined from the outputs planned for each of the objectives during the lifetime of the programme as contained in the Project Document (pp. 25 – 27). The following matrix provides an assessment of what has been achieved against each of the programme objectives and projected outputs.

Objective #	Output #	Achievements
1. Establishment and management of Conservation Area Projects.	1.1. CAPs will be initiated in most participating countries; a number of projects will have reached the stage of being successfully established CAPs.	17 CAPs covering approximately 1.5 million hectares of land and marine areas in 12 (out of 14) participating countries. All have reached the stage of being successfully established but many would require substantial input to make them sustainable. Achievement under output 1.1. is believed to have exceeded expectations.
	1.2. A range of guidelines and case studies (covering planning, participation, conservation development, administration, legal, and other aspects of CA establishment and management) will be developed, documented and made available as tools to other CA projects.	An SPBCP Guidelines showing the project development and approval processes was developed very early on in the programme to promote awareness of the programme and to show how people and communities can participate in it. Eco-tourism and other case studies have also been prepared for a number of CAPs. A tool kit for CA managers is under preparation and training workshops have been conducted on aspects such as planning and management of natural resources. More CA-specific work could be done in this area especially given the experience gained over the past few years under the programme.
	1.3. CA Coordinating Committees will be established for projects accepted for SPBCP support.	Except for two newly established CAPs, all other projects have set up CACCs to have overall responsibility for the management of their projects. A good number of these CACCs are operating very well while a small number of others will need time to build up their capacity to look after these projects.
	1.4. For projects reaching establishment stage, plans will be developed and endorsed, covering a) essential information on geography, biodiversity, human settlement and use of the are and its resources; and	Five Year Plans (called Project Preparation Documents) have been prepared for all projects before they were accepted for SPBCP support. The PPDs contain all the information as required under this output. As discussed elsewhere in this report, these

	<p>b) CA management and coordination arrangements (CA objectives; how decisions on resource use, community development and biodiversity protection are to be agreed and resolved; roles of local, national and outside partners; financing; etc.).</p>	<p>PPDs were considered too bulky and technical for the local communities. They required too much time to put together and in some instances, tried to second-guess what was best for the project even before they are set up. For future projects, a much simpler planning document should be preferred over PPD-type documents.</p>
	<p>1.5. Economic development and use of living resources in and around CAPs will be encouraged in ways which do not degrade the biodiversity within the CA and which are socially beneficial.</p>	<p>Takitumu, Utwa-walung, Vatthe, Sa'anapu/Sataoa, Koroyanitu, Rock Islands, Ngaremeduu and Ha'apai are all embarking on eco-tourism enterprises. Uafato has been involved in wood carving for a long time and has recently ventured into bee-keeping. Huvalu has developed a small scale coconut oil production business to complement its small eco-tourism development initiative. Jaluit and Funafuti are also interested in eco-tourism but would find this difficult given the small number of visitors to Marshall Islands and Tuvalu respectively. Arnavon is witnessing the recovery of some marine species and are looking at ways in which the communities could begin to once again harvest these resources in a more sustainable manner. Although various enterprises are at different stages of development, it is fair to say that the experience and lessons learned on the ground from this output over the past 3 to 4 years will be difficult to match even by doing twice that number of years in university!</p>
<p>2. Regional Species Conservation.</p>	<p>2.1. Selected endangered species or threatened species of birds, marine mammals and turtles will be given increased protection, following the agreed SPREP Regional Species protection strategies; strategies for plant and invertebrate species will be designed.</p>	<p>Financial support was provided to SPREP for the implementation of the Regional Strategies for the conservation of marine mammals, sea turtles and avifauna. A very successful regional campaign was launched in 1995 for the conservation of sea turtles. Called the Pacific Year of the Sea Turtle, the campaign reached not only all the PICs but also some countries outside the region. Bird recovery strategies have been developed for each of the three sub-regions, Polynesia, Melanesia and Micronesia. Whale watching in Tonga is attracting increased interest and assistance have been provided to the region's efforts to establish a</p>

		<p>South Pacific Whale Sanctuary under the IWC.</p> <p>At the country level, there are evidence that the kakerori populations in Rarotonga is recovering quite well. Increased sightings of sea turtles have also been reported from Arnavon and Funafuti CAPs and anecdotal records of coral growth and fish populations are available from a number of PICs..</p>
3. Identification of Important Potential CAPs.	<p>3.1. Improved information will be developed and made available on the biodiversity and status of resource use and conservation of participating countries. Information will be in the form of country reports, site reports, reviews of past works, ecological and socio-economic surveys and assessment based on country visits, maps, etc.</p>	<p>With the number of surveys, inventories and other studies carried out during the lifetime of the SPBCP, we now know a lot more about the biodiversity of each of the CAPs than before. In addition to the PPDs, resource surveys have been carried out in a number of CAPs (i.e. Ha’apai, Koroyanitu, Jaluit, Uafato, Funafuti, Kiritimati, and Huvalu) and reports are now available for the use of the projects. What is required in the next few years is more socio-economic surveys to determine how the CAPs have impacted on the social and economic well-being of the local communities. These kinds of surveys will need to be repeated on a regular basis so that the projects are able to determine whether the CAPs are making a positive or negative contribution to the people and biodiversity of the areas under conservation.</p>
	<p>3.2. Possible Conservation Areas will have been identified in each participating country. Outline concept and detailed plans for CAPs will be developed. Concepts and proposals will be evaluated and, where appropriate, accepted for further development or support.</p>	<p>More than 20 areas were identified as having potential for CAPs, 17 of which were finally accepted for further development and support under the SPBCP. In 1998, it was decided that the programme should not take on any more new areas but to concentrate resources on making the existing areas more sustainable. In the last two years of the programme, SPBCP assistance have been limited to the identification of other areas with potential as CAPs for funding by other donors.</p>
4. Improved Awareness of biodiversity and its conservation.	<p>4.1. General awareness of the CA concept, the SPBCP, how it is being implemented and how people can participate will be raised through existing outlets.</p>	<p>The SPBCP and CA concept have been widely publicised regionally and internationally. Videos, newsletters, articles and technical presentations on the programme have been developed and distributed widely in the region and outside.</p>

		Some international organisations such as IUCN, World Resource Institute and others have published articles on the SPBCP and its community-based approach to conservation. SPREP also carry regular news items on the programme in its quarterly newsletter in addition to the CALL newsletter that is produced by the programme also on a quarterly basis.
	4.2. Education and general improvement of information will be built into each CA project, to explain the area's biodiversity and how it is being used and conserved. Materials will be developed in the language(s) relevant to the locality.	A large number of the CAPs have opened up to the public and schools to increase awareness about the CAPs and the biodiversity they contain. Radio and TV programmes have been staged, field days to the CAPs and giving of classroom talks have been popular means of educating and raising awareness about the CAPs. Seminars and workshops involving local communities and conducted in local languages were also found very effective as a way of informing them about the CA and how it is being managed.
5. Improved capacities and cooperation for conservation of Pacific biodiversity.	5.1. Pacific island nationals – in government agencies, NGOs, regional bodies, research and training institutes – will be better trained in conservation of biodiversity and related sustainable development practices, primarily through participation in particular CAPs.	More than 1,000 Pacific island nationals – from local communities, government agencies and NGOs - have received training under the programme. Training ranged from project management skills to surveying techniques and small business enterprise management. In-country training organised by the CASOs enabled the participation of many more local people who would otherwise be unable to attend regional training courses. With funding from New Zealand, a Pacific Islands Community Conservation Course was jointly launched with ICPL and USP at USP Center Fiji in February 2001. The course will finish in December but it is expected that SPREP and USP will be able to continue this course in future years. Talks are currently underway in this regard.
	5.2. SPBCP and CA project studies and lessons learned recorded and disseminated to guide policies and programmes for conservation in the region.	SPBCP and CA lessons are being documented for publication and wider dissemination later in the year. Earlier lessons from SPBCP have been made available to other interested parties to guide their own initiatives. SPBCP's community-

		based approach is now widely accepted as the most effective way of achieving conservation objectives in the Pacific.
	5.3. Information generated from SPBCP activities will be used to set up and improve databases at local CA project, national and regional levels.	A regional biodiversity and CA database has been set up in SPREP using data provided by the projects. Database has been available in CD-R format to the CAPs. Assistance was provided to Ngaremeduu, Samoa and Pohnpei in setting up their national biodiversity databases.
	5.4. Better coordination will be established among groups and agencies involved in biodiversity conservation in the region. The CA management models and tools developed will be shared within and outside the SPBCP participant countries, including all SPREP countries.	<p>SPBCP played a significant role in the establishment of the Roundtable on Nature Conservation in the Pacific region. The RT brings together all regional and international organisations that are actively involved in nature conservation in the Pacific. The continuing increase in the number of organisations wanting to participate points to the importance of this mechanism. SPREP's Climate Change programme is now looking at replicating the RT concept.</p> <p>The CA model has been very successful that it is being used by many other organisations in the region. There is reason to believe that more conservation areas following the SPBCP CA model will be set up in future years.</p>

9. MEASURING SUCCESS

Pages 32 to 34 of the Project Document list the criteria for judging the successful achievement of the immediate objectives of the SPBCP. Although these criteria were developed to judge success up to 1996 (the initial end of project date), they are still valid for use in 2001 especially since the project objectives have remained unchanged from 1996. The following matrix provides and assessment by the Programme Manager of how the SPBCP achievements ranked against the success criteria.

Objective #	Success Criteria	Achievements	Rank
1. CA Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAPs are established in at least fifteen locations, with coordinating groups, and planning, administration, management and development arrangements well formed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 CAPs have been established in 12 countries. All except two have coordinating groups established and functioning. All 17 CAPs have planning, administration and other arrangements set up. Although some coordinating groups are functioning better than others, it is believed that the majority of them will be able to handle the tasks after SPBCP. 	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of CA projects, and of the measures to achieve biodiversity conservation, ecologically sustainable development, and control of incompatible impacts of human activities within them, is assessed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness of community-based projects such as the CAPs can take a long time to assess and evaluate. A more meaningful assessment should be done two or three years after the SPBCP. There are early indications however that the approach is right and acceptable to local communities. This will augur well for the long term sustainability of the projects. • Ecologically sustainable development projects such as eco-tourism, oil and honey production etc have been tried out in a number of CAPs with mixed results. There are indications that some of these enterprises will be successful over time 	1 2 2

		<p>and will provide useful lessons for others to follow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In many CAPs, local communities have adopted rules and by-laws that aim to control incompatible activities in the project areas. Examples include community control of ifilele extraction at Uafato, ban of mesh-sized nets below 2.5 inches in North Tarawa, and limiting access by permitting system in Kiritimati. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results and lessons are recorded and disseminated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wherever possible, results and lessons learned have been made available in the past years either through reports and technical publications or presentations by the programme. However, experiences and lessons learned will be fully recorded and published by the end of the year as part of the SPBCP's final evaluation now in progress. 	2
2. Species Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection plans are in place and implementation started for important threatened species involved in each CA project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection/recovery plans have been developed for the kakerori and sea turtles in Takitumu and Arnavon CAPs respectively. A management plan has also been prepared for ifilele forest at Uafato CA. Monitoring work have been carried out for coconut crabs and bats in Huvalu. 	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection strategies for marine mammals, birds and turtles will have been in operation for five years of the SPBCP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection strategies for marine mammals, sea turtles and birds have been implemented by SPREP for more than ten years. SPBCP has supported the implementation of these strategies in the last eight years. 	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection strategies are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No invertebrates are reported 	3

	prepared for threatened or endangered plant and invertebrate species.	endangered in the region. CAPs through forest surveys carried out recently are in the process of identifying what plants are endangered. This is the necessary first step to developing such strategies.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term programmes for regional species protection are organised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPREP has created two key positions, the Species Officer and Invasive Species Officer, who should ensure the long term involvement of SPREP in regional species protection work. With SPBCP funding running out shortly, this is considered the best means of achieving long term species conservation in the Pacific. 	1
3. Identification of potential CAPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of potential CA in each country is completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This task was completed for the SPBCP in 1998. However, the programme continued to render assistance as requested in identifying other areas with potential for CAPs following the SPBCP concept. 	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of identified areas against developed criteria is completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each concept proposal received was evaluated against the SPBCP's CA selection criteria. This task was completed in 1998. 	1
4. Improved awareness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CA concept, the SPBCP, how it is being implemented and how people can participate are understood at national and provincial levels and among community groups and NGOs in participant countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An impressive amount of awareness raising materials were produced at the regional and CA levels to help increase awareness about the SPBCP and the CAPs since the start of the programme. Videos, pamphlets, leaflets, newsletters, displays, radio and TV programmes have all been developed to promote the CAPs in the respective countries and regionally. Many people in rural areas are now well aware of the SPBCP and the CAPs as 	2

		shown by the continuing interest by communities who were not originally involved in the programme.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each SPBCP CA project includes relevant education and information activities and materials, of known effectiveness in explaining the area's biodiversity and how it is being used and conserved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takitumu, Vatthe, Ha'apai and Arnavon produced videos to educate people and raise awareness about their projects. A regional video covering Uafato, Sa'anapu/Sataoa, Koroyanitu, Takitumu, Utwa-walung, Pohnpei, Ngaremeduu and Rock Islands was also produced for the same purpose. Information on all CAPs are featured in the SPBCP display and are available in information centers for many of these projects. The CALL newsletter also carry information on each CAP on a regular basis so people can learn about what progress are being made by each of the projects. 	1
5. Improved capacities and cooperation for conservation of biodiversity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a measurable increase in the number of Pacific island nationals involved in biodiversity conservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no doubt that the SPBCP has contributed enormously to increasing the number of Pacific islanders involved in biodiversity conservation especially at the community level. The provision of skills and training to the people who are key to conservation success – the community people – was what made the SPBCP significantly different from other programmes and projects who have focused primarily on government agencies. The SPBCP has produced some of the most skilled community workers in the Pacific that it comes as no 	1

		surprise that some government agencies are turning to these people to help them with their community projects.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each SPBCP CA project has an operational training programme and training materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While only a few CAPs actually prepared operational training programmes, most projects opted for ad hoc programmes that included talks to school children, field days for the public and schools at the CAPs, and participation at national environment programmes and events where activities of the projects could be introduced and publicised more widely. Ad hoc programmes have the advantages of being need-specific and more flexible in terms of timing. In some cases, CASOs have been involved in the development of environment and conservation curriculum for local schools. 	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appraisal of organisational issues and the conservation, economic and social effects of each CA project will be completed, and results disseminated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisational issues affecting each CA were discussed at a regional workshop in 1999. (This report is also presenting an appraisal of certain organisational issues which have not been documented before). However, most of the other issues, including the social and economic impacts of the CAPs are expected to be documented and disseminated at the end of the year. It is too early to assess the success or otherwise of this criteria, hence the ranking could change when the task is completed. As pointed out 	2

		earlier, the real success of the CAPs in addressing these types of issues could be better measured when they are left to manage on their own after the SPBCP.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one technical report on biodiversity conservation will be completed each year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On average, 4 to 5 technical reports are completed each year. They include resource survey reports, feasibility studies, management plans and strategies, technical articles and narrative reports. The list of SPBCP reports is attached as Annex 1. 	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each SPBCP CA project includes a managerial database. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only Ngaremeduu and Pohnpei have developed CA databases of their own. However, the SPBCP database serves the needs of all the other CAPs. This was considered a more cost-effective approach compared to each CA having its own database. Some CAPs are relatively small and lack the necessary computer capacity to set up their own databases. This criteria does not match the resources made available under equipment for the provision of hardware to enable this activity to be implemented. 	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a SPBCP database accessible in each participant country, with links to a coordinating point at SPBCP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPBCP database has been copied on CD-R and made available to the CAPs. SPREP will maintain the database after the SPBCP as the central coordinating point for the rest of the projects. CASO are now able to update the information on their projects and advise SPREP so that the regional database could be updated accordingly. 	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All groups and agencies involved in biodiversity conservation in the region are collaborating in SPBCP activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPBCP was instrumental in the establishment of the Roundtable for Nature Conservation in the Pacific. The RT brings together all regional and international organisations who are active in nature conservation in the Pacific. At present more than 25 organisations are participating but it is expected that the number will continue to grow in future years. The RT has been so successful that other regional programmes are considering setting up similar collaborating mechanisms. 	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suite of management models and tools are documented, and shared within and outside the SPBCP participant countries, including all SPREP countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences and lessons learned from the application of SPBCP management models, tools and practices are being documented and will be published and widely distributed within participants countries and other SPREP member countries. Copies will also be available to countries and organisations outside the region. 	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial support will have been given to at least three relevant conferences in the region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPBCP provided partial support for the Fifth Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in the Pacific Region (Tonga 1993) and the Sixth Conference in Pohnpei 1997. The latter conference was facilitated largely by CASOs who contributed enormously to the success of the meeting. Future conferences are expected to capitalise on the experience of the CASOs not only in their organisation but 	1

		also in the discussion of more substantive matters.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased biodiversity conservation activity within the region beyond 1996 is organised with technical assistance and funding assured. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the end of SPBCP, SPREP will have primary responsibility for supporting biodiversity conservation efforts of the PICs. In this regard, SPREP and WWF have worked with PICs to develop their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) as the basis for future action in protecting biodiversity in each PIC.. The NBSAPs, together with efforts by SPREP and other regional agencies and organisations should ensure future support for biodiversity conservation in the region. It is imperative that building PICs' capacity to cater for their own needs should become the key concern for outside organisations like SPREP, UNDP and GEF. Much of the information collected during the lifetime of the SPBCP will assist future efforts aimed at increasing conservation of the region's biodiversity. 	2

Key to ranking: 1 = Highly successful; 2 = successful; 3 = fair; 4 = failed.

10. LESSONS LEARNED

Invariably, there are positive and negative lessons from any regional initiative involving a multitude of people, groups and organisations. The SPBCP was no exception. While the Lessons Learned publication currently under development will highlight some of the important lessons learned especially at the country and community levels, the following are some examples as seen from the SPBCP's point of view.

10.1. CA establishment is only a means to an end.

So much emphasis has been placed by the SPBCP on the establishment of CAPs as though this would inevitably ensure the effective protection of biodiversity in the Pacific. The hard reality is that CAPs are only a tool for achieving sustainable conservation of biodiversity in the region. Dealing with the threats to the CAPs once established is therefore just as important if not more so than CA establishment. The experience of the CASOs in their dealings with local communities supports this line of thinking.

10.2. Conservation is about people.

It has been said many times before that “humans are the biggest threat to conservation” or that “resources are safe without people”. Accounts by CASOs of their experience with the projects suggest that up to 80% of their time was spent on ‘people issues’, ranging from community consultations, resolving community conflicts, organising meetings and conducting training and awareness raising workshops. This account would suggest that those with skills to deal with social and cultural issues are likely to become more successful community workers than perhaps those whose training have been restricted to the natural sciences.

10.3. Communities are unlikely to commit to conservation without reasonable compensation.

Unlike churches, schools and other community based development projects, communities have shown some reluctance to commit to conservation projects unless reasonable compensation is offered. This attitude is believed to stem from the misunderstanding that SPREP and other donors are paying for the conservation projects and that the communities, as owners of the land and resources thereon should therefore be entitled to some monetary benefits from them. It is possible that this attitude will disappear when the SPBCP support comes to the end. It is also possible that it will resurface when another donor agency becomes involved. It is believed that as long as other programmes are paying fees and other monetary rewards to local communities, this problem is unlikely to go away soon.

10.4. Long term investment is absolutely essential to achieving conservation success in the Pacific.

As the single longest serving donor-funded conservation programme in the Pacific in more than three decades, the achievements of the SPBCP speak for themselves. With almost eight years of secured funding, the SPBCP has clearly demonstrated that considerable progress could be achieved in conserving biodiversity on the ground when field staff do not have to worry about raising funds year after year. And when donor institutions and governments realise the compelling need for long term investment in nature conservation, the frustrations of not knowing when and where the next lot of funds will come from could be replaced with the confidence to plan ahead and the joy in seeing results being achieved according to plan and on schedule – something that has been difficult to do without funding investments.

10.5 *Project design*

The SPBCP took less than 8 months to design - it took almost 16 months for UNDP and GEF to approve this design. This was particularly frustrating especially since UNDP's technical and finance staff had reviewed and provided detailed inputs on all drafts (there were at least three) by the design team.

The design phase of the programme was included in the 5 year period (1991 – 1996) given for its implementation. Since the Project Design was not approved until April 1993, there was virtually less than 3 years available to complete project implementation. Although it was later agreed to extend the programme to enable resources to be fully utilised, the fact remained that:

- Project design should have been considered as a separate part of the programme's implementation time frame. This is particularly important if there was to be a fixed timeline for implementation or if the design approval process was going to be extremely slow.
- The enormous time lapsed between programme design and approval did not bode well for an enthusiastic start of the programme at the regional and country levels where expectations began to fade after several months of "wait and see". Approval process should be made easier and proponents kept informed of progress throughout the process.

10.6 *Project Coordination and Execution*

The inability of the SPBCP to have direct access to technical staff of UNDP in New York is considered unfortunate as it limited the extent of exchange of views and sharing of ideas. UNDP Apia often defer to UNDP New York on substantive issues raised by the programme or by SPREP and this sometimes take several weeks if not months. UNDP New York's views are often conveyed by UNDP to SPREP thereby maintaining the "no direct contact" policy.

UNDP may have its reasons for maintaining this "no direct contact" policy. The following consequences are noted:

- The inability to have direct access to those who make decisions is not conducive to creating good and effective relationships between any two organisations. Instead it creates suspicion of some ulterior motive for keeping the other party out of reach of the other.
- Channels of communication within and between SPREP and UNDP should have been clarified and agreed to prior to the commencement of the SPBCP. This would have avoided some of the misunderstandings that occurred between staff in the early years of the programme.

10.7 *Regional vs. national execution*

There has been some skepticism, especially from some donor agencies that programmes implemented through regional organisations have no real added advantages compared to those implemented directly by national governments. It has also been suggested that the regional implementation modality only "eats" into the resources that should have gone directly to national projects.

This argument does not take into consideration the limited capacity of countries to implement donor-funded projects, let alone, locally funded activities. It also does not take into account the fact that regionally-executed programmes have been behind the unprecedented momentum in environment and biodiversity conservation in recent years. Two observations that are particularly relevant in this case are:

- Compared to nationally-executed projects, the average rate of delivery by regional projects is usually 4 to 5 times higher (pers.comm, UNDP official);
- It is so much easier to draw out funds from regional organisations for country-based projects than funds provided directly to national governments for the same purpose (pers. comm. Fiji Government Official).

The SPBCP was proof of the effectiveness of the regional approach as it aimed to ensure that the skills and the necessary tools were in place before cash-strapped and relatively untrained communities were asked to take up the projects.

10.8 Integration vs. a Narrow Focused Approach to Conservation

Although the SPBCP activities included species conservation work, its main focus was on the establishment and management of conservation areas. Its success was attributed in part to having this narrow focus. This success is however countered by the inability of the programme to address all conservation issues in a more integrated and holistic manner. For example, it did not deal with the conservation of important biodiversity outside CAPs, nor did it deal adequately with addressing the threats to biodiversity from invasive species, sea level rise and other natural calamities. The situation was made even worse when the programme's involvement in the SPREP Management team was terminated. This not only effectively isolated the programme from other conservation-related programmes of SPREP, it also denied the programme access to other resources available to SPREP from its traditional donors.

Instead of attempting to create unsustainable isolated units within SPREP, donors would do well to seek greater integration of projects they fund into the mainstream SPREP projects. This would ensure that projects have a better chance of continuation after donor funds run out. Furthermore, this ensures that there is mutual cooperation and sharing of experience and resources amongst projects whether GEF, UNDP, AusAID or whoever funded them.

10.9 Donor requirements vs. community needs

As has been pointed out in earlier sections, the demand for reports from the SPBCP by UNDP was extremely heavy. These reports meant very little to the local communities, so a different style of reporting - usually in very simple, straight-forward language - have to be prepared, further increasing the workload of CASOs and SPBCP staff.

Whilst the preparation of PPDs enabled the compilation of previously difficult-to-access information on the CA sites, the process took far too long, using valuable time that could otherwise be spent on implementing activities. For any future projects of this nature, a simple concept paper summarising the importance of the area for conservation should suffice for the purpose of

approving funding support. Flexible long term management plans could then be developed during the implementation process to cater for the changing needs and priorities of local communities. Inflexible tight timelines and requirements of donor organisations often do not allow for these changes to be made.

Donors including UNDP should consider moving away from a disbursement culture and rigid frameworks that are incompatible with local conditions and situations. Instead, they should embrace process approaches that are flexible, iterative and responsive to the long term needs of the local communities who are recipients of donor support. They should also let go of the project/programme design process to assure a locally-driven process based on principles of community/national ownership, partnership, dialogue and mutual accountability.

10.10 Resolving community conflicts

Biodiversity conservation can bring peace and harmony to rival communities who share a common concern about the loss of biological resources. It can also cause division to communities who were previously at peace with each other.

CASOs and project managers probably spend more time resolving community conflicts than any other aspects of project management and implementation. It is imperative therefore that they have the necessary skills and resolve to deal with these issues. But despite the best efforts, community conflicts are an inherent part of community life that resolving an argument today will not necessarily mean that the issue has been put to rest once and for all.

Land boundary disputes are common to all the CAPs, some more sensitive and disruptive than others. They test the resolve of the CASOs to the extreme and only those who have patience and determination would persevere. Returning absentee landowners who were not involved in the initial discussions and negotiations for the CAP can create problems by trying to impose their authority over previously agreed decisions regardless of whether resident landowners had unanimously approved certain decisions. The point to take home is that community conflicts are an inherent part of project management that should be expected at any time. Understanding community dynamics and getting to know those who influence or make decisions within a community is an important characteristic that CASOs and other community workers should possess.

10.11 Effectiveness of Project Management Structures

The success or otherwise of each CAP was the direct result of the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of the CASOs, the CACCs and the Lead Agencies. A general perspective on how each of these structures performed is provided below:

- *The CASOs:* The CASOs are the most important people in the management structures of the CAPs; they are primarily responsible for the daily operations of the projects and for keeping the communities informed and committed. By and large, the CASOs were effective in their dealings with local communities but many lacked the technical know-how to plan and implement activities of their projects. Although this situation later improved as a result of several training courses carried out under the programme, the situation remains fragile for some CAPs.

CASOs could have been more effective in doing their jobs had they been provided with all the necessary tools to do so. Many CASOs had to travel long distances to their CAPs and in the case of a few, there were no public transport to enable them to get there. When managers of other projects like the CAPs are seen driving in their project vehicles to get to their place of work, it does not take too much imagination to understand how the CASOs feel at not having the same privilege. Capital equipment such as vehicles may be expensive but are so essential to the effective and timely implementation of community-based projects such as CAPs. There is little point in having a committed and enthusiastic CASO when he/she could not get to his/her place of work because of the lack of transport.

- *The CACCs:* CACCs were intended to bring together all key stakeholders to jointly manage the CAPs. Many CACCs worked out reasonably well although it was common to find one or two members not totally committed for various reasons, including the non payment of sitting fees when attending meetings of the group.

Apart from sitting fees, other problems common to the CACCs include, a) long distance to travel by some members to get to meetings (some require overnight stays when attending meetings); b) junior status of some representatives within their agencies preventing them from making firm commitments on behalf of their agencies; c) too many members making it difficult to reach unanimous decisions; and d) misunderstanding of the role and status of the CACCs.

Despite the problems as outlined above, the CACCs remain a practical and workable management model with potential for replication elsewhere. Certain things need to be done to improve the effectiveness of this structure. They include:

- i) careful selection of CACC members from participating agencies and communities to ensure that they have the necessary clout and influence to represent the CACC within their agencies and communities;
 - ii) assign an appropriate status (not necessarily legal) for the CACC that is acceptable to the communities and respected by all stakeholders.
 - iii) provide appropriate compensation for members of the CACC, if affordable.
- *The Lead Agencies:* Like the CACCs, the Lead Agencies are critical to CAP success. They play a key role in the early stages of CA establishment and are often looked at by the CASOs and local communities for continued advice and guidance. The Lead Agencies often provide one of their staff as Project Manager to whom the CASO is responsible. The lead agencies are also expected to take over much of the responsibilities (including funding support) for the projects after the end of SPBCP.

Lead Agencies will not commit to community-based CAPs unless they are convinced that the projects contribute to their overall efforts to conserve biodiversity in their countries. Making them understand that the communities were the true owners of the projects proved difficult and getting them to commit resources and time to the CAPs was not easy. As time passed, this

attitude began to change and it was encouraging to hear all governments represented at the last Multipartite Review Meeting of the SPBCP pledging their support for the CAPs beyond 2001.

To help the Lead Agencies continue to play their role in community-based CAPs effectively, the following suggestions would need to be considered:

- i) consider community-based CAPs as integral parts of governments biodiversity action plans and strategies (e.g. NBSAPs);
- ii) appoint staff who understand and have respect for community's way of life as Project Managers;
- iii) establish closer working relationships with communities not only through the CAPs but also other activities of the agencies.

10.12 Ownership of CAPs

The SPBCP has proven beyond doubt that in the Pacific, community ownership of CAPs was key to their long term viability. With many outstanding community disputes and conflicts that could erupt any moment given a little bit of provocation, CAPs can be very vulnerable unless the communities are firm in their belief that they, and no one else own and have control over the CAPs. But it is extremely important to make the communities understand that ownership is not just sitting around waiting for the benefits to start coming their way while someone else has to sweat to earn those benefits for them. Ownership is about making commitment, it is about making hard decisions, compromises if necessary so that responsibilities and benefits are equitably shared amongst all the stakeholders in the project, not just the landowners.

It wasn't easy for the SPBCP to make local communities accept full responsibility as owners of the CAPs. To most of them, the SPBCP was providing the funding hence the projects were theirs. Much had to be done to correct this situation, including deliberately asking not to include SPBCP or SPREP names / logos on CA signs and other promotional materials. Some positive results were achieved from doing this. However, it was not until when the end was drawing near for SPBCP funding that the communities and governments stepped forward to pledge continuing support for the projects. What this implies is that as long as donor funding was available for conservation purposes, the communities will continue to see the donors as the primary source of funding.

The establishment of trust funds using part of the revenues earned by the CAPs from eco-tourism and other income generating activities would help avoid having to call on local communities to use their meager earnings to pay for conservation. A small number of CAPs have taken steps towards setting up such funds and their experience will undoubtedly be invaluable to the other projects. But what is urgently needed to further encourage local communities to take on the full responsibilities as owners of the CAPs is to continue to build their capacity to be able to handle this responsibility on their own.

10.13. Project ownership can mean different things to different communities.

Project ownership can mean different things to different communities/individuals – SPBCP was strong in promoting local ownership of projects, to instill in local communities a sense of

leadership in project planning, implementation and monitoring. The ultimate aim was to make the communities not only feel but believe they own the projects and as owners, they have a responsibility to ensure that the projects are successful and sustainable. Unfortunately, communities view their responsibilities as owners in different ways. For some, it means laying back waiting to reap the benefits while someone else does the hard work. These people see themselves as the ‘bosses’ whose only job was to decide who gets what share of the benefits. For others, ownership of projects is a responsibility, a duty to perform and to be accounted for. These people accept their lead role in decision-making and implementation and would normally wish to consult with others rather than to dictate to their colleagues.

10.14 Sustainable development and biodiversity conservation

The overall goal of the SPBCP “to conserve biodiversity by means of the sustainable use of biological resources” provided an excellent opportunity for the programme to demonstrate that sustainable development and biodiversity conservation can be possible. Generating income and other benefits from the CAPs was an important part of the SPBCP and continuing monitoring of the impact(s) of one component over the other will be an important aspect of the future management of the CAPs.

It is too early yet to say what impacts the income generating activities are having on the conservation of biodiversity and vice versa. Early indications are that the two could co-exist provided the management regimes for one takes into account the special needs of the other. So far, local communities appear to be making ad hoc decisions on the number of users they would like to allow into the CAPs at any one time. For the moment, the numbers have been kept deliberately low as communities elect to be more careful and cautious. But whether this cautious approach will continue especially in the face of the expected increase in the number of people wishing to visit the CAPs, is not known. What is known is that the twin purpose for managing the CAPs may become very difficult, even impossible to achieve in the future if practical strategies and plans for the balanced management of the projects are not put in place now.

What needs to be learned from this experience is that:

- a) For some communities, their customary attachment to the land and its resources may far outweigh any benefits sustainable development could bring. The management preference of these communities should be respected;
- b) Greed for more benefits from the CAPs can be a lethal threat to the projects. It is probably better to invest revenues from CAPs in other community projects (schools, health clinics etc) than dividing it amongst village members, especially when there is not enough (as is expected from the CAPs) to really make an impact on village members.
- c) Incomes from the CAPs are important incentives for conservation but are unlikely to meet the expectations of the local communities.

10.15 Gender balance in CAP management

Throughout the participating countries, men were primarily responsible for making decisions relating to the CAPs. Although some women also participated in CACCs, men dominated these

groups. This is not to say that women did not play an important role in the establishment and management of the CAPs. On the contrary, in some CAPs, women played key roles in the projects either as CASOs, project managers or supervisors for very important activities of the CAPs.

In some CAPs (example Uafato), while the men may have thought that they made the decisions, the women were actually behind the scene lobbying for certain decisions to be taken. When the women decided that they wanted to revive their traditional art of weaving fine mats and other pandanus products, the men were “quietly reminded” to do something about the roaming pigs! This low key and unassuming nature of the Pacific women is often mistaken as the lack of interest in what is often wrongly assumed “male territory”. Donor-funded projects should try to see beyond the meeting houses, at what roles the women are actually playing in the implementation of the projects, and not judge solely from their lack of presence at certain discussions.

10.16 Capacity of NGOs

It is commonly said that NGOs can be effective ambassadors of community conservation. However, NGOs are almost always severely handicapped by their lack of capacity and resources, making them less effective and unable to cope with the demands of community conservation.

Unlike government agencies and the more established international NGOs (e.g. TNC and WWF), local NGOs rely almost entirely on members’ contribution and support from their counterparts in more developed countries for their survival. They often lack the manpower and resources to implement projects unless project funding are extended to cover the recruitment of additional staff. Unfortunately, this is often not provided for in the project designs and budgets.

The Conservation Societies in Palau and Pohnpei have shown that with the necessary amount of funding support, NGOs can be very effective associates of local communities in managing their projects. But, unlike its counterparts in Micronesia, the OLSSI in Samoa had found the responsibility too much to carry with the limited resources at its disposal. For NGOs such as this, investment of resources in capacity building coupled with the provision of some logistical support would have made a positive contribution. But unless such contributions are made available, the participation of local NGOs in community conservation work is likely to be confined to membership in CACCs and the provision of technical advice from time to time. Direct involvement in the implementation of project activities will be too much to ask for from these groups.

There is also a need to ensure that NGO activities are consistent with the priorities as identified by the countries wherein they work. TNC was able to obtain a medium size grant to support biodiversity conservation in the FSM. Yet this grant was not able to fund boundary survey of the Pohnpei CAP which was identified as critical to the success of the project. It is noted that neither the local NGO nor certain senior government officials knew much about how this grant was being used by the international NGO.

10.17 Documenting Lessons Learned

For all intents and purposes, the SPBCP was the “quinea pig” for a variety of speculations and assumptions about community conservation and sustainable development in the Pacific. Now that the programme is nearing its end, those that have been ‘waiting in the wings’ are swarming to hear of the

outcomes and prospective new initiatives are anxious to learn from the experience and lessons learned by the programme.

Numerous 'events' have occurred during the life of the programme, some positive, others not so. These events can sometimes be mistaken as lessons learned whereas in fact they were simply an incident in the process or processes that might eventually lead to a certain outcome(s). The lesson in this case could well be the average of the 'ups and downs' during that process which led to the outcome. A "lesson" should have withstood the test of time and is unlikely to change in the immediate future. Everything else is simply an event in time.

As alluded to earlier, the lessons learned from the SPBCP are presently being documented for publication later in the year. However, a number of publications recently put out by the programme contain a number of useful lessons which should complement the final publication as mentioned earlier. The Income Generating Manual by Bill Parr and the Ecotourism Tool Kit by *terra firma* are highly recommended for use by field officers who have little time to read complex and technical publications on the subjects.

10.18 Evaluating the Programme

TMAG and Multipartite Reviews have been held every year since the inception of the programme. The mid-term review was carried out in 1996 and the final evaluation is now in progress. When the final multipartite and evaluation are completed in the next few months, the SPBCP would have been evaluated eighteen times (including the GEF OPS Mission).

Except for the GEF OPS Mission, each evaluation is a cost to the programme which of course increases every year. Hence, while they serve a very useful purpose, one wonders if holding these reviews every two years might not have been a more cost effective alternative. On one hand, it allows the secretariat sufficient time (i.e. 2 years) to implement the recommendations on the review) and on the other, it reduces the cost of such reviews by about 50%.

As discussed elsewhere, the conducting of the final evaluation ahead of the actual completion of the programme denies it the opportunity to see how the CAPs would fare after the SPBCP. An assessment carried out one or two years after the cessation of SPBCP support would have provided a more interesting assessment of the CAPs actual capacity to carry on without outside support. Some comments on the final evaluation have been made in the earlier parts of the report and will not be repeated here. Suffice it is to say that the post-evaluation, if it eventuates, should involve a Pacific islander who is familiar with the customs and traditions of Pacific island communities, and is well known and respected by them.

11. RISKS

This report will not be complete without looking at how the SPBCP fared against the risks identified in the Project Document as posing possible problems for the programme³⁵.

11.1 Inadequate access to communally-owned land which would benefit from CA status.

Since land was overwhelmingly custom or communally owned with little access by governments, it was assumed that the programme may not be able to gain adequate access to these lands for

³⁵ Risks are contained in Section F page 35 – 37 of the Project Document.

conservation. The assumption was based on the poor relationship that governments have had with landowners and the usual failure of governments to consult with landowners on matters affecting their land and other community-owned resources.

The risk has been negated by the community approach of the SPBCP, making sure that communities were well aware of what was going on in the project and ensuring that communities are at the forefront of decision-making. The fact that the programme was able to reach its target in terms of sites selected and the continuing expression of interest by other communities to become involved in the programme proved that the assumption was wrong and that the programme was able to establish harmonious and effective relationships with the traditional landowners and users.

11.2 Insufficient support from governments

There was concern that while governments have developed some excellent policy statements, good legislation and impressive conservation rhetoric, effective follow-up have often been lacking. There was no reason to believe the SPBCP will be any different unless governments were serious about biodiversity conservation. A related risk was that government departments with formal responsibility for conservation activities but with little history of effective action may resent strong in-country management roles for NGOs and other local groups.

While government departments played important roles either as lead agencies or members of the CACCs, the local communities were the focus of the CAP development and management. Hence, while some government departments continued to try to dominate, the majority accepted and became comfortable in their roles as technical advisers to the communities. Through the CACCs, the communities and government departments became close partners, each appreciating and respecting the other's role.

Support from governments is not limited to accepting the key part that communities play in biodiversity conservation, it extended to the commitment of government resources in support of the CAPs. In this regard, it was pleasing to hear the pledge of support by all governments at the last MPR to the CAPs after the SPBCP.

11.3 Insufficient activities within the participating countries

There was concern that regional assistance programmes tend to become top-heavy with the bulk of funds spent on headquarters staff, generation of studies etc, with the less proportion of funds going to in-country activities.

The breakdown of SPBCP expenditures during its eight years of operation show that less than 25% of the total budget was spent on programme staff. This is considered standard for any project but is considered lower than some donor funded projects around the world who would normally allow 30% of total budget for overhead costs. Since there was little capacity within governments and communities to effectively manage the projects, capacity building was seen as a main priority for many projects and hence, a significant amount of funds spent on this activity.

It is also fair to point out that unlike other donor-funded programmes executed by SPREP, the SPBCP was not charged SPREP's normal administration fee of around 10%. Instead SPREP

provided free space and furniture for the programme in addition to other in-house services which other organisations would have charged for.

11.4 SPREP may be unable to effectively use the GEF support

There was concern that, as a relatively new organisation, SPREP may not be able to manage a large, new initiative while it was undergoing structural changes.

While the SPBCP operated as part of SPREP, it basically operated as a “complete unit” with its own team of professional staff and an executive officer. Disbursement of funds during the first two years of the programme was slow, not because SPREP was unable to handle the resources, but because there was little demand for funds from the projects at this stage of CAP development. This was understandable as projects had to carry out negotiations with communities, set up management structures and see to other preparatory work before field activities begin.

The fact that SPREP is also managing other large initiatives, including two more from the GEF, is a clear indication of SPREP’s capacity to manage these types of initiatives and the confidence that the donor community is according SPREP as an effective regional organisation.

11.5 The success of the SPBCP may be short term only

There was concern that SPREP will not have the finances to support the CAPs beyond the life of the SPBCP. The concern appeared to be based on an assumption that SPREP will continue to support the CAPs.

This was never the intention of the SPBCP; that SPREP will take over responsibility for the CAPs after the SPBCP. Throughout the eight years of the SPBCP, the aim has always been to build the capacity of governments and communities to take over the responsibilities for the CAPs after the SPBCP. Several CAPs have received pledges from their governments that they will invest resources in the CAPs after the SPBCP, and some are already starting doing so this year.

The concern was based on a wrong assumption although it is acknowledged that SPREP will no doubt try its best to investigate other means of support to the CAPs as part of its mandate to support conservation initiatives in the region.

11.6 Insufficient or inappropriate biodiversity research and education of prospective biodiversity specialists.

The concern was that while special technical knowledge is required for conservation and sustainable development to proceed, the understanding of biodiversity and of appropriate, sustainable uses of renewable resources was incomplete in the Pacific islands. The SPBCP approach and logic has been, “it is better to act quickly to develop effective models with the best of working knowledge available, than to wait until our knowledge was complete”.

There are merits in both arguments, but with the short amount of time (5 years) available to complete the programme, and the pressure from the donors to spend the funds, the argument to start with available knowledge was more convincing at the time. With the benefit of hindsight and

with more information on the biodiversity of the islands now available, it is true that some areas could have benefited more if such knowledge was available at the start of the projects. However, there are still opportunities to make amends either by expanding the boundaries of the CAPs to include neighboring biodiversity that are under threat and need protection, or to establish new sites with the knowledge now available. What is considered more important is that we now have eight years of experience in biodiversity conservation available to us and the tools are now in our hands to improve and/ or apply this knowledge perhaps more effectively elsewhere.

12. ANTICIPATING THE FUTURE

Although the intention was to try to make all the CAPs sustainable and self-sufficient by the end of SPBCP, it is recognised that this was going to be an ambitious undertaking right from the start for the following reasons:

- The original lifespan of the programme was too short to enlist the full support of the multitude of stakeholders in projects of this kind;
- Community-based projects that have started well before the SPBCP were still struggling to make progress in the face of community conflicts and lack of resources. Some of these projects eventually turned to SPBCP for support.
- Communities are still vulnerable to other development proposals that promise immediate cash returns to them; and
- Changing government policies and emphasis could result in additional pressure for communities to consider other less sustainable development options.

The above factors made it very difficult to predict the future for the CAPs established under the programme. If they are able to withstand the pressures from other forms of resource use, then it is possible that most if not all of them will continue to exist. However, if they fail, then the result should be quite obvious.

A number of CAPs are making very good progress which, if maintained, will see them well on their way to sustainability. Annex 4 provides a summary of the status of each of the 17 CAPs together with some comments on their potential for sustainability.

Once again, the key to achieving sustainability for the CAPs are:

- i) committed and dedicated stakeholders including local communities;
- ii) effective coordinating committee and CASO;
- iii) availability of funding support; and
- iv) equitable sharing of responsibilities and benefits amongst the stakeholders.

The following is a brief account of how the CAPs are progressing towards achieving the above.

i) *Committed and dedicated stakeholders*

Indications are that most of the communities, government agencies, NGOs and individuals involved in the CAPs are committed to these community-based projects although there is still a need to ensure that this commitment is given every chance to grow and to bear fruits for those concerned. Training and awareness raising within these groups will need to be continued and perhaps expanded to include others outside the CAPs. Greater links with government agencies and NGO groups will also need to be strengthened as would the interest of donor communities in the projects.

There is greater recognition and appreciation by governments of the important contribution by local communities to the conservation of biodiversity at the national levels. Likewise, communities are becoming less suspicious of the intention of their governments when confronted with suggestions for biodiversity conservation. NGOs and governments are also beginning to appreciate each other's roles in building the capacity of local communities for nature conservation. All these will augur well for the future of the CAPs as it is this kind of cooperation that is critical to the success of the projects. I am confident that with time and continuing hard work, all the stakeholders will be able to fully commit to the success of community-based CAPs and nature conservation in general.

ii) *Effective coordinating committees and CASOs*

As previously discussed, many CACCs are operating well, but there is still much to be done to continue to build their capacity and confidence to take on their role as decision-makers for the projects. Some projects, as part of their transition strategies are already embarking on restructuring their CACCs, to make them more effective and productive.

Problems with CACCs in the past relate to the lack of compensation for time spent on CAP matters. The options are (a) provide compensation as required; and (b) appoint only those who are willing to serve voluntarily on the CACC. The latter option is preferred as it is consistent with the role of local communities as owners of the projects. If the CAPs are able to maintain the interest of the other members of their CACCs in their projects, then this is reason for optimism about the future of such projects.

CASOs are so critical to the success of the CAPs that it is hard to envisage the projects surviving without them. Because of the significance of the role they play and the heavy dependence of communities and other stakeholders on their ability to resolve difficult issues and to make progress, it is easy to understand why the CASO positions have been given higher priority in the search for additional funds after SPBCP. The pledges made by many governments to pick up the cost of these positions post-SPBCP is a welcome development in this regard.

iii) *Availability of funding*

The real test for the CAPs will come in the next few months when the support from the SPBCP is no longer there to pay for the upkeep of the projects. Transition strategies have been prepared for many CAPs to help them achieve a smooth transition from the programme. Whether or not the CAPs will be able to find the additional resources to implement these strategies, only time will tell. What is encouraging though is the readiness of some government agencies to help out by offering

to take on the responsibility for the cost of supporting the CAPs in their countries. This is a good indication that not all CAPs will struggle after the SPBCP.

Of greater importance is the demonstrated ability of the CAPs to identify and access other donor funding by themselves. As is shown in section 7.3 above, a number of CAPs have been able to raise substantial amounts of additional funding from outside the SPBCP. They include Takitumu, Funafuti, Utwa-walung, Ha'apai, Vatthe and Koroyanitu. The projects should be able to manage by themselves although it is expected that SPREP and other organisations will also be able to help with their efforts.

iv) *Equitable sharing of responsibilities and benefits*

Several CAPs have gone some way in identifying specific roles and responsibilities for each of the stakeholders in their projects. This is good as it clarifies each other's responsibilities and contribution to the project thereby avoiding opportunities for conflicts and duplication of efforts.

Progress on identification of responsibilities is not matched by similar work on the equitable sharing of benefits, and this is one of the most difficult challenges the CAPs may have to face in future. Some CAPs are already starting to make money out of their income generating activities. How they manage and distribute these benefits to all the stakeholders will be of interest to other projects. Success in making everyone in the CAP happy will most certainly strengthen their commitment to the projects. Failure to do so is likely to spell disaster for the projects. No doubt, this is an area where outside support will be needed especially in the next year or so.

13. THE TRANSITION FROM SPBCP

The end of the SPBCP will definitely leave a huge gap not only in terms of available resources but also in terms of conservation on the ground. These gaps will be difficult to fill in the foreseeable future. But to lessen the impact of this situation on countries and SPREP, it is important that appropriate arrangements are made for the smooth transition of SPBCP and CAP activities and responsibilities to SPREP and countries respectively. To this extent, the following actions have been undertaken.

i) **Retention of some SPBCP staff:** One former staff of the SPBCP has been appointed to the Action Strategy Coordinator position in SPREP. He represents an invaluable link between the SPBCP and other nature conservation work of SPREP. He will be the major source of information on the SPBCP in SPREP after the programme is long gone.

ii) **Disposition of SPBCP Equipment:** The SPREP Director has formally requested UNDP to allow SPREP to keep some of the equipment (vehicle, computers, printers etc) purchased under the SPBCP. If agreed, this would help maintain the capacity of the organization to service its member countries. It is recommended that UNDP supports the request from SPREP especially given that the organization did not charge administrative costs for the execution of the programme.

iii) **Use of unspent funds:** It is estimated that around \$300,000 will remain unspent after all outstanding SPBCP commitments have been accounted for. These funds should be retained by SPREP to pay for the following post-SPBCP costs:

- Lessons Learned publication (now in progress);
- Post-SPBCP evaluation (to be held in 2003 or earlier)

iv) Continuation of the Regional Trust Fund Initiative: Despite the lack of support to date from UNDP and GEF, it is imperative that SPREP should continue its efforts for the establishment of a Regional Conservation Trust Fund for the Pacific islands. A recent proposal by Wren Green and Peter Hunnam which recommended the setting up of an Establishment Project to continue efforts in this regard should be acted on by SPREP. A meeting of the Trust Fund Steering Committee may be convened to agree on next steps and to consider a funding proposal to NZODA or other donors to support the Establishment project.

v) SPREP Support for CAPs: Continued involvement by SPREP in the work of the CAPs will be critical to their long term survival. Some CAPs have already expressed concern about their future and this is a very worrying signal for these projects. SPREP may not be able to provide financial support after the SPBCP but it can certainly continue to provide moral and technical support whenever required. Some CAPs (e.g. Uafato) have benefited from support from other organisations through the help of SPREP and it is this kind of assistance that will be required from the organization to help ease the burden for the CAPs while more secured sources of funds are being explored.

vi) Storage and use of SPBCP records and information: SPBCP has accumulated over its entire life an enormous amount of information that could only benefit future users. With the help of SPREP's library staff, SPBCP files and publications have been catalogued and archived. More important reports and other types of information will be burned on CDs for safekeeping by SPREP.

14. RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of recommendations could be drawn from the experience of the SPBCP and the lessons learned therefrom. For the benefit of the CAPs and for all those who tirelessly tried to make the SPBCP a success, the following few recommendations are made in this section. They complement those made elsewhere in this report.

- SPREP should continue to assist the CAPs identify and investigate other sources of funding support, including AusAID, to enable the projects achieve sustainability status in the shortest time possible.
- SPREP should ensure that the CAP and CASO networks are maintained post SPBCP, and that the CALL newsletter, in addition to other means are produced regularly to service the networks.
- That SPBCP headquarter equipment should remain in the custody of SPREP while those provided to CASOs should be retained by the CAPs at the closure of the SPBCP.
- That an ex-post evaluation of the SPBCP be carried out no later than end 2003;

- e) That any unspent SPBCP funds with SPREP should be retained by SPREP for the production of the Lessons Learned publication, as a first priority, and the post-SPBCP evaluation.
- f) SPREP should continue its efforts for the establishment of a Regional Conservation Trust Fund in the Pacific Islands.
- g) That SPREP should be able to claim administrative fees for GEF and UNDP-funded programmes executed by the organisation in future.

15. CONCLUSION

Like so many other regional programmes, the SPBCP has not been without its critics. There are those who suggested that the CA selection process was too hasty and could have benefited more from scientific and technical studies of the proposed sites. On the other hand, there are those who argued that the production of PPDs and other technical reports consumed too much time that could have otherwise been dedicated to progressing activities on the ground.

Both the above arguments are good and valid, for there is no universal approach to addressing the diversity of issues and concerns associated with the conservation of land and marine resources under community control in this vast region. CAPs were set up as pilot projects to address a specific need using a specific approach. That need was to protect areas of high biodiversity values that may be threatened from human intervention. Community-based CAPs was the chosen approach to address that need.

The SPBCP had its shortcomings. Its narrow focus on CA establishment created an imbalance in the way conservation issues and concerns were addressed in the Pacific. It left out issues such as ex-situ conservation, trade in biodiversity resources, and cooperation in international conventions which are also important to small island countries of the region. It also had limited capacity to deal with new emerging issues such as biosafety, intellectual property rights and bio-prospecting although it is acknowledged that many of these issues were relatively unheard of at the time when the programme was designed.

What is more pertinent is that the SPBCP has successfully pioneered a concept and approach that have been given so much lip-service in the past. We have known for a long time that governments have limited capacity to protect biodiversity on community land simply because they have little or no access to such land. We have also known for so long that the only way to protect biodiversity on communally-owned land and marine areas was to empower local communities to do so themselves. The problem – and this is a big problem – is that governments naively thought (some even believed) that it was their job to protect biodiversity and that they, and only they have the mandate to do so! When governments finally recognised the importance of involving local communities in protecting the biodiversity these same communities are so dependent on, they (the governments) suddenly realised that they lack the experience and expertise to deal with these communities.

The SPBCP has been about building the capacity of governments, NGOs and local communities to jointly establish and manage conservation areas. It stands to reason therefore that partnerships

between these and other stakeholders was the way to go if community-based conservation was to be successfully achieved. The SPBCP has shown in the last eight years that such partnerships are possible and workable but that there was still work to be done to ensure greater commitment by those involved. This is an area that the CACCs and the involved stakeholders should be able to continue working on themselves, even after the SPBCP. The success of the CAPs rests so much on these partnerships that every effort should be made to ensure their success.

With the benefit of hindsight, there are a number of ways in which the implementation of field activities could have started much earlier than they actually did. One of these is the inclusion of the identification and selection of potential CA sites in the design phase. This would have allowed governments, NGOs and communities to embark on negotiations, agree on arrangements etc while awaiting approval of the implementing phase of the programme. Although the SPBCP design phase had allowed some funding for the immediate implementation of projects that were ready for implementation, no such project was identified during this period.

Had the SPBCP design phase included the identification of CAP sites for immediate implementation when the programme design was approved, prolonged negotiations that caused so much delay in the implementation of field activities would have been avoided. Resources would have been spent on schedule and activities undertaken and completed according to plans. As it was, at least two years were required by most CAPs to carry out community negotiations, a task they could have effectively done during the design phase and before the programme was finally approved.

The SPBCP has also shown how much the region could do when funds are secured over a longer period of time. The establishment of 17 CAPs surpasses any other regional effort in the past. More importantly, there is now a large group of local people who are well trained and capable of leading biodiversity conservation in the Pacific to the next two to three decades.

It is most unfortunate that efforts to set up a Trust Fund for Nature Conservation under the programme have not been successful to date. This would have provided the funding security that is so vital to current and future efforts to conserve biodiversity in the small island countries of the Pacific. It is hoped that SPREP would continue its efforts to establish the Trust Fund or to investigate other suitable mechanisms for supporting biodiversity conservation in this region. The region deserves to have such security if its biological diversity is to be protected for the generations to come.

Finally, it is with concern that after so many years of talking about involving communities in biodiversity conservation, there seems to be a great deal of difference in opinion about how this should be achieved. The report of the final evaluation of the SPBCP suggests that the programme had failed because the CAPs were not formally established. Management plans were not prepared and the capacity of lead agencies (usually a government agency) was not developed to ensure sustainability of the CAPs.

It is quite obvious from this suggestion that the evaluation team had missed the plot altogether – that the SPBCP and the CAPs were different from the traditional national parks and reserves that have failed to motivate local communities to protect the resources under their control. Formal establishment would involve boundary surveys, development of legislation and dictating by law what could and could not be done within the CAPs, including fines and punishments for those who

offend against the laws. All these are western requirements which may or may not be acceptable to local communities. Communities have expressed concern that once legislation are enforced, local control could be lost.

It could be argued that communities should play a vital role in the development of management plans, legislation etc and that they should have a key role in the implementation of same. This is fair enough although experience has also shown that once a legislation is passed, responsibility is given to a government body for enforcement. I have yet to see a legislation whose enforcement is vested in a local community or an NGO. Nor have I seen an example of a community or NGO is receives funding from government to enforce or implement a piece of legislation pertaining to conservation!

The point is that while legislation could be useful, local communities should decide on the appropriateness or otherwise of such instruments and at what point should such instruments come into play. Having the areas formally established may be appropriate for western type protected areas that are owned and managed by governments. They are certainly not a priority for community-owned and managed conservation areas until the communities are ready and willing to go this path.

To conclude, it is my honest opinion that while we have done well in acknowledging the critical need to have local communities assume the lead in protecting biodiversity, our experience with, and training in western management systems have made it difficult for us to let the communities take full control of the management of their projects, at their own pace! Fixed timelines, coupled with unreasonable pressure to show early results to keep the donors happy are contributing factors. Unless these attitudes change, we run the risk of once again, isolating the very people who are vital to the success of biodiversity conservation from future initiatives in the Pacific. We can't afford to make this mistake again!

16. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Many people, groups and organisations contributed time and other resources to the SPBCP and the CAPs. This report is an opportunity to express our sincere gratitude and appreciation for their support and contribution to the programme.

The chairman and members of the Technical and Management Advisory Group (TMAG) were always available to provide advice and guidance to the programme. They freely gave of their valuable time to support the programme. The Secretariat would have found the job overwhelming without the help and input of the TMAG.

Participating countries, through the Multipartite, SPREP and other meetings provided direction to the programme. Their role in facilitating the effective implementation of CAP activities and the hospitality accorded SPBCP staff during country visits made it such a pleasure to be part of the SPBCP.

The CASOs are pretty much part of the “SPBCP family”. Their dedication and enthusiasm have been evident throughout the eight years of the programme. The progress that has been achieved so far is attributed to their hard work. It has been a privilege to know and work with this group of dedicated and committed individuals.

Project managers and lead agencies, whether they be government agencies or NGOs, also gave so much in support of the CAPs. I believe a few CASOs would have lost their way had it not been for the supervision provided by the project managers and lead agencies. The CAPs will continue to need this support from the lead agencies and I am confident that this will be expeditiously provided as before.

The GEF, UNDP and AusAID as co-funders of the programme deserve our most sincere appreciation for the financial support, which enabled the implementation of this innovative and groundbreaking project. I believe the results of the SPBCP will speak louder than any words of thanks we could offer. Suffice it is to say that the GEF has left a legacy in the Pacific that will be hard to forget. The CAPs will always serve to remind peoples and countries of the Pacific of the invaluable support from these donor organisations to the protection of the Pacific’s natural heritage.

To our collaborating partners, TNC, WWF, USP, ICPL, AusAID, NZODA and PIE, IUCN, Canada Fund and many others who contributed either directly or indirectly to the SPBCP and CAPs, we thank you kindly for your support. There is no better satisfaction for us than knowing that so many people share a common goal and are willingly supporting each other achieve that goal. What an inspiration to give future generations for the benefit of biodiversity conservation in the Pacific!

Last but not least, are the special thanks to the Director and staff of SPREP who not only provided a home for the programme, but also constantly made sure that the programme was well serviced by the organisation. The opportunity for the Programme Manager to serve as one of the SPREP Management team was an indication of the high regard SPREP had for the SPBCP and a privilege I was honored to receive. I hope the SPBCP had provided some useful lessons for the organisation

to guide its future activities in nature conservation. Equally important, I trust that with the experience of the SPBCP, governments and donors will now see and appreciate more fully the important role that SPREP is playing in protecting the region's biodiversity and give the organisation the support it rightly deserves.

TABLE 1: SPBCP EXPENDITURES 1991 – 2001

SPBCP Expenditures 1991- June 2001						
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Total
Details	Actual Expenditure	1997 & 1998	1999	2000	Jan-June	Total
	1991 - 1996	Expenditure	Expenditure	Expenditure	2001	Expenditure
Project Personnel (SPREP)	810,467	437,059	236,038	167,245	82,322	1,733,131
Project Consultancies	396,421	303,302	163,540	50,118	57,682	971,063
Support Personnel(SPREP)	216,468	143,398	41,897	15,814	7,602	425,179
Official Travel	235,748	102,623	29,878	5,393	9,390	383,032
Mission Costs	152,924	106,382	40,626	40,020	31	339,983
CA Support Officers	139,324	325,334	81,363	199,141	76,551	821,713
UN Volunteers	25,332	157,231	21,548	9,176	0	213,287
COMPONENT TOTAL	1,976,684	1,575,329	614,890	486,907	233,578	4,887,388
Sub-contracts						
CA Awareness, Identification	248,675	78,166	54,602	36,071	3,295	420,809
CA Establishment & Mgmt	258,134	251,084	23,229	128,645	18,276	679,368
CA Sustainable Dev.Activities	131,015	204,483	6,991	73,799	1,520	417,808
Species Protection	330,480	276,098	73,894	42,290	11,280	734,042
COMPONENT TOTAL	968,304	809,831	158,716	280,805	34,371	2,252,027
Training						
Study Tours	119,553	99,009	-14,353	654	0	204,863
In-Service Training	372,265	39,027	368,947	69,852	61,168	911,259
COMPONENT TOTAL	491,818	138,036	354,594	70,506	61,168	1,116,122
Equipment						
Equipment	139,113	63,823	12,142	11,238	664	226,980
Miscellaneous	190,459	112,358	43,550	14,976	5,092	366,435
UNDP Support Costs (Admin)	268,132	12,587	91,461	26,403	0	398,583
COMPONENT TOTAL	597,704	188,768	147,153	52,617	5,756	991,998
GRAND TOTAL	4,034,510	2,711,964	1,275,353	890,835	334,873	9,247,535

TABLE 2: SPBCP EXPENDITURES BY CAP

TABLE 3: SPBCP EXPENDITURES BY COMPONENT

SPBCP Expenditures by Component	
	Total
Details	Actual
	Expenditure
Project Personnel	1,733,131
Project Consultancy	971,063
Support Personnel	425,179
Official Travel	383,032
Mission Costs	339,983
CA Support Officers	821,713
UN Volunteers	213,287
COMPONENT TOTAL	4,887,388
Sub-contracts	
CA Awareness, Identification	420,809
CA Establishment & Mgmt	679,368
CA Sustainable Dev. Activities	417,808
Species Protection	734,042
COMPONENT TOTAL	2,252,027
Training	
Study Tours	204,863
In-Service Training	911,259
COMPONENT TOTAL	1,116,122
Equipment	
Equipment	226,980
Miscellaneous	366,435
UNDP Support Costs (Admin)	398,583
COMPONENT TOTAL	991,998
GRAND TOTAL	9,247,535

TABLE 4: ACTUAL EXPENDITURES VS BUDGET ESTIMATES

Insert table from Tina

TABLE 5: LIST OF SPBCP STAFF

Name	Sex	Nationality	Designation	Length of service
Iosefatu Reti	Male	Samoan	Programme Manager	May 1993 – December 2001.
Gary Spiller	Male	Canadian	Programme Officer (Biodiversity)	April 1994 – January 1995 (Contract terminated)
Andrew Tilling	Male	New Zealand	Programme Officer (Socio- economics)	April 1994 – June 1996 (Resigned for personal reasons)
Roger Cornforth	Male	New Zealand	Programme Officer (Biodiversity)	August 1995 – August 1996 (resigned for personal reasons)
Michael McGrath	Male	Australian	Programme Officer (Socio- economics)	June 1996 – March 1998 (Resigned for personal reasons)
Samuelu Sesega	Male	Samoan	Programme Officer (Resource Management*)	February 1997 – June 2001 (Appointed to another post within SPREP)
Francois Martel	Male	Canadian	Programme Officer (Socio- economics)	September 1998 – September 1999 (End of contract)
Sue Miller**	Female	New Zealand	Species Officer	May 1994 – December 1999 (Resigned to take up another job)
Selesitina Puleaga	Female	Samoan	Executive Officer	December 1997 – December 2001
Faatupu Poihega	Female	Samoan	Secretary	April 1993 – 1996 (resigned)
Ruta Tupua-Couper	Female	Samoan	Divisional Assistant Secretary	1994 – 1996 1996 – 2001
Sarona Stanley	Female	Samoan	Divisional Assistant	September 1996 – 1999 (resigned)
Helen Ng Lam	Female	Samoan	Divisional Assistant	March 1999 – March 2000
Talanoa Tuala	Male	Samoan	Driver	July 1993 – July 1996 (resigned)
Albert Williams	Male	Samoan	Driver	August 1996 – July 1999 (resigned)
Montini Smith	Male	Samoan	Driver	August 1999 – December 2001

* Position was previously titled Programme Officer, (Biodiversity)

** SPBCP paid for 50% of the salary of this position from 1993 to 1999.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF SPBCP PUBLICATIONS AND REPORTS

Inventory of SPBCP Documentation³⁶

Program Documentation	PRODUCTION	DESCRIPTION – SCOPE	
Program Plans	Project Document	1993, May	RAS/91/G31/E/IG/99 - Five-year plan, produced through the program design phase, approved by GEF, UNDP and AusAID.
	SPBCP User Guidelines	1994, October	Revised and final Guidelines for the CA projects planning and management for potential project proposals.
	Annual Work Plan and Budget	Annually, for years 1994 to 2001	Produced by Program Manager, submitted with Annual Report to SPREP Director, TMAG, MPR, UNDP and AusAID
	Annual Work Programme Schedule and Budget	Annually, for years 1999, 2000 and 2001	SPBCP contribution to SPREP Annual Work Programme and Budget for Key Result Area (KRA) 1: Nature Conservation – Key Outputs 101 – Establishment and Management of Conservation Areas, 102 – Conservation Area Awareness, 103 – Sustainable Income Generation and Conservation Enterprises, 104 – Training and 109 – Species conservation and sustainable Use Initiatives.
Program Reports	Mission Report	1994, July	Review of the programme and preparation of guidelines to SPBCP and three PPDs by SPBCP Design Consultant
	Quarterly Reports	Each quarter, from Q1 –2000 to Q2- 2001	Technical progress report on all components of SPBCP, prepared by Program Manager, submitted to UNDP, Apia office.
	Project Implementation Reports (PIR)	Annually, from 1998 to 2001	Technical progress report on all components of SPBCP, submitted to UNDP, Apia office.
	Annual Programme Reports	Annually, from 1994 to 2000	Technical progress and financial report on all components of SPBCP, produced by Program Manager, submitted to SPREP, TMAG, MPR and UNDP and AusAID
	UNDP Pacific Sub-Regional Programme Reports	Six-monthly for years 1994 to 1999	Consolidated technical progress report on the Pacific sub-regional Programme, produced by UNDP (Suva), submitted to UNDP (Suva)

³⁶ Programme documents only. Studies, inventories and other CA documents are listed in CA Database.

	SPBCP Technical & Management Advisory Group Reports (TMAG)	Annually, for years 1994 to 2000	Comments and recommendations produced from the annual TMAG meeting. Last, 8 th TMAG meeting was held in October 2000.
	Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPER)	Annually for years 1994 to 1997	Performance evaluation of programme by SPBCP secretariat, UNDP and Multi-partite members.
Program Reports (cont.)	SPBCP Multi-Partite Review Meeting Report	Annually for years 1994 to 2000	Produced by UNDP as proceedings of the Multi-partite review meetings includes decisions and comments including annual programme report (APR) and evaluation by MPR. Last, 8 th MPR meeting to be held in Apia in October 2001.
	Legal and Institutional Models for Conservation Areas	1993, July	Published document. SPREP Reports and Studies Series No. 79. Prepared by the Environmental Defender's Office, Sydney Australia for SPBCP.
	Independent Mid-Term Evaluation Report	1996, August	The report of the mid-term review of SPBCP conducted by independent consultants.

	MAG and SPBCP Secretariat comments on the Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of SPBCP	1996, August	Review and comments of draft mid-term review report by TMAG and SPBCP Secretariat on the Independent Mid-Term Review report and findings.
	Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Reports – Outputs 101-104 Conservation Area Programme and Outputs 109 Species Conservation	Quarterly for years 1999, 2000 and 2001.	Performance monitoring and evaluation reports prepared quarterly by SPBCP staff for SPREP to review performance of the programme against SPREP Annual Work Programme and Budget. Division of Conservation of Natural Resources and Strategic Output 1 of the SPREP Action Plan 1997-2000.
	Guidelines for Conservation Area Project Review and Evaluation	1999, June	Brief document prepared for CAP and CASOs by SPBCP Secretariat in preparation for work on Transition Strategies. Revised following May 1999 CASO/CACC Management Workshop in Nadi, Fiji. Prepared by SPBCP.
	Draft Transitional Strategy for SPBCP and SPREP – July 2000 to December 2001	2000, November	Paper prepared at the request of TMAG presenting a Transition Strategy for SPBCP at programme level and for SPREP. Contents: Achievements to date; Key issues for the CAPs; key issues for SPBCP and SPREP; Priorities for key actions; A strategy for on-going SPREP support to CAPs. Prepared by SPBCP for 8 th TMAG Meeting held in Wellington, October 2000.
Financial Reports	Annual Financial Reports and summaries	Annually, from 1994 to 2000	Financial reports on all components of SPBCP, produced by Program Manager, submitted to SPREP, TMAG, MPR and UNDP and AusAID

	Financial Summary of Accounts	2001, May	Reconciled summary of SPBCP audited financial accounts, both approved and spent up to December 2000.
Training Reports	Training Workshop for Conservation Area Support Officers in the South Pacific	1994, October	First SPBCP Workshop held in Nadi, Fiji, and 17 -21 October 1994 to initiate the process of CASO training on the establishment and management of their Conservation Areas. Training Notes – include Introduction, Field Visit to Koroyanitu CAP, Participatory Planning and Implementation, Project Management, Workshop Review and Future needs. Prepared by SPBCP.
	Papers and Proceedings: Training Workshop for Conservation Area Support Officers in the South Pacific	1995, May	Published Papers and Proceedings: Training Workshop for Conservation Area Support Officers in the South Pacific, Nadi, Fiji, 17 -21 October 1994. Included sections: Introduction to the SPBCP, Visit to a Conservation Area, Participatory planning and implementation, Project management and income-generating projects (first IGA and ecotourism workshop session) and review of Workshop. Prepared by SPBCP.
	CASO Workshop on Project & Resource Management	1995, September – October	Workshop held at Port Vila and Espiritu Santo, Vanuatu, for training of CASOs on project and resource management issues. (Andrew Tilling and Roger Cornforth facilitators and resource people).
	Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation in SPBCP Conservation Areas – Workshop Report	1998, October	Report on a CASO workshop on participatory monitoring and evaluation. Held in Apia, Samoa 2-5 December 1996. Facilitated by Michael McGrath. Includes sections on basic principles, participatory socio-economic monitoring and evaluation by Sango Mahanty, participatory biophysical monitoring and evaluation by Tony Whitaker, monitoring of coral reefs by James Aston, a section on Hawksbill Turtles in the Arnavon Marine CA: a case-study in participatory monitoring and evaluation by Sue Miller. SPREP Publication.
	Workshop Information and Exercises for the Community – based Ecotourism	1997, July	Workshop information package including exercises and case-study forms prepared for participants in the Community –based Ecotourism Planning and Management Workshop – Phase I held in Kosrae, FSM on 29 July-8 August 1997. Prepared by terra firma associates and Tourism Resource Consultants.

	Planning and Management Workshop – Phase I		
	Community Ecotourism Development Manual – Phase I	1997, July	Workshop Manual on community-based ecotourism development including parts on Tourism Awareness, Tour Product Development , Project Development, Resource Management, Community Development, Creating a business, Training skills and training needs analysis, and Tour guides and interpretation. © <i>terra firma associates</i>
Training Reports (Cont.)	Evaluation Report for the Community Based Ecotourism Planning and Management Workshop – Phase I	1997, July – August	Evaluation report of the Workshop for SPBCP supported Conservation Areas on community ecotourism held in Kosrae, FSM, 29 July to 8 August 1997. Evaluation of objectives and learning outcomes, stakeholder and client interest, administrative and management issues, follow-up support and recommendations. Prepared by <i>terra firma associates</i> .
	Pre-Workshop Package – Income generating Activities Training Workshop for SPBCP-supported Conservation Areas – Phase 1	1998, July	Workshop information package including case-study forms prepared for participants in the Income-generating Activities Training Workshop – Phase I held in Apia, Samoa, 13-24 July 1998. Prepared by SPBCP.
	Participant Manuals and Workbook - Income-generating Activities Training Workshop – Phase I	1998, July	Workshop participant Manual and Workbook on Income-generating Activities– Phase I held in Apia, Samoa, 13-24 July 1998. Prepared jointly by the Small Business Enterprise Center (SBEC) and SPBCP.
	Field Trip Manual – Uafato Conservation Area, Upolu,	1998, July	Workshop field trip manual for Saturday 18, July visit to Uafato Conservation Area as part of the Income-generating Activities Training Workshop – Phase I held in Apia, Samoa, 13-24 July 1998. Prepared by SPBCP.

	Samoa		
	Training Evaluation Report of the Income-Generating Activities Training Workshop for SPBCP – supported Conservation Areas	1998, August	Evaluation report of the Workshop on Income-generating Activities– Phase I held in Apia, Samoa, 13-24 July 1998 including observations on pre-workshop package, case-studies, resource-persons, exercises, fieldtrip, group work and presentation, and Participants evaluation of the programme. Prepared by SBEC and SPBCP.
	Melanesia Sub-Regional Workshop on Community-based Resource Management Planning	1998, November – December	Workshop for CASOs and CA stakeholders, held at Espiritu Santo, Vanuatu
	Workshop Information and Exercises for the Community – based Ecotourism Planning and Management Workshop – Phase II	1998, November	Workshop information package including exercises and case-study forms prepared for SPBCP-Conservation Areas and Melanesia Coral Reef Focal points participants in the Community –based Ecotourism: A skills Development Programme and Workshop - Phase II held in Lonnoc, Espiritu Santo, Vanuatu. On 23 November – 4 December 1998. Prepared by <i>terra firma associates</i> and Tourism Resource Consultants.
Training Reports (Cont.)	Community-based Ecotourism Development Manual – Phase II – <i>Community Ecotourism for Conservation in the Pacific</i>	1998, November	Workshop Manual on community-based ecotourism development including parts on Tourism Awareness, Tour Product Development , Project Development, Resource Management, Community Development, Creating a business, Training skills and training needs analysis, Tour guides and interpretation, and Marine Ecotourism. © <i>terra firma associates</i>
	Evaluation Report for the Community Based	1999, January	Evaluation report of the Skills Development Programme and Workshop for SPBCP supported Conservation Areas and Coral reef focal points on community ecotourism held in

Ecotourism Planning and Management Workshop – Phase II		Lonnoc, Vanuatu, 23 November to 4 December 1998. Evaluation of pre-workshop, workshop teaching, learning outcomes, administrative and management issues, stakeholder's interests, next steps and recommendations. Prepared by <i>terra firma associates</i> .
Handouts and Notes from SPREP Community Based Ecotourism Workshops	1999, January	Compendium reports on handouts, case studies and notes from the 1997 and 1998 community-based ecotourism workshops for SPBCP-supported conservation areas. Compiled by <i>terra firma associates</i> .
Workshop Documents for the CASO/CACC Project Management Training Workshop for SPBCP-supported Conservation Areas	1999, May	Workshop material and binder for CASOs, CACC members and key CA stakeholders participating in the CASO/ CACC Project Management Training Workshop held in Nadi Fiji, 17-28 May 1999. Delivered by SPBCP and SPREP staff over two weeks. Includes all aspects of SPBCP project management.
Travel Report and Summary of Evaluation for CASO/CACC Workshop 17-28 May, 1999	1999, June	Duty Travel Report prepared by the SPBCP Programme Manager on the delivery of the CASO/CACC Workshop held in Nadi, Fiji. Includes a summary of evaluation forms from participants.
Report on the SPBCP project Monitoring Workshop on Resource-based Income-generating Opportunities	1999, June	Final report on the sustainable development component of the CASO/CACC Project Management Training Workshop for SPBCP-supported Conservation Areas held 17 May to 28 May 1999 in Nadi, Fiji. Prepared by Parr & Associates Ltd. Contents: Section 1 - Workshop on Sustainable Income-generating Activities; Section 2 – Planning for the pre-feasibility study of IGA in Koroyanitu CA. Includes Training Outputs and Outcomes as Appendices.
Planning for a Manual and Guidelines for Income-generating	1999, June	This report provides information to assist in the preparation of a Manual and Guidelines for community ecotourism development in SPBCP Conservation Areas. Prepared by John Gilbert & Associates.

	Activities in SPBCP-supported Conservation Areas - Report		
Training Reports (Cont.)	Polynesia & Micronesia Sub-regional Workshop on Community-based Resource Management Planning	1999, July	Workshop for CASOs and CA stakeholders, held Nadi, Fiji
	Pre-Workshop Package - Conservation Enterprises & Income Generating activities: skills development workshop – Phase II	1999, September	Workshop information package including case-study forms prepared for participants to the Conservation Enterprises & Income Generating activities Training Workshop – Phase II held in Apia, Samoa, 20 September – 1 October 1999. Prepared by SPBCP and SBEC.
	Participant Manuals and Workbook - Conservation Enterprises & Income Generating activities: skills development workshop – Phase II	1999, September	Workshop participant Manual and Workbook for the Conservation Enterprises & Income Generating activities Training Workshop – Phase II held in Apia, Samoa, 20 September – 1 October 1999. Prepared jointly by the Small Business Enterprise Center (SBEC) and SPBCP.
	Features of Successful Ecotourism Businesses – Training Document	1999, September	Document on ecotourism businesses for the ecotourism component of the Conservation Enterprises & Income Generating activities Training Workshop – Phase II held in Apia, Samoa, 20 September – 1 October 1999. Prepared by <i>terra firma associates</i> . Funded by PIE-NZODA.
	Training	1999, October	Evaluation report of the Conservation

	Evaluation Report of the Conservation Enterprises & Income Generating activities workshop for SPBCP – supported Conservation Areas – Phase II		Enterprises & Income Generating activities Training Workshop – Phase II held in Apia, Samoa, 20 September – 1 October 1999 including observations and Participants evaluation of the programme on pre-workshop package, resource-persons, exercises, fieldtrips, and learning outcomes. Prepared by SBEC.
	Evaluation of Community Ecotourism Field Exercises in the Conservation Enterprises & Income Generating activities : skills development workshop – Phase II	1999, October	Evaluation report of the ecotourism component of the Conservation Enterprises & Income Generating activities Training Workshop – Phase II held in Apia, Samoa, 20 September – 1 October 1999 including review of ecotourism exercises and recommendations. Prepared by <i>terra firma associates</i> . Funded by PIE-NZODA.
Training Reports (Cont.)	SPBCP Monitoring for Success – Conservation Area Project Marine indicators-monitoring workshop – Phase I – Course Notes	2000, August	Course notes for the workshop for CASOs, of marine and coastal conservation areas of SPBCP and key marine CA stakeholders, Apia, Samoa, 14-25 August. Includes:
	SPBCP Indicators for Success – Marine Indicators Workshop – Field Procedures	2000, August	Field Procedures for the Marine Indicators Training Workshop held in Apia, Samoa, August 14 to 25, 2000. Phase One of the training for SPBCP Indicators of Success. Procedures on monitoring of : Produced by Trevor Ward, Geoff Dews.
	SPBCP	2000, August	CD-ROM including technical notes, field

	Marine Areas Monitoring Workshop – CD-ROM		procedures, handouts, exercises and database forms developed and used as part of the SPBCP Marine Areas Monitoring Workshop held in Apia and Aleipata, Samoa, 14-25 August 2000.
	Evaluation Report for the SPBCP Marine Indicators Monitoring for Success Workshop	2000, August	Evaluation report with analysis of the workshop evaluation forms on the programme, the instructors, presentations and general comments. Includes consultant's observations and recommendations. Authored by: Anna Tiraa-Passfield, SPBCP Consultant.
	Pacific Islands Community-based Conservation Course - Training Workshop and Manual	2001, February-March	Training Workshop on the Community-based Conservation Course- Phase I held at the University of the Pacific, Suva, Fiji 12 February – 9 th March 2001. The manual has been developed by the International Center for Protected Landscapes, in consultation with USP and SPREP. The course is given at USP with SPBCP/SPREP staff and is intended for conservation areas support officers (CASOs), protected area and community development staff, environmental practitioners and community leaders in the South Pacific Region. Manual developed by IPCL/USP/SPREP.
	Report on the Pacific Islands Community-based Conservation Course (PICCC)	2001, June	First draft version of the report on the first Training Workshop on the Community-based Conservation Course- Phase I held at the University of the Pacific, Suva, Fiji 12 February – 9 th March 2001. The manual has been developed by the International Center for Protected Landscapes, in consultation with USP and SPREP. Compiled by Audrey Dropsy, Training Consultant.
Training Reports (Cont.)	SPBCP Indicators for Success Phase II - Terrestrial Monitoring Techniques Training Workshop – Course Notes	2001, June	Course notes for the Terrestrial Monitoring Techniques Training Workshop held in Apia, Samoa, June 18 to 22, 200. Phase Two of the training for SPBCP Indicators of Success. Sections include: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity; Designing Monitoring; Sampling Designs and Baseline Surveys; A Framework for Monitoring; Developing Conservation-Level Indicators in Practice; Identifying Indicators; The SPBCP Core Indicators; ; Prioritisation of indicators in each CA; Community –based planning and the SPBCP Standard Monitoring Protocols.

			Produced by Trevor Ward, Art Whistler and Greg Sherley. 64 pages.
	SPBCP Indicators for Success Phase II - Terrestrial Monitoring Techniques Training Workshop – Field Procedures	2001, June	Field Procedures for the Terrestrial Monitoring Techniques Training Workshop held in Apia, Samoa, June 18 to 22, 200. Phase Two of the training for SPBCP Indicators of Success. Procedures on monitoring of carving tree harvest; Weeds monitoring; Bird Monitoring; Assessing the Plan of Management for natural resources. Produced by Trevor Ward, Art Whistler and Greg Sherley. 13 pages.
	SPBCP Terrestrial Areas Monitoring Workshop – CD-ROM	2001, June	CD-ROM including technical notes, field procedures, handouts, exercises and database forms developed and used as part of the SPBCP Terrestrial Areas Monitoring Workshop held in Apia and Uafato, Samoa, 18-22 June 2001.
	SPBCP Manual - Community-based Ecotourism & Conservation in the Pacific Islands: A tool Kit for Communities. – Lessons learnt, Steps to take and Resources to Use.	2001, June	First draft of Ecotourism tool kit based on lessons learned mainly from SPBCP community ecotourism initiatives. In three parts: Part 1- Case Studies of Ecotourism in Conservation Areas; Part 2 – A Guide to Ecotourism Development (Getting started, Operating an Ecotourism Business, Managing Relationships); Part 3 – Resource Kit & Photo CD. Prepared by terra firma associates (TFA). Final manual to be completed by September 2001.
	SPBCP Manual on Natural Resource-based Income Generating Activities	2001, June	First draft of Income-generating activities manual and tool kit based on lessons learned mainly from SPBCP community IGAs. Draft covers: Part 1- Financing conservation Part 2 – Culture, commerce & conservation, Part 3 – Identifying the Opportunities, Part 3 – Assessing the Opportunities, Part 4 – Verifying the opportunities. Prepared by Bill Parr & Associates. Final manual to be completed by September 2001.
Training Reports (Cont.)	SPBCP Inspirational Stories Week – Lessons	<i>In preparation</i>	<i>Workshop of all 17 CASOs involved in the SPBCP Conservation Area Projects in the Pacific. To be held in Manase, Savaii 25-29 June 2001.</i>

	<i>from the Field Workshop</i>		<i>Final Report expected in September 2001.</i>
SPBCP Monitoring Documents and material	Guidelines for the collection & Development of Baseline Data in Conservation Areas	1996, August	First set of guidelines for data collection to be used by CA staff to promote and develop community involvement in CA
	SPBCP Indicators of Success – Volume 1 – Technical Report	1999, August	The technical basis for the initial identification of indicators (Phase 1)
	SPBCP Indicators of Success – Volume 2 – Field Trials	2000, June	Results of field trials of the indicators (Phase 2) CA including baseline data collected from the Uafato CA during phase II.
	SPBCP Indicators of Success – Volume 3 – Data Report	1999, August	This report documents the raw data collected during Phase I in the three CAs of Uafato, Koroyanitu and Vatthe.
	SPBCP Indicators of Success – Volume 4 – keeping Track of Changes in Uafato Conservation Area	1999, August	This report is a local peoples guide to the project and the main findings for Uafato, and is intended to be suitable for translation into Samoan language.
	SPBCP Indicators of Success – Volume 5 – keeping Track of Changes in Vatthe Conservation Area	1999, August	This report is a local peoples guide to the project and the main findings for Vatthe, and is intended to be suitable for translation into bislama language.
	SPBCP Indicators of	1999, August	This report is a local peoples guide to the project and the main findings for Vatthe, and is

	Success – Volume 6 – keeping Track of Changes in Abaca, Koroyanitu		intended to be suitable for translation into bislama language.
	SPBCP Indicators of Success – CD-ROM Version 1 – 2000	2000, August	The CD-ROM was prepared to document all reports and databases produced under the Success Indicators series. The CD contains the six Volume of the SPBCP Indicators of Success Series (refer list and description above).
Trust Fund Documents	Funding Options to Support Sustainable Development and Conservation in Pacific Island Countries	1996, February	Published report prepared for the SPBCP on Funding Options for sustainable development and management of conservation projects. Includes chapters on: The funding problem, Internally generated funding options, Externally generated funding options, Debt-for-nature swaps, Trust Funds and Recommendations. Authored P.H.C. (Bing) Lucas, SPREP Reports and Studies Series No. 94.
	Review of Funding Options for Biodiversity Conservation in the South Pacific Region	1996, December	Draft report prepared by consultant J. Stanley & Associates. Report not finalised.
	Concept Paper proposing the framework for a Pacific Island Regional Conservation Trust Fund	1998, May	Detailed concept paper on the proposed Pacific Islands Regional Conservation Trust. Prepared by Elliot .Rosenberg, UN- ESCAP/ Pacific Operations Center, Vanuatu. Contents: Why establishing a Trust Fund?, Trust beneficiaries, Trust Goals, Emphasis on Initial Trust Activities, The Trust Instruments, Annual Funding level for Grants, The Trust Principal, Trustees, Trust Board, The director, Technical Staff, Trust Budget limit, The expert Team, proposals, National Trusts, Other Trusts and organisations, Absorptive capacity, A catalyst and grant Follow-up.
	Pacific Conservation Trust Fund Regional	1999, October	Documents prepared for a special regional workshop held in Apia, Samoa on pursuing the Pacific Conservation Trust Fund. Held in Apia, Samoa, 27-28 October 1999

	Workshop		
	Concept: Proposing the Framework for a Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund – Legal and Administrative Issues	1999, September	Concept Paper reviewing the key legal and administrative issues for a Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund. Content” Part 1 – Rationale for a Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund; Part 2 – Legal and Administrative considerations in the design of the Trust Fund inclusive of recommendations. Prepared by Mark Christensen of Russell, McVeagh, McKenzie, Bartlett & Co., New Zealand for SPREP.
	Concept Paper submission to GEF: Pacific Islands Trust Fund for Nature Conservation	2000, May	Official proposal for the Pacific Trust Funds prepared by SPBCP/SPREP and submitted to UNDP for GEF funding. Submission pending further reviews but currently not in the GEF pipeline.

Trust Fund Documents (Cont.)	Pacific Islands Trust Fund for Nature Conservation: An Overview	2000, August	Information pamphlet produced by SPREP/SPBCP with support from NZODA following Regional Trust Fund Workshop. Contents: Pacific islands Biodiversity resources at risk; What is a Conservation Trust Fund?; Why a regional Trust Fund?; What will the mission and objectives of the Trust Fund be?; Where has the Regional Trust Fund Idea come from?; The process from here; How much money will be required?; What are the implications for the Governments?
	<i>Paper on Issues & Options for a Pacific Islands Trust Fund for Nature Conservation</i>	<i>In preparation</i>	<i>Terms of Reference available (March 2001). Consultancy by Peter Hunnam and Wren Green, consultants for SPREP/SPBCP. Funded by PIE-NZODA.</i>
SPBCP Video documentary Arnavon CA	Conserving Pacific Heritage – The role of the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme	1998	Video documentary of communities and their conservation activities as part of the SPBCP. The documentary highlights the

Big Bay CA Takitumu CA Sa'anapu /Sataoa CA			natural heritage of various Conservation Areas established under SPBCP in Polynesia, Melanesia and Micronesia. Narrated by CASO, Madison Nena, Kosrae. Produced and a film by Anna Sierpinska. © SPREP 1998.
SPBCP Display and Posters	SPBCP Display of Conservation Areas and the Programme	2000	Series of mobile displays on the SPBCP and Conservation Areas for exhibits, meetings and conferences. Designed and produced by Anna Tiraa-Passfield, SPBCP consultant.
	SPBCP Poster on Conservation Areas: Conserving Our Unique Heritage	2000	Poster of the programme showcasing a montage of biodiversity from the 17 Conservation Areas supported by the SPBCP. Compiled by Anna Tiraa, Design and Graphics by Michael von Reiche. Produced by SPBCP.
SPBCP Newsletters	CASO Link – Issue No.1 December 1994	1995	Newsletter published by SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on First CASO workshop, Big Bay CA, Current SPBCP Projects, New Initiatives for Species Programmes, Let Our Turtle Family live.
	CASO Link – Issue No.2/3 January/June 1995	1995	Newsletter published by SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on Arnavon CA, TMAG 1995, Framework for Communication Strategy
SPBCP Newsletters (Cont.)	CASO Link – Issue No.4 October 1995	1995	Newsletter published by SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on Arnavon Islands Declared Solomon Islands First CA, SPBCP key Message Competition, CA Profile: Komaridi Catchment, Solomon Islands, Workshop –

		Community Management of Conservation Areas, Forest resources: harvesting and enhancement
CASO Link – Issue No.5 September 1996	1996	Newsletter published by SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on Ha'apai Conservation Area, Tonga, Takitumu CACC visits Fiji and Samoa, Wetlands and Mangrove Issues, From Sierra Leone to Niue, Abaca Village Wins TCSP Prize.
CASO Link – Issue No.6 June 1997	1997	Newsletter published by SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on: A flying Success – The kakerori Recovery Programme, An Islander's Perspective, Vatthe Conservation Area Project – The first three years, Tools for nature Conservation, SPBCP Conservation Areas summary, From salmon to coral reefs, Dugong Conservation in Palau, SPREP Supports first national ecotourism conference in Solomon Islands.
CASO Link – Issue No.7 June 1997	1997	Newsletter published by SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on: Uafato in Action, Ha'apai Conservation Area Project – Volcano Expedition; Crater Mountain Wildlife management Area, PNG; Campaigning for Coral Reefs in the Pacific; Ecotourism Training and Development; Regional Conservation Trust Fund Proposal gains Support; Sustainable Management of Ifilele in Uafato CA, Samoa; My experience as Uafato CASO.
CASO Link – Issue No.8	1998	Newsletter published by

	June 1998		SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on: Funafuti Atoll – A marine conservation Area in Tuvalu; Australia Volunteer Abroad. New Challenges ahead for CAs; Game Fishing at Kiritimati atoll; News from the Species programme; Ra’ui – marine management plans in the Cook Islands; Evaluation of the 1997 Pacific Year of the Coral Reef Campaign; Assessment of coral reef stress from satellite remote sensing in Fiji
SPBCP Newsletters (Cont.)	CASO Link – Issue No.9 January 1999	1999	Newsletter published by SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on: Ecotourism comes to Komaridi; Komaridi Ecotourism Project, Utwe-Walung Conservation Area; Signs of Progress in the Ha’apai CA; Finding Ways of Measuring SPBCP Success; What’s happening to our coral reefs?; Interview with Joe Reti; Why a girl became a dugong in Palau; Thank goodness for mangroves; What’s happening on the Rock? Niue;
	CASO Link – Issue No.10 April 1999	1999	Newsletter published by SPBCP to link activities and exchange with SPBCP projects and CASOs. Articles on: Skills Development Programme in Virtual Reality!; Key TMAG Recommendations; Happenings in the Utwe-Walung CA; Unique Paradise in Palau; Seagrasses...did you know?; Uafato CA Community Develops Resource Management Plan; Turtle News.
	CALL – Issue No.1	1999	New look newsletter produced

	January – March 1999		by SPBCP as the Conservation Area Live Link, a newsletter for Conservation Areas in the Pacific. Articles on: Taking the first steps to save disappearing Pacific birds; The Kakerori Recovery Programme; Setting the scene – bird conservation status in Polynesia; Working together on crown-of-thorns eradication project; Turtles in Vanuatu: Wan Smol Bag play tours 1996-99; Staff changes in Takitumu CA; Peacemaking - the conservation dividend; Community-driven biological surveys do work!; The story of Ikataea (Tuvalu); El Nino drought Destruction: the death of PNG's Mc Adam National Park
	CALL – Issue No.2 April – June 1999	2000	New look newsletter produced by SPBCP as the Conservation Area Live Link, a newsletter for Conservation Areas in the Pacific. Articles on: Voices from the villages – Comparative Study of Coastal Resource Management in the Pacific Islands; The little mermaid; Atoll and Biodiversity Conservation – The case of Na'a Islet at North Tarawa CA; How's Komaridi Going? And no birds sing; Jellyfish in the mud sea; First monitoring survey of the Rarotonga Rau'i; Ecotourism going Ahead; The story of Iketaea (part 2) ; CASO/CACC Project Management Training Workshop.
SPBCP Newsletters (Cont.)	CALL – Issue No.3 July – September 1999	2000	New look newsletter produced by SPBCP as the Conservation Area Live Link, a newsletter for Conservation Areas in the Pacific. Articles on: Monitoring as an important management

			<p>tool - Impacts of Funafuti on local biodiversity and the community; Profiting from Natural Resources; Training in Community-based natural resource management planning; naturewalks into the Takitumu CA; The Kakerori Story; A visit to Vatthe CA, Vanuatu; A network of small, community-owned Village Fish reserves in Samoa</p>
	<p>CALL – Issue No.4 October - December 1999</p>	<p>2000</p>	<p>New look newsletter produced by SPBCP as the Conservation Area Live Link, a newsletter for Conservation Areas in the Pacific. Articles on: The Environment Protection Fund: The Cook Island Experience 1994-99; A case-study of ecotourism development Koroyanitu CA; Madison Nena receives 1999 Seacology Prize; Uafato visits you all; Monitoring birds in Uafato CA; A decade of working with Pacific communities; Polynesia/Micronesia hotspots; Who and What is TMAG?; Key TMAG recommendations from the 7th meeting; Fun and games on the coral reef;</p>
	<p>CALL – Issue No.5 January – March 2000</p>	<p>2000</p>	<p>New look newsletter produced by SPBCP as the Conservation Area Live Link, a newsletter for Conservation Areas in the Pacific. Articles on: Jaluit Atoll CA moves ahead with full support of communities; First World Heritage Officer for the Pacific; Melanesian Bird Conservation Workshop, Fiji; DME Coconut-oil trial in Huvalu forest CA, Niue –Update; The Abaca Familiarisation Day for the Tourism Industry, Fiji;</p>

			Conservation Trust Fund Steering Committee meeting ; The CA Database; A database of key information on South Pacific CAs; Ecotourism ventures to be documented; A legend from Fiji: How the Beka got its wings. Success Indicators Workshop.
SPBCP Newsletters (Cont.)	CALL – Issue No.6 April – June 2000	2001	New look newsletter produced by SPBCP as the Conservation Area Live Link, a newsletter for Conservation Areas in the Pacific. Articles on: Ha’apai CA: Video and environmental awareness raising; Success Indicators for the SPBCP; Funafuti CA update; Sea horses discovered and promotional videos for Utwe-Walung CA; Income-generating activities under way in Huvalu CA, Niue; Workshop to help protect mangroves for Jaluit CA; Bees for conservation? Uafato is going honey; The Palau Conservation Society: Raising Awareness on the Mesekiu and other environmental matters; Leatherback turtles visit Samoa; Wan Smolbag Theatre Turtle Monitor programme, Vanuatu. News brief.
	CALL – Issue No.7 July – December 2000	In print.	New look newsletter produced by SPBCP as the Conservation Area Live Link, a newsletter for Conservation Areas in the Pacific. Articles on: Our gecko is unique (Tuvalu); Peleliu State Increases protection for Southern lagoon area; Coral Reef Indicators in the SPBCP; Multi-use community-based marine protected areas for Samoa; World heritage Convention in the Pacific;

			Cloudy Bay Biodiversity Project Report; Report on the Marine Resource Survey of Jaluit Atoll.
	<i>CALL – Issue No.8 January – June 2001</i>	<i>In preparation</i>	<i>New look newsletter produced by SPBCP as the Conservation Area Live Link, a newsletter for Conservation Areas in the Pacific.</i>
Conference and Roundtables on Nature Conservation & Protected Areas in the Pacific Islands	Proceedings of the Fifth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas 4-8 October 1993	1993, November	Proceedings of the Fifth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, held in Nuku'alofa. Tonga, 4-8 October 1993. Volume 1: Conference Report and Volume 2: Conference Papers in sections – Regional Overview, People in Conservation, Local Conservation Area Ownership and Management; The role of NGOs in Conserving Biodiversity; Funding mechanisms; Conservation Policy and legislation and Future Directions for biodiversity conservation. Prepared by SPBCP/SPREP.
	Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the South Pacific Region, 1994-1998	1994, December	Published Action Strategy for the Pacific Islands, 1994-1998, including Mission Statement, Summary of the Action Strategy and Roundtable process, Action Strategy Objectives and Key Actions. Reference and Annexes. Prepared by SPREP/SPBCP on behalf of partners and member countries.
Conference and Roundtables on Nature Conservation & Protected Areas in the Pacific Islands	<i>Proceedings of the Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, 29 Sept.-3 October 1997</i>	<i>In preparation. Draft available.</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, held in Pohnpei, FSM, 29 September- 3 October 1997. Theme of the Conference: Tools for Nature Conservation. Volume 1: Conference Report; Volume 2: Working Groups</i>

(Cont.)

		<i>Discussions on Tools for Conservation; Volume 3: Conference papers on four main Tools: Prepared by SPBCP/SPREP from 1997 to 2001. Final publication expected in July 2001.</i>
Pacific islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, 24-26 February, 1998, Apia, Samoa – Meeting Report	1998, September	Meeting Report of the 1 st Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, held on 24-26 February, 1998, Apia, Samoa. Prepared by SPBCP/SPREP.
Second Pacific islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, 9-11 September 1998– Meeting Report	1998, September	Meeting Report of the 2 nd Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, held on 9-11 September 1998, Apia, Samoa. Prepared by SPBCP/SPREP.
Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands region, 1999-2002	1999, April	Published Action Strategy for the Pacific Islands, 1999-2002, including Mission Statement, Summary of the Action Strategy and Roundtable process, Action Strategy Objectives and Key Actions. Reference and Annexes. Endorsed by SPREP meeting, IUCN, NZODA, WHC, FSP, USP, TNC and WWF. Prepared by SPREP/SPBCP on behalf of partners and member countries.
Third Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, 16-19 February 1999 – Meeting Report	1999, April	Meeting Report of the 3 rd Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, held on 16-19 February, 1999, Suva, Fiji. Prepared by WWF – South Pacific with SPBCP/SPREP..
Monitoring the Conservation Action – Pacific Islands RoundTable for Nature Conservation	1999, November	Monitoring Working Group report on Monitoring the 1999-2002 Action Strategy. Prepared by the Monitoring Working Group with input from SPBCP. Includes Monitoring Matrix and Monitoring protocols.
Fourth Pacific Islands	2000, February	Meeting Report of the 4 th

	Roundtable for Nature Conservation, 1-5 November 1999 – Meeting Report		Pacific islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, held on 1-5 November, 1999, Honolulu, Hawaii. Prepared by TNC with SPBCP/SPREP.
	Pacific Island Roundtable Database of Regional Conservation Activities	2000, November	Detailed database reports from the PCI Roundtable Database compiled by Lou Eldridge, Hawaii. Work coordinated by Sam Sesega (1998-2000), SPBCP.
Conference and Roundtables on Nature Conservation & Protected Areas in the Pacific Islands (Cont.)	Fifth Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, 6-10 November 2000 – Meeting Report	2001, June	Meeting Report of the 5 th Pacific islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, held on 6-10 November, 2001, Wellington, NZ. Prepared by NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs with SPBCP/SPREP.
SPBCP Articles, Papers, Case-studies & Presentations	People in Protected Areas in the South Pacific	1993, October	Paper presented by Iosefatu Reti, SPBCP Programme Manager at the Fifth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, Nuku'alofa, Tonga, 4-8 October 1993. Plenary Session 1, key Issue Paper 1, Tuesday 5 October 1993.
	The Komaridi Catchment Conservation Area Model – Providing for Sustainable Management of Conservation Areas Through a resource rent and other Income Generation	1993, October	Case-study presented by Peter Thomas, The Nature Conservancy and Graeme Workboys and Adrienne Farago, SPREP on Komaridi CA at the Fifth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, Nuku'alofa, Tonga, 4-8 October 1993. Plenary Session 4, Case study 3, Wednesday 6 October 1993.
	Arnavon Islands Marine Conservation Area Project, Solomon Islands.	1993, October	Case study presented by Russell Nari, Tanya Leary, The Nature Conservation at the Fifth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and

			Protected Areas, Nuku'alofa, Tonga, 4-8 October 1993. Plenary Session 1, Case study 4, Tuesday 5 October 1993.
	Protection and Sustainable Development of marine Biodiversity in the South Pacific Region – Concept Document	1994, January	Concept document produced for discussion at the Initial Consultative Meeting on the Restructured GEF and the South Pacific, held by SPREP, in Sydney, Australia in January 1994. Prepared and presented by Joe Reti, SPBCP Programme Manager.
	The South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Program. In <i>National Biodiversity Planning – Guidelines Based on early Experiences Around the World</i>	1995	Profile of the SPBCP in publication National Biodiversity Planning by Miller Kenton R. and Steven M. Lanou. World Resources Institute, UNEP and the IUCN-World Conservation Union based on case-study material prepared by Iosefatu Reti, program manager, SPBCP.
SPBCP Articles, Papers, Case-studies & Presentations	Abaca –Find adventure, spectacular views, and historical sites in Viti Levu	1995, November	Article on Abaca prepared with the assistance of Justin Francis and Jale Baba, Fiji Pine. Published in Fiji Magic, November 1995, p.37-38
	Participatory Planning and management of Pohnpei's Watershed and Environment: A case-study from the Federated States of Micronesia	1996	Article written by Andrew Tilling, former Programme Officer (Socio-economics) on PRAs used as part of the Pohnpei Watershed and Conservation Project, FSM. Based on his experience with the project between 1994 and 1996.
	Marine Protected Areas: Problems and solutions for the South Pacific, with special reference to Small Island States.	1996?	Paper prepared by Iosefatu Reti and Don Stewart drawing on the experience of the SPBCP in the establishment and management of a series of CAs as a possible model for further MPA areas in the Pacific Islands.
	Globalising and	1996, December	Paper by Johanna Sutherland,

	decentralizing In Situ Biodiversity Conservation		member IUCN Commission on Environmental Law; Ph.D. candidate, Dept. of International Relations, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University, Canberra. Received by SPBCP unsolicited.
	Community-based Conservation Areas in Vanuatu	1997, October	Paper presented by Russell Nari and Charles Vatu (CASO) at the Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, Pohnpei, FSM, 4-8 October 1997. Tool 1: Protected Areas, Paper Session.
	Sustainable Tourism – New Challenges for the Future: A Resource Management and Nature Conservation perspective	1997, October	Participation and Paper presentation to the 1 st South Pacific Tourism Conference, organised by the TCSP on 23-24 October 1997 in Tahiti. Paper by Samuelu Sesega, Programme Officer (Resource Management) SPBCP.
	Takitumu Conservation Area Project: Community-based or landowner-based?	1997, October	Paper presented by Anna Tiraa-Passfield (CAS) and Robert Ben at the Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, Pohnpei, FSM, 4-8 October 1997. Tool 1: Protected Areas, Paper Session.
	Concept Paper – proposing the Framework for a South Pacific Regional Trust Fund for Conservation and the Environment	1997, October	Paper presented by Elliott Rosenberg (SPBCP consultant) at the Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, Pohnpei, FSM, 4-8 October 1997. Tool 3: Conservation Trust Funds, Paper Session.
SPBCP Articles, Papers, Case-studies	Community-based Biodiversity Surveys And Conservation Action Plans as Tools for nature	1997, October	Paper presented by Randy Thaman (SPBCP consultant), B. Eritaia (CASO) and S. Faka'osi (CASO) at the Sixth

& Presentations (Cont.)	Conservation in the Pacific Islands: Lessons learned from Fiji, Tonga and Kiribati (Melanesia, Polynesia and Micronesia)		South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, Pohnpei, FSM, 4-8 October 1997. General Paper Session.
	Saving the kakerori	1998, January	Article by Florence – Syme Buchanan on the Takitumu Conservation Area published in the Pacific Islands Monthly, January 1998. p.36-37.
	A Cycad for peace in the Pacific	1999, January	Article written by Bing Lucas on the Vatthe Conservation Area and the SPBCP in Plant Talk, Issue No. 16, January 1999, News and Views on Plant Conservation Worldwide.
	Development Process of an Ecotour Venture in Komaridi Catchment Conservation Area (KCCA), Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands	1998, July	Case study presented at the Pacific Ecotourism Workshop, Taveuni, Fiji Islands, 28-31 July 1998 by Nathaniel Lix De Wheya, CASO Komaridi CA, Solomon Islands.
	The experience of a community-based ecotourism development project in Vanuatu	1998, July	Case study presented at the Pacific Ecotourism Workshop, Taveuni, Fiji Islands, 28-31 July 1998 by Charles Vatu, CASO Vatthe CA, Vanuatu..
	Importance and Use of Conservation Areas in the NBSAP Strategic Process	1999, February	Presentation and discussion by François Martel, SPBCP Officer, at the SPREP/WWF Workshop for Pacific Island Coordinators on National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans – Under the Convention on Biological Diversity, held in Sigatoka, Fiji, 8-12 February 1999. Power Point presentation.
	Overview of SPREP's activities for Forrest Conservation in the Pacific Islands	1999, April	Presentation and discussion by Sam Sesega and François Martel (SPBCP Officers) at the Pacific Sub-Regional Workshop on Conservation and Management of Forest and Tree Genetic resources in the Pacific Islands, held in Apia, Samoa, 12-16 April 1999. Power Point presentation.

	Field trip to Uafato Conservation Area and east of Upolu Island, 15 April 1999.	1999, April	Presentation by Dion Ale (CASO) and François Martel (SPBCP Officer) at the Pacific Sub-Regional Workshop on Conservation and Management of Forest and Tree Genetic resources in the Pacific Islands, held in Apia, Samoa, 12-16 April 1999. Power Point presentation.
SPBCP Articles, Papers, Case-studies & Presentations (Cont.)	Field Trip Manual – Uafato Conservation Area and East Upolu Island – Thursday, 15 April 1999. SPRIG Sub-Regional Workshop.	1999, April	Field trip manual prepared as SPBCP contribution to the Pacific Sub-Regional Workshop on Conservation and Management of Forest and Tree Genetic resources in the Pacific Islands, held in Apia, Samoa, 12-16 April 1999. Prepared by François Martel (SPBCP).
	Parks for Biodiversity – The Pacific: Where do we stand? A New Approach to Conservation that Contributes to Development	1999, June	SPBCP contribution to Parks for Biodiversity – Policy Guidance based on experience in ACP Countries. Prepared by the World Commission on protected Areas of IUCN – The World Conservation Union.
	SPREP – A focus on Tourism Initiatives in the Pacific Island region Note No.1	1999, November	Submission for UNEP – Coordinating Meeting on Tourism held in Paris, 4-5 November 1999. Prepared by SPBCP. Summary Note No. 1 on SPREP focus and activities related to environment and sustainable tourism.
	SPBCP Conservation Areas of the Pacific islands Note No.2	1999, November	Submission for UNEP – Coordinating Meeting on Tourism held in Paris, 4-5 November 1999. Prepared by SPBCP. Summary Note No.2 on the SPBCP basic approach including summary description of CAs.
	Ecotourism in Conservation Areas of the Pacific Note No.3	1999, November	Submission for UNEP – Coordinating Meeting on Tourism held in Paris, 4-5 November 1999. Prepared by

		SPBCP. Summary Note No.3. on Ecotourism approach of SPBCP as a tool for conservation of biodiversity.
	Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Sustaining Community-based Conservation Area Projects: Experiences from the SPBCP	2000, June A paper on the Conceptual Framework for Conservation Areas Transition Strategy, presented at the 19 th Annual Pacific islands Conference Entitled” Success stories, Continuing Challenges and realistic Solutions”, 20-23 June 2000, American Samoa. Sam Sesega.
	Profile: South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme. In <i>“The Landscape of Conservation Stewardship”</i>	2000, July A profile of SPBCP included in: <i>“The landscape of Conservation Stewardship – The Report of the Stewardship Initiative Feasibility Study”</i> – based on an organisation interview and material provided by Joe Reti, SPBCP Programme Manager.
	Community Management of Conservation Areas in countries of the South Pacific region	? Case-Study by Joe Reti in World Heritage
	Conservation Priorities for Marine Biodiversity in the South Pacific region	? Paper presented by Iosefatu (Joe) Reti, Programme Manager at ?
SPBCP Articles, Papers, Case-studies & Presentations (Cont.)	Managing Samoa’s Environmental Resources: A global obligation	2000, October A paper prepared and presented by Muliagatele I. Reti (SPBCP Programme Manager) at the Samoa’s National Environment Forum, National University of Samoa, 31 October 2000.
	“Conserving the future” - Interview on the SPBCP on Radio Australia series “Carving Out: Development in the Pacific.	2000, May Tape interview with SPBCP Programme Manager , Joe Reti, in “Carving Out: Development in the Pacific” – a 13 part series produced by radio Australia, presented by Heather Davis & broadcast on radio Australia and Radio National . In Program 10 – Conserving the Future (Environ

			mental issues) Broadcast 13 May 2000.
	The role of SPREP's South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme in community ecotourism development in small islands of the Pacific	2000, December	Presentation in second plenary session of the WTO/UNEP International Conference on Sustainable Tourism in the Islands of the Asia-Pacific region, held in Sanya, Island of Hainan, China, 6-8 December 2000. Prepared and presented by François Martel.
	Current Status of Biodiversity in the Pacific Islands region.	2001, March	A paper to the ADB Regional Biodiversity Expert's Consultation held in Manila, Philippines, 20-21 March 2001. Prepared by Joe Reti and presented by François Martel (SPBCP)
	Takitumu Conservation Area: A case-study on a community owned ecotourism enterprise	2001, May	A case-study full-length article with plates and maps, accepted for publication in Sustainable Tourism in Small Islands special edition of the UNEP Environment & Industry Review. To be published in July 2001.
CAP Reports	CA Project Preparatory Documents	Various years from 1993 to 2000	Produced for each Conservation Area Project, including project description, and a 5-year plan with tentative budgets.
	CAP Annual Work Plans and Budgets	Various years from 1993 to 2001	Prepared for each CAP, submitted by each local lead agency or the CACC to SPBCP management for comments and approval.
	CAP Quarterly Work Plans and Budgets	Each quarter, various years depending on CAs, 1993 to 2001	Prepared for each CAP, submitted by each local lead agency or the CACC to SPBCP management for comments and approval.
	CAP Annual Reports	Various years, 1993 to 2000	Prepared for each CAP, submitted by each local lead agency or the CACC to SPBCP management
	CAP Quarterly Reports	Each quarter, various	Prepared for each CAP,

	years, 1993 to 2001	submitted by each local lead agency or the CACC to SPBCP management	
CAP Transition Strategies	2000, 2001	Prepared by SPBCP for each CAP to guide termination of SPBCP and continuation plans for the CAP beyond the project life.	
CAP Coordinating Committee Meeting Reports	Various years from 1993 to 2001	Prepared by Secretary of CACC or CASO and submitted to Lead Agency. Record discussions and decisions made by CAP coordinating committees.	
CAP Resource Assessment Survey Reports	Various years from 1994 to 2001	Technical reports, surveys and inventories of CAP biodiversity resources. Series of studies commissioned by Lead Agencies and SPBCP to professional consultants and local agencies. Complete and updated list of Resource Assessment Surveys for each CAP is reported and available from the Conservation Area database. (see below)	
CAP Site Management Plans	Various years from 1994 to 2000	Community-based site and resource management plans. Commissioned by Lead Agencies and/or SPBCP to professional consultants and local agencies. Complete and updated list of Site Management Plans for CAPs is reported and available from the Conservation Area database. (see below)	
CAP Participatory Rural Assessments	Various years from 1994 to 2000	Reports on Participatory Rural Assessments conducted in the CAP, commissioned by Lead Agencies and/or SPBCP to professional consultants and local agencies. Complete and updated list of PRAs report for CAPs is reported and available from the Conservation Area database. (see below)	
CAP Reports	CAP Income Generating	Various years from	Technical reports, pre-

(Cont.)	Activities Assessments and Studies	1997 to 2001	feasibility assessment of options, feasibility study reports conducted in the CAP, commissioned by Lead Agencies and/or SPBCP to professional consultants and local agencies. Complete and updated list of IGA assessment and study reports for CAPs is reported and available from the Conservation Area database. (see below)
Conservation Areas Database	Conservation Area Database. Microsoft (MS) Access'97© version. Held at SPREP with SPBCP and archives. Accessible through network in <code>spone/database/CA</code> databases.	From 1998 to 2001	Database of key information on conservation areas that have been developed with the assistance of the SPBCP. First established in 1997 but in continual development. Two major categories of data: (1) CA features, information on the natural and other features of each SPBCP conservation area, along with maps and photographs (2) Project Information: Information on conservation area project activities such as objectives, outputs, surveys and inventories, biodiversity indicators, etc. Prepared by James Atherton. Inputting by Anna Tiraa and updating by Selesitina Puleaga.
	Manual for SPBCP - CA Database (1 st version)	1998, June	First version of a Users Manual for the CA database developed by Lisa Lotte Lyng. Data incomplete. Using MS Access'95 version. Includes sections on Database navigation and viewing, Inputting, Editing and Importing Data, Printing Reports. Also a Flow-Chart for CA Database and summary of IUCN Information Sheets on Protected Areas Systems in Oceania.

	Consultancy to improve the design of the Conservation Area Database.	2000, April	Final consultancy Report on the design of the Conservation Area Database with recommendations. Authored by James Atherton, CA Database Consultant.
	SPBCP Conservation Area Date Base – USER’S MANUAL (Final Version)	2000, May	Manual for the use of the Conservation Area Database. The manual explains the three main functions of the database developed for a) SPBCP staff, and b) Conservation Area Support Officers (CASOs) and other interested users. The manual explains: 1) viewing and entering data on Conservation Areas; 2) Searching for references under title, author, etc to get full references; 3) Producing Reports specially formatted and printable easily. Part One: Background Information , Part Two: Operating the database. Prepared by James Atherton. 11 pages.
Conservation Areas Database (Cont.)	Database – CA features: SPBCP Conservation Areas Physical features	From 1998 to 2001	Data on each CA site and location including descriptions of: Geographical location, Area, Altitude, Physical features and Climate. Data extracted mainly from Project Preparation Documents and subsequent reports.
	Database – CA features: SPBCP Conservation Areas Fauna and Vegetation	From 1998 to 2001	Data on each CA site including descriptions of : Local Fauna and Vegetation. Data extracted mainly from Project Preparation Documents and subsequent reports
	Database – CA features: SPBCP Conservation Areas Infrastructures	From 1998 to 2001	Data on each CA site, including descriptions of : Physical and Social Infrastructures. Data extracted mainly from Project Preparation Documents and subsequent reports
	Database - CA features: SPBCP Conservation Areas	From 1998 to 2001	Data on each CA site, including descriptions of : Local Human

	Community Features		population and Social Structures. Data extracted mainly from Project Preparation Documents and subsequent reports
	Database – CA features: SPBCP Conservation Areas Visitors and Visitors Facilities	From 1998 to 2001	Data on each CA site, including descriptions of : Visitor s and Visitors facilities. Data extracted mainly from Project Preparation Documents and subsequent reports
	Database – CA features: SPBCP Conservation Area IUCN Protected Area Data Sheet	From 1998 to 2001	Data on each CA site, based on IUCN Protected Area Directory for Oceania, including descriptions of : IUCN Management Category, Biogeographical region, Geographical Location, Date and History of Establishment, Area, Altitude, Land Tenure, Physical features, Climate, Vegetation, Fauna, Cultural Heritage, Local Human Population, Visitors and Visitors facilities, Scientific research and facilities, Conservation value, Conservation management, management constraints, Staff, Local Address. Data extracted mainly from Project Preparation Documents and subsequent reports
	Database – CA features: SPBCP Conservation Areas Maps	From 1998 to 2001	Data on each CA site, including geographical map of country with Conservation Area location and in some case boundaries. Data extracted mainly from Project Preparation Documents and subsequent reports
	Database – CA features: SPBCP Conservation Areas Photos	From 1998 to 2001	Data on each CA site, including one or two photographs of key features from the conservation area (generally of fauna or vegetation). Photos taken during planning phase or subsequent activities.
Conservatio	Database – Project	From 1998 to 2001	Data information on each CA

n Areas Database (Cont.)	Information: SPBCP Conservation Areas Project Summary		project, including the description of: Date and History of Establishment, Lead Agency, CASO, Staff, Area, Population, Ecosystems, Key Issues, Income-generating Opportunities, Collaborating Agencies, Other SPBCP activities. . Data extracted mainly from records and files, Project Preparation Documents and subsequent reports.
	Database – Project Information: SPBCP Conservation Areas Objectives and Outputs	From 1998 to 2001	Data information on each CA project, including the description of: Each project component objectives and activities including period implemented and descriptive notes. Data extracted mainly from records and files and various CA Quarterly reports.
	Database – Project Information: SPBCP Conservation Areas Survey and Inventories	From 1998 to 2001	Data information on each CA project, including the description of : Surveys undertaken, Date and Status of completion, related data available for each survey, comments and availability of reports. Data extracted mainly from records and files and various CA Quarterly reports.
	Database – Project Information: SPBCP Conservation Areas Monitoring Indicators	From 1998 to 2001	Data information on each CA project, including the objective and description of: indicator, baseline figure, subsequent measurements with period and results, methodology, name of monitor, starting and completion dates, evaluation of results. Database not yet updated to include the various baseline data. Data will be extracted from each CA monitoring reports, not yet produced.
	Database – Project Information: SPBCP Conservation Areas	From 1998 to 2001	Data information on each CA project, including the title of consultancy, name and

	Consultancies		nationality of consultants; duration, date and costs of consultancy. Data extracted mainly from contract records and files held by SPBCP.
	Database – Project Information: SPBCP Conservation Areas Budgets	From 1998 to 2001	Data information on each CA project, including the description of: Budget allocations from 1994 to 2001 on Administration, Consultancies, Volunteers, CA establishment, CA awareness, Sustainable Development, Training, Equipment. Data extracted mainly from records and proposed and actual budgets and expenditures.
	Database – Project Information: SPBCP Conservation Areas Staff and contact Address	From 1998 to 2001	Data information on each CA project, including the description of staff and local address for the Conservation Area. Data extracted from records held at SPBCP.
Conservation Areas Database (Cont.)	Database – Project Information: SPBCP Conservation Areas Research and References	From 1998 to 2001	Data information on each CA project, including the description of existing research and other references with authors, date, report title, publisher and if a copy is held at SPREP. Data extracted from records held at SPBCP.
	<i>SPBCP Conservation Area Data Base – CD-ROM</i>	<i>In preparation</i>	<i>CD-ROM containing the entire CA database and manual for use and operation. To be made available and released to all CASOs by end of June 2001.</i>
CAP Video Documentaries	Big Bay – Community Conservation in Action	1995	Video documentary of communities and their conservation activities as part of the SPBCP supported Vathe Conservation Area in Vanuatu. Produced by Tradewind Communications Ltd.
	Ha'apai – Community Conservation in Action	1996	Video documentary of communities and their

			conservation activities as part of the SPBCP supported Ha'apai Conservation Area in the Ha'apai Group of Tonga. Produced by Tradewind Communications Ltd.
	Arnavon Islands – Community Conservation in Action	1996	Video documentary of communities and their conservation activities as part of the SPBCP supported Arnavon Islands Marine Conservation Area in the Solomon Islands. Produced by Tradewind Communications Ltd.
	Enua Manea – The Takitumu Conservation Area Project	1998	Video documentary of communities and their conservation activities as part of the SPBCP supported Takitumu Conservation Area Project in the Cook Islands. Produced by Access Productions Ltd. Duration: 20 minutes.
Marine Mammals Conservation	Marine Mammals in the area served by SPREP	1999	The report provides an overview of the marine mammals from published and unpublished information on marine mammals of the region
Whales	<i>South Pacific Whale Sanctuary Meeting Reports</i>	<i>Draft 2001 (currently being compiled)</i>	<i>SPREP report on the SPWS meeting in Apia.</i>
Tonga Whale Watching Project	1997 Tonga Whale Watch Training Report	1997	Report of the Training for implementation of the interim whale watch guidelines (Mick McIntyre). Report on the workshop in 1999 to provide specific training in the use of the guidelines and wider education and public awareness initiatives as promoted in the Tonga's vision for Whale watching
	Whales Alive – The Whale Watching Operators and guides Training Workshop. Video.	1996, August	Video documentary on the workshop provide specific training in the use of the guidelines and wider education

			and public awareness initiatives as promoted in the Tonga's vision for Whale watching. Produced by Whales Alive, Melbourne Australia. Duration: 8 mins.
Dugong Conservation	Report on the Dugong Management and Education Programme (<i>Palau Conservation Society</i>).	1998	
Turtle Conservation	Regional Strategy for Turtle Conservation		

<p>Report on the third meeting of the Regional Marine Turtle Programme and the first Meeting of the Regional Marine Mammal Conservation Programme</p>	<p>1993, October</p>	<p>Publication by SPREP of proceedings of both meetings held in Apia, Western Samoa on 9-11 June 1993. RMTCP meeting report contents: Overview; Introduction to Turtle biology; Turtle Conservation Activities by country; Turtles in the South Pacific overview; Census and Tagging projects; CITES and Legislation; Other management and research aspects. Brief section on RMMCP. Prepared by SPREP/SPBCP.</p>
<p>Regional Pacific Turtle Database. Microsoft (MS) Access'95© version. Held at SPREP with Marine Species officer and archives. Accessible through SPREP networks.</p>	<p>From 1995 to 2001</p>	<p>Database including two key sets of data: (1) Marine Turtle literature compiled into SPREP Country Turtle Information and General Turtle Information; (2) Marine Turtle tag records from the Pacific region. Database created and updated by Petelo Ioane, SPREP Turtle Database Officer. First established in 1995. Accessible through network in pone/database/Turtles and /database/turtle ref.</p>
<p>1995 Year of the Sea Turtle – Campaign Plan</p>	<p>1995, January</p>	<p>Campaign plan prepared by the Regional Marine Turtle Conservation Programme. Content: Key messages and Audiences; SPREP planned activities (communication, policy, resource production); SPREP's timeline; In-country activities; Things to keep in mind; Reporting, monitoring and evaluation. Prepared by Sue Miller (RMTCP Coordinator and SPBCP Species officer).</p>

	Marine turtles of the South Pacific – SPREP Fact Sheet No. 10/5	1995	Fact Sheet on marine turtles of the South Pacific. Published in French and English by SPREP as part of the 1995 Pacific Year of the Sea Turtle. Prepared by SPREP/SPBCP with support from Queensland Dept. Environment & Heritage and CORA.
	Turtle Poster: Report Tagged Turtles poster - 1995 Year of the Sea Turtle	1995	Poster to promote reporting of tagged turtles in various languages of the Pacific islands as part of the 1995 Pacific Year of the Sea Turtle.
	Turtle Posters and stickers: Let Our Turtle Family Live! - 1995 Year of the Sea Turtle	1995	Posters and stickers on turtle conservation prepared to launch the 1995 Year of the Sea Turtle as part of the SPBCP contribution to the Regional Turtle Conservation Programme.
Turtle Conservation (cont.)	Turtle Video documentary: Let Our Turtle Family Live! - 1995 Year of the Sea Turtle	1995	Video documentary on turtle conservation prepared to launch the 1995 Year of the Sea Turtle as part of the SPBCP contribution to the Regional Turtle Conservation Programme. Produced by Tradewind Communications Ltd.
	Marine Turtle literature – Access database – Looking for Information	1998	Briefing notes for future reference & update of Marine Turtle literature Access database. Titled: Looking for Information. Prepared by Joanna Sim, SPREP consultant.

Other reptiles conservation	Turtle Video Documentary: Let Our Turtle Family Live! Updated version	1999	Updated version of the 1995 video documentary on turtle conservation in the Pacific. Contains the rap song and the updated version of the turtle documentary without reference to 1995 Year of the Turtle. Produced by Tradewind Communications Ltd. French/English versions.
	Turtle Tagging Database Report – 1997/98	1999	
	Turtle Tagging Database Report – 1999	2000	
	The Status of the Estuarine Crocodile (<i>Crocodylus porosus</i> Schneider 1801) in Vanuatu	1993, December	Assessment on the current status of the estuarine crocodile in Vanua Lava, the only island in Vanuatu known to have a breeding population of estuarine crocodiles. Funded by UNEP and authored by M.R.Chambers and D. Esrom. SPREP Reports and Studies Series No.74.
Bird Conservation	South Pacific Regional Bird Conservation Programme Plan for Action	1991, October 1999, April (updated) 2000, March (updated)	<i>Plan of Action developed by the Avifauna Working Group at the SPREP Biodiversity Workshop held in Port Vila, Vanuatu, 24-28 October 1991. This document was subsequently updated following each Sub-regional Avifauna Workshops held in 1999 and 2000.</i>
	Guide to the Birds of Niue	1998, July	Published bilingual book (Niuean/English) authored by Rod Hay and Ralph Powlesland. Compiled by Joanna Sim for the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme to provide information on birds of Niue to a wide audience. Describes 29 species of birds seen on Niue, with plates.

<p>Bird Conservation (cont.)</p>	<p>Proceedings of the Polynesia Avifauna Conservation Workshop, Rarotonga, 26-30 April 1999</p>	<p>1999, April</p>	<p>Unpublished Report of the Proceedings of the Polynesia Avifauna Conservation Workshop held in Rarotonga, 26-30 April 1999, hosted by SPREP/Birdlife International. Contents: South Pacific Regional Bird Conservation Programme Plan for Action; Ranking Criteria; Priority Avifauna Conservation Projects – Wallis & Futuna, French Polynesia, Cook islands, Tonga, Pitcairn island, Samoa, American Samoa, Tuvalu & Tokelau. Compiled by Greg Sherley and Anna Tiraa. (SPBCP support provided to CASO participants)</p>
	<p>Guide to the Birds of Niue Book Launch – BCN News piece (English and Niuean)</p>	<p>1999, December</p>	<p>Bilingual Video documentary on the official launch of the Guide to the Birds of Niue book, held at the FaleFono, Alofi, Niue in December 1999. Produced as a clip for the Evening News by the Broadcasting Corporation of Niue (© BCN-News, 1999).</p>
	<p>Proceedings of the Melanesia and Nauru Avifauna Conservation Workshop, Nadi, Fiji, 5-10 March 2000.</p>	<p>2000, March</p>	<p>Unpublished Report of the Proceedings of the Melanesia Conservation Workshop held in Nadi, Fiji, 5-10 March 2000, hosted by SPREP/Birdlife International. Contents: South Pacific Regional Bird Conservation Programme Plan for Action; Avifauna project briefs: – New Caledonia, Vanuatu, PNG, Solomon Islands, Fiji, Pigeon Harvesting (region-wide), Nauru. Workshops recommendations. Compiled by Greg Sherley. (SPBCP support provided to CASO participants)</p>

	Proceedings of the Micronesia Avifauna Conservation Workshop, Timon Bay, Guam, 5-10 November 2000	2000, November	Unpublished Report of the Proceedings of the Micronesia Avifauna Conservation Workshop held in Timon Bay, Guam, 5-10 November 2000, hosted by SPREP. Contents: South Pacific Regional Bird Conservation Programme Plan for Action; Avifauna project briefs: Northern Marianas, Guam, Marshall islands, FSM, Palau, Kiribati, various sub and regional projects. Workshops recommendations. Compiled by Greg Sherley. (SPBCP support provided to CASO participants)
	Bird Conservation Priorities and a Draft Avifauna Conservation Strategy for the Pacific Island Region	2001, May	SPREP publication summarizing the recommendations of the three sub-regional avifauna conservation workshops with a Draft Avifauna Conservation Strategy for the Pacific Islands Region. Produced by Dr.Greg Sherley for the Regional Avifauna Conservation Programme including SPBCP CA species work.
Bird Conservation (cont.)	<i>A Guide to the birds of Fiji and Polynesia</i>	<i>In print</i>	<i>To be published book by Dick Watling on the birds of Fiji and Polynesia as an updated version of the book Birds of Fiji, Tonga and Samoa. Produced for the Regional Avifauna Conservation Programme. Book in print and to be published in August 2001. Including SPBCP CA species work.</i>
Cook Islands Bird Project Reports	Towards 2000: A Management Plan for the Kakerori's next 5 years	1995, April	Draft Document providing the core of the Kakerori Recovery Programme's component of the planned Takitumu Conservation Area and beyond. Authored by Ed Saul.
	Breeding biology of the Kakerori (<i>Pomarea dimidiata</i>)	1998	Scientific article by Ed Saul, Hugh Robertson and Anna

	on Rarotonga, Cook Islands		Tiraa (CASO) on the breeding biology of the Kakerori. In <i>Notornis</i> 45: 255-269 (1998) (© Ornithological Society of New Zealand)
	Conservation of Kakerori (<i>Pomarea dimidiata</i>) : a report to the Avifauna Conservation Programme, SPREP	1998, October	A report by Dr. Hugh Robertson, Science & Research Unit, DOC, new Zealand on a visit to Rarotonga in 1997. Results of kakerori census, mist-netting and color-banding, blood sampling, rat control, TCA liaison and The future.
	Conservation of Kakerori (<i>Pomarea dimidiata</i>) : a report to the Avifauna Conservation Programme, SPREP	1999, October	A report by Dr. Hugh Robertson, Science & Research Unit, DOC, new Zealand on a visit to Rarotonga in August/September 1999. Results of kakerori census, mist-netting and color-banding, blood sampling, rat control, TCA liaison and The future.
Invasive Species	Invasive species in the Pacific: A technical review and draft regional strategy	2000, June	A report technically compiled by Dr. Greg Sherley. Regional Invasive Species Programme including SPBCP CA issues.
General biodiversity	<i>Biodiversity of the Samoan Archipelago</i>	<i>In preparation</i>	<i>Supporting publishing costs of a book by Meryl Rose titled Biodiversity of the Samoa Archipelago.</i>

ANNEX 2: LIST OF SPBCP EQUIPMENT

ANNEX 3: REGIONAL TRAINING BY SPBCP

Title of Training	Date and Location	Objectives of Training
Training workshop on the establishment and management of conservation areas under the SPBCP.	October 1994, Nadi Fiji.	To familiarise CASOs and CACCs about the SPBCP, its CA concept and community-based approach. Participants were also briefed about the SPBCP project approval process including reporting and management of project funds. This workshop involved participants from Polynesia and Fiji only.
As above.	September 1995, Port Vila, Vanuatu.	This was a repeat of the 1994 workshop for participants from Melanesia and Micronesian countries only.
CASO Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation workshop.	December 1996, Apia Samoa.	To provide training in CA monitoring and evaluation techniques for CASOs and project managers under the SPBCP.
Community-based Eco-tourism: A skills development programme – phase 1.	July/August, 1997, Kosrae, FSM.	To provide training for CASOs and some eco-tour operators in managing eco-tourism projects. The training included development of tours and tour products as well as development of tour guiding skills.
SPBCP Income Generating Activities Training workshop – phase 1.	July 1998, Apia Samoa.	To introduce CASOs and Small Business Operators to the principles of sustainable small business enterprise management as the basis for the effective management of income generating activities within the CAPs. The workshop was conducted in conjunction with the Samoa Business Enterprise Center, Samoa.
Melanesia Sub-Regional Workshop on Community-based Resource Management Planning.	November / December 1998. Gizo, Solomon Islands.	To provide further training in resource management and planning for CASOs and project managers from Melanesia sub-region. SPBCP and WWF – Pacific in Fiji, jointly conducted the training.
CASO/CACC Project Management Training workshop.	May 1999. Nadi, Fiji.	To improve the knowledge and skills required by CASOs, CACC members and other CA practitioners for the sustainable management of the CAPs. CASOs requested this training in 1998.
Polynesia & Micronesia sub-regional workshop on community-based resource management planning.	July 1999, Nadi, Fiji.	This was a repeat of the same training provided for Melanesian countries in 1998.
Conservation Enterprise & Income Generating Activities: Skills Development workshop – Phase II.	September 1999. Apia, Samoa.	An extension of the 1998 training to continue skills development in business enterprise management for CASOs and small business operators.

SPBCP Monitoring for Success – Marine Indicators Monitoring Workshop.	August 2000, Apia, Samoa.	To provide training for CASOs from marine CAPs in the identification and application of appropriate indicators for measuring success within their respective CAPs.
Pacific Islands Community Conservation Course (PICCC).	February – December 2001, USP, Fiji.	This course was a joint initiative of SPREP/SPBCP, USP and ICPL to provide basic training for Pacific islanders who are managing community-based CAPs in the region. Eight CASOs under the SPBCP participated with ten others from other projects. The course will conclude in a final two weeks at USP in October / November.
SPBCP Monitoring for Success – Terrestrial Indicators Monitoring Workshop.	June 2001. Apia, Samoa.	A similar workshop as in 2000 but focusing on CASOs from land based CAPs.
SPBCP Inspiring Stories Week.	June 2001. Savaii, Samoa.	A workshop to record and document lessons learned from the SPBCP and CAPs during the past eight years. This is part of the final evaluation of the programme before it closes in December 2001.

ANNEX 4: STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL CAPS TO DATE

NAME OF CAP	STATUS TO DATE
<p>Takitumu Conservation Area, Cook Islands. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1996.</p>	<p>The TCA's overall goal was <i>“to conserve the CA's biodiversity for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations on Rarotonga”</i> (PPD, 1996). The project concept was based on an earlier recovery programme (Kakerori Recovery Programme) initiated by the Environment Service to save this endangered endemic bird species which had declined to only 38 birds in 1987. Under the SPBCP, the scope of the project was broadened to include not only kakerori recovery plan, but also the wider environmental and conservation issues such as biodiversity, sustainable development and community participation.</p> <p>In 1998, two years after the TCA was established, kakerori populations increased to 163, an increase of more than 400%. By February 1999, 233 birds were recorded.</p> <p>In 1998, the TCA opened up to visitors when an eco-tourism enterprise was initiated. Today, the number of visitors to the TCA is steadily increasing and the landowning communities of Takitumu are beginning to benefit from the initiative.</p> <p>The TCA enjoys the undivided support of the three land-owning communities of Kainuku, Karika and Manavaroa. It also has the support of the Environment Service of the government who is already making financial contributions to the management of the CAP. In addition, the TCA is eligible to apply for funding from the Environment Fund set up by government (from departure taxes) to support environment and conservation projects in the country.</p> <p>Apart from the eco-tourism project, the TCA also runs a “One Stop Shop” which sell t-shirts and other mementos from the CA. It is also widely advertised on internet resulting in volunteer groups and other interested groups offering funds and free labor to the project. In the last three years, the project has been setting aside part of the funds collected from visitors for the future management of the project.</p> <p>The following attributes should make the TCA a sustainable project after the SPBCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It enjoys the support of a committed and dedicated group of landowners, government agency and the general public; • It has an effective CACC and a CASO who is well trained, committed and skillful in raising interest and support for the project; • It is already investing its own funds in the future of the project and has the means to identify and attract additional resources; and • The communities are already enjoying the benefits from the project.
<p>Koroyanitu Conservation Area, Fiji. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1994.</p>	<p>The KCAP aims <i>to establish long term biodiversity and sustainable development of the area and its communities</i>. It was based on the concept that ongoing management of natural resources under customary ownership will depend on the</p>

	<p>vital and informed participation of the landowning communities.</p> <p>Although the Koroyanitu range include six landowning villages, the SPBCP has been involved with only two of these, Abaca and Navilawa. The Abaca eco-tourism project started well before the SPBCP became involved in Koroyanitu. The Navilawa component has recently started but has some way to go before it gets to the same stage as Abaca. An Eco-tourism Cooperative Ltd. has been established for the village but it is expected that the project will diversity to other potential income-generating activities soon. New Zealand through the Tourism Resource Consortium (TRC) and more recently Japan have provided assistance to KCAP in support of eco-tourism development.</p> <p>The May coup was a major blow for progress in the KCAP especially the eco-tourism components as tourist numbers declined nation-wide. Consultations with the rest of the communities were also suspended as the situation in the country become very tense. Things may be slowly returning to normal in Fiji but the CA will probably continue to feel the impact of the political crisis for some time yet.</p> <p>It is noted that the KCAP has won a number of best eco-tourism awards in the last four years. However, there are still four village communities yet to be fully incorporated into the project. Whether they will benefit as much as the first two communities is not possible to determine at this stage. In the last month or so, a new proposal for the development of a mini-hydro scheme in the CAP was unveiled. It is not yet known what impacts such a development will have on the project but this is something the CASO and lead agency are checking on.</p> <p>The viability of the KCAP could be judged based on the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communities of Abaca and Navilawa appear to be fully supportive and committed to the project, but there are four other villages to be fully integrated; • The CACC, CASO and lead agency are all working hard to ensure success for the project. Efforts are underway to revert management of the Koroyanitu back to the communities although this was interrupted by the May events. • KCAP is already attracting other funding (e.g. NZODA, JAPNEC) aside from the SPBCP. The lead agency (NLTB) is committed to paying for the CASO and other costs after the SPBCP. • Abaca is already benefiting from its eco-tourism enterprise, but there is a need to ensure that the other communities also benefit. The mini-hydro scheme should provide electricity for the communities but the impacts of the scheme needs to be closely monitored.
<p>Pohnpei Conservation Area, Federated States of Micronesia. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1994.</p>	<p>Pohnpei Conservation Area Project (PCAP) aims <i>to help plan for the conservation and sustainable development of Pohnpei's valuable watershed resources.</i></p> <p>In 1994, the PCAP received a 2-years ADB grant to support the project. This grant was managed by TNC on behalf of government. SPBCP support supplemented ADB funding which was mainly directed at the development of a</p>

	<p>GIS system for Pohnpei.</p> <p>SPBCP funding was managed by the lead agency, the Department of Resource Management until 2000 when the Conservation Society of Pohnpei (an NGO) was appointed the new lead agency.</p> <p>Several studies of the fauna and flora of Pohnpei have been undertaken by SPBCP and others in the past several years. However management efforts have concentrated largely on campaigns to stop sakau (kava) development in the upland areas of the CA. A “Grow Low” campaign was launched in 1999 and is reported to have made a very good impact on local farmers.</p> <p>Although a pre-feasibility study of compatible development on Pohnpei was completed in 1996, there has been very little follow up to see if any of these will be practicable and economical. For the time being however, communities will continue to rely on income from sakau, so there is a possibility that the threat to upland forests could once again pose its ugly head unless ongoing campaigns such as Grow Low continue to be effective.</p> <p>Last year, the PCAP received through TNC \$1.2 million GEF funding for continued management of the project. A proposal for the establishment of a Trust Fund for the PCAP is also understood to be under preparation with the help of TNC. These developments should take care of any future needs of the project.</p> <p>The future of the PCAP can be better judged by taking the following into perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community consultations in all five municipalities of Pohnpei have been going on for almost ten years. However, not all the communities are fully aware of the benefits of the project as is evident from the continuing clearing that has been going on in the CA. Community consultations are continuing. • The recent changeover in lead agencies has resulted in very good progress for the project; this changeover should have happened earlier. The CASO needs closer supervision and greater commitment to the job. A new CASO may not be a bad idea. • For the amount of funds it has received, the PCAP has very little to show on the ground. There is a need to focus more on activities that involve and benefit communities, for example eco-tourism and other income generating activities. The GEF funding should ensure the future funding needs of the project are met.
<p>Utwa-walung Conservation Area, Kosrae, Federated States of Micronesia. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1996.</p>	<p>The Utwa-walung CAP aims <i>to preserve and maintain the diversity and abundance of living things within the area as a basis for long term sustainable development.</i></p> <p>Lead agency was changed from the Department of Commerce and Industries to the Development Review Commission, which has the legal mandate for resource</p>

	<p>management in Kosrae. This move was foreshadowed for sometime but was only implemented in 2000. The DRC is fully committed to the project and has contributed \$10,000 for infrastructure development in the project site.</p> <p>The main threats to the area are destructive fishing and over harvesting of mangrove resources but the CASO and CACC with the support of the two communities are working together to address these issues.</p> <p>The potential of the project area for aquaculture and other income generating activities have been investigated and the report is expected soon. A number of tours have been developed but the low number of visitors to Kosrae make this option less viable compared to other projects.</p> <p>The future of the Utwa-walung CAP after SPBCP could be determined if the following facts are considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communities of Utwa and Walung have been very supportive of the project. The DRC has also demonstrated its support, as has the governor of Kosrae. This suggests that the project was in a good position to receive and attract funding from government and its allies. • The CASO has been very effective in mobilising community support. He also enjoys the support of other stakeholders in the project. The CACC is undivided about the project and has demonstrated its support through participation at meetings and in soliciting additional resources. • Government as well as other outside organisations have pledged support for the project either through monetary donations, provision of equipment or other means. The main source of funding for the project after the SPBCP is expected to be the State government. • Although there has not been a great deal of benefits to the communities from the project, there are expectations that this will come at some stage. However, the benefits are likely to come from the sustainable use of resources of the mangroves (crabs, fish, etc) and not necessarily cash.
<p>North Tarawa Conservation Area, Kiribati. Approved for SPBCP in 1995.</p>	<p>The North Tarawa Conservation Area Project (NTCAP) aims <i>to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within the conservation area.</i></p> <p>The NTCAP has focused mainly on conservation awareness and training to increase people's knowledge and understanding of the project and its resources although a scoping study to determine the potential for eco-tourism was undertaken recently.</p> <p>The CACC comprise 52 members, which is far too many to be effective. As part of their transition strategy, membership in the CACC is being reviewed with the view to reducing the numbers to make it more manageable.</p> <p>The NTCAP is unlikely to raise much outside funding for its support. But this does not necessarily translate to failure of the project to survive after SPBCP. The government has contributed staff time and resources to the project and is likely to continue providing such support post SPBCP.</p>

	<p>The following summary provides a basis for determining the status of the NTCAP after SPBCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is good support from the communities of north Tarawa for the project. It is not clear if this will be enough to repel the threat from communities in South Tarawa. • The CASO has had limited success, partly because of ill health and partly due to other commitments to the lead agency that he works for. The CACC has been ineffective due to its large size. Greater involvement by the Fisheries Division would be important given the marine nature of the project. • Except for staff time of some government officials, the project has not demonstrated a capacity to raise funds from other sources regionally or internationally. It will therefore struggle to meet the cost of maintaining the project unless the government agrees to invest more funds in it. • Benefits to local communities will be very limited from the CAP although this will not necessarily spell doom for the project. Communities are well aware of the scarcity of marine resources that used to be abundant in recent times and would like to see the project succeed in its mission. The future of the NTCAP will depend to a great extent on this support from the communities.
<p>Kiritimati Conservation Area, Kiribati. Approved for SPBCP in 1997.</p>	<p>The Kiritimati CAP main objective is <i>to protect the atoll's terrestrial and marine environment, its extensive resident and nesting seabird populations, which are of global conservation importance.</i></p> <p>The Kiritimati CA was the latest addition to the family of SPBCP-sponsored CAPs. Its main attraction in terms of biodiversity is the extensive population of seabirds resident on the islands; it is one of the largest rookeries of sea birds in the world.</p> <p>The CA has had its problems, the main one being its isolation from Tarawa where the lead agency is located. Late last year, it was agreed that funds for the project could be sent directly to Kiritimati, a decision that was welcomed by the CASO and supported by the lead agency.</p> <p>A number of studies have been completed on the biodiversity of Kiritimati. These will come in handy in the planning and management of the resources of the atolls. And although there are no income generating activities operating at the moment, there is a desire by government to investigate the potential of the islands for these types of activities.</p> <p>Financially, the CAP will struggle after the SPBCP. However, there is great potential for the project to raise funds from the international community given the global significance of its biodiversity.</p> <p>The following comments should help determine the future of the Kiritimati project after SPBCP.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government is committed to the CA but there is still a need to convince a small portion of the resident population about the importance of the project. Work is continuing in this regard. • The first CASO was replaced after a short stint with the project because he was considered ineffective. The new CASO has shown a lot of potential, has the respect of the communities and the lead agency. Significant progress has been made since he took over the job. • There will be an on-going need for funding for the cat eradication programme and for the general upkeep of the CA after the SPBCP. The government is expected to take over the salary of the CASO but is unlikely to provide much more. However, the lead agency should capitalise on the global status of the CAP to attract donor funding. If it does, then the project should be well looked after in future. • The benefits for the communities will come mainly from increased fish catches and revenue from the increasing number of bird watchers to the area. At the moment, sport fishing is bringing groups of visitors to the atolls and appropriate links between the CAP and this activity will need to be explored.
<p>Jaluit Conservation Area, Marshall Islands. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1998.</p>	<p>The Jaluit Conservation Area (JCA) has as its main aim <i>the conservation and sustainable management of the biodiversity of the Jaluit atoll for the subsistence and socio-economic needs of its present and future generations.</i></p> <p>As a late starter in the SPBCP, the JCA has had less assistance from the programme compared to the other CAPs. However, significant progress has been made since the commencement of work in the area. The 16 member CACC has been grouped in four separate working groups, each with a specific focus based on the main needs of the project. The four groups are (a) Environment Protection and Resource Conservation, (b) GuestHouse, (c) Tour Guiding, and (d) Handicraft Co-op.</p> <p>A recently completed resource survey of the area confirmed the rich and healthy status of the reefs and marine resources with many species of fish, corals, land crabs and plants still in abundance.</p> <p>The involvement of the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) is considered critical to the long-term survival of the JCA. It is expected that after the SPBCP, the EPA will provide the necessary support (funding etc) that will take the CA through until other sources of funds are identified and secured.</p> <p>The following developments are indicative of progress that have been made by the JCA. These should help determine the future of the project after SPBCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the first and only protected area in the Marshall Islands, the CA continues to enjoy the full support of the communities and the government (the EPA). There is however still a need to continue consultations with local communities to make them fully aware and appreciative of the project. • The former CASO has been appointed the head of the EPA but continues to support the project. The new CASO has considerable potential and is already settled into the job. He enjoys the support of the community and the EPA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like other CAPs, funding after the SPBCP will be a concern for the JCA. The EPA may be able to provide some interim assistance, however the project will have to rely mainly on its own initiative to raise funding from elsewhere. The CASO seems to have the ability to do so. • Government and communities have yet to realise benefits from the CA although the main interest remains the protection of the marine resources of the atoll. If the project is able to do this, then there is a good possibility of the project continuing regardless of the lack of funding and benefits to the communities. Plans are already underway to set up an eco-tourism project for the atoll although it is realised that such an initiative is unlikely to bring much revenues unless tourist numbers into the country are improved.
<p>Huvalu Conservation Area, Niue. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1995.</p>	<p>The main goal of the Huvalu Conservation Area Project (HCAP) is <i>to conserve the biodiversity of the Huvalu Forest Conservation Area through the development of village and magafaoa-managed activities founded upon the sustainable use of natural resources and for the benefit of the village communities and their descendents.</i></p> <p>HCAP started off with a relatively large CACC but quickly realised the ineffectiveness of having so many people (especially government officials) on the group. CACC membership was then reduced to involve only the lead agency and community members.</p> <p>In terms of public awareness, the project has done extremely well with students from Niue High School carrying out coconut crab surveys as part of their school exercises. Hakupu village has also declared a “Hakupu litter-free day” as an additional activity of the project. The recent installation of CA signs will add to the awareness already created. This increased awareness should see this project continuing to make progress in the years ahead.</p> <p>A DME coconut oil extraction enterprise has been established as an income generating activity of the project. Locally made oil, soap and other products have been sold locally and there are efforts underway to explore potential markets with the Niue community in New Zealand. Unfortunately, reports are that the business is not being looked after very well and there is fear that this potential source of income for the community may not last very long.</p> <p>The future for the HCAP looks difficult and there is still a lot of work to do as is evident from the following summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communities of Hakupu and Liku are supportive of the project but there is a need for better collaboration between them. This is an area where the CASO will need to focus more effort on. • The CASO needs to put more energy into the project; better still the lead agency should look at having someone who is more comfortable to work with both communities to try to resolve ongoing community conflicts. The CASO does not appear to have that capacity. The lead agency has shown far more commitment in recent years. This is a good sign for the project, which will no doubt falter without such support after the SPBCP.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding will be a problem for the HCAP post-SPBCP. The Department of Community Affairs (the lead agency) will probably provide funding support for the CASO position plus some operating costs but not much more. However, the Department has the technical know-how to identify and secure funding from elsewhere. SPREP and other interested organisations should also be able to help in this regard. • The coconut oil enterprise was to bring some benefits for the project and communities but this is unlikely to happen unless there is vast improvement in its management. Eco-tourism has also started but like the other small countries in the Pacific, there is limited potential for this venture given the small number of visitors to Niue and the difficulty of getting there in the first place. It is believed that the communities will take more satisfaction out of the protection of their forests than any money they could make out of the project.
<p>Ngaremeduu Conservation Area Project, Palau. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1996.</p>	<p>The Ngaremeduu Conservation Area Project's (NCAP) main aim is <i>to conserve the Ngaremeduu CA in perpetuity in order to maintain and enhance biodiversity while providing for sustainable development by incorporating traditional resource management and active community participation into project planning and management.</i></p> <p>The Three States concerned in May 2000 approved a legislation formally establishing the NCAP. This means that the NCAP has formal status which will be difficult to revoke unless by agreement of all three States. With its status secured the main concern for the NCAP will be finding the funding required to sustain its operations.</p> <p>An eco-tourism strategy has been developed for the project and should be implemented shortly. Other income-generating activities linked to eco-tourism (e.g. sports fishing, kayaking etc) are also possible and are being investigated.</p> <p>The future looks good for the NCAP as can be determined from the following status report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three States of Ngaremlengui, Ngatpang and Aimeliik are well and truly behind the project as shown by the passing of the legislation by all three States to effect the formal establishment of the CA. The Federal government, through its Division of Conservation and Entomology, Ministry of Natural Resources has also supported the project since its establishment. • The CA is blessed with an extremely skilled CASO who has been at the forefront of efforts to get the three States together to support the project. The lead agency consider the project as part of its ongoing responsibility to protect Palau's biodiversity and is expected to continue its support in the years ahead. • An eco-tourism project is being planned and is expected to become operational in 2001. This venture should bring some benefits for the States concerned although it is expected that this will take a few years before it becomes profitable. Immediately after the SPBCP, the Division of Conservation and Entomology is expected to inherit the project for

	<p>government sponsorship. It has already picked up the cost of the CASO and will do so for the rest of the cost starting January 2002.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated earlier, the eco-tourism project will generate some revenues for the communities when it becomes operational. Other benefits will come from the expected increased harvest in marine resources like mangrove crabs etc. <p>In brief, the Ngaremeduu CA has good potential to be self-sustained after SPBCP. Palau government is investing very heavily in the tourist industry and given the attraction of Palau as a prime tourist destination, it shouldn't be too difficult to make projects in the country profitable and economical.</p>
<p>Rock Islands Conservation Area, Palau. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1997.</p>	<p>The objectives for the Rock Islands Conservation Area (RICA) are to: <i>a) preserve for prosperity the ecological integrity and biodiversity of all biological communities and habitats within the CA; and b) provide for the long term use of certain resources within the CA in order to meet the economic, subsistence, and recreational needs and desires of the people of Koror and Peleliu, primarily, the people of Palau secondarily, and the people of the world thirdly.</i></p> <p>As one of the latest additions to the SPBCP, the RICA has not had the same level of support as had other projects under the programme. RICA however, has a lot more potential than many of the other projects. It is area of international renown with tens of thousands of visitors visiting each year.</p> <p>The main concern for the RICA in the past few years has been trying to get the two States of Koror and Peleliu to lay aside their traditional disputes over ownership of the islands but to work together to ensure their conservation. This task fell on the shoulders of the Palau Conservation Society (PCS) which has the lead agency role for the project.</p> <p>Agreement between the Koror and Peleliu States has recently been achieved hence the project should now be able to make greater progress towards sustainability in the next few months. Improved relations between the PCS (an NGO) and government agencies should also help in achieving that goal.</p> <p>To determine the likelihood of RICA achieving sustainability after the SPBCP, the following conditions will need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two States, Koror and Peleliu, have now agreed to work together to protect the biodiversity of the Rock Islands through the establishment of the RICA. This agreement will need to withstand the test of time, but expectations are high that given the close relationship three other States have developed in relation to the Ngaremeduu CA, the agreement between these two States will last. • The RICA CASO is relatively new but has shown great potential. She is supported by a very committed PCS who has spent a considerable amount of time trying to protect the biodiversity of the RICA. The PCS enjoys considerable support from many mainly US-based Foundations and funding NGOs and has a track record of success in fund raising. • Continuing funding for RICA after SPBCP is not considered to be a major

	<p>hurdle. The PCS is fully committed to the project and has indicated that it will take over the funding responsibility. As stated above, this NGO has an impressive track record in fund raising which will benefit the RICA immensely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RICA earns more than \$1 million from the 5% dive tax imposed on users of the CA. Part of this money could be set aside to support the project but first there is a need to have all the stakeholders discuss and agree on this.
<p>Sa'anapu/Sataoa Conservation Area, Samoa. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1994.</p>	<p>The main aim of the Sa'anapu / Sataoa Conservation Area Project (SSCAP) is <i>to protect the important mangrove resources of the Sa'anapu / Sataoa area for the benefit of the communities and the country as a whole.</i></p> <p>As one of the first projects to be approved for SPBCP support, the SSCAP has had some major problems getting started. It had four changes in CASOs in four years. The two village communities did not get along well and the CACC has had changes in membership far too often that it failed to function as a decision-making body. In addition to this, there was a high expectation on the part of the communities that the project would bring similar benefits (large cash donations, building of schools and health clinics etc) as other donor-funded programmes in Samoa were doing.</p> <p>Income generating activities such as eco-tourism in the SSCAP had to compete with neighboring initiatives who were, because they were privately and individually-owned, better organised and less cumbersome to deal with. However, recent developments seem to suggest that given a little bit more time and resources, the SSCAP could become a viable project in the future. The following assessment would help determine the future status for the SSCAP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two villages are still unable to work together as a single entity for the purpose of the project. It is possible to consider having two sub-projects within the area if the intention is to satisfy the two villages, however this might create unnecessary competition that may prove disastrous for the resources under protection. The CASO and lead agency will have to continue their efforts to resolve the differences between the communities. • The CASO spend three days a week at the project, the other two days being spent in the office in Apia. This arrangement may have to change in order for him to spend more time with the communities working on the issues that are critical to the future of the project. The lead agency will also need to demonstrate greater commitment to the SSCAP either by providing financial resources, advice or supervision. • The CASO and lead agency are capable of attracting donor funding to the SSCAP but will need to consider the project as a priority for such support. It is unclear if the lead agency will fund the CASO after the SPBCP. If not, then the project is unlikely to progress much further in the years ahead. • Eco-tourism has been operating in a very small scale in the past three to four years. Unfortunately, the takings from the gate (from entry fees) are distributed by those who collect them as quickly as they are earned. This is a major cause for disgruntlement by the rest of the communities. It is probably

	<p>the single most difficult issue to be resolved for this CA, but one that will continue to cause division in support for the project.</p>
<p>Uafato Conservation Area, Samoa. Approved for SPBCP support in 1995.</p>	<p>To main objective for the Uafato Conservation Area (UCA) is <i>to protect through wise use and management, the ifilele resources of the area for the benefit of the local communities of Uafato.</i></p> <p>The UCA has made significant progress in the past two years. Village by-laws have enabled the more sustainable use of the ifilele resources and the CACC has become more localised. Honey is expected for extraction in July 2001 and this should provide some financial benefits for the village.</p> <p>The biggest problem for the CA is the loss of confidence in the lead agency, the O le Siosiomaga Society (OLSSI). This has been a pre-SPBCP problem, which has at times, tested the commitment of the village to the project. This problem is unlikely to be resolved in the near future although the village had agreed to continue working with the OLSSI despite the problems faced.</p> <p>If the bee-keeping project becomes successful as is expected, then the UCA should be able to raise part if not all of the funding that will be required to keep it going. The following comments provide an assessment of the potential for the UCA to achieve sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Uafato village is fully committed despite the problematic relations with the lead agency. There is the option of the village managing the project without the need for a lead agency. However, it is considered that the village has not yet developed the necessary capacity to do so at this stage. SPREP has indicated that it will continue to assist the UCA in conjunction with the OLSSI until such a time when the village is able to manage on its own. • The current Uafato CASO has only been on the job for two years but has already made a significant contribution to the project. He enjoys the support of the village and is currently training a village person to take over from him in the next year or so. The CACC is led by the village pastor who has the interest of the village at heart. The CACC will need to make its decisions known the to the wider community to avoid unnecessary suspicions about what it is doing. • Like all other CAPs, the UCA will feel the impact of cessation of SPBCP funding. It however has the potential to attract other funding sources, although it might need assistance to identify and access such sources. SPREP should be able to help in this regard. • The Uafato village has already seen some of the benefits from the CAP. The village households now have piped water from a water supply scheme funded by the SPBCP. Roaming pigs are penned in fences and honey production is expected very shortly. The biggest benefit for the village however is likely to come from the ifilele resources that is being sustainably managed for the long-term benefit of the village people.
<p>Komaridi Catchment Conservation Area Project, Solomon Islands. Approved</p>	<p>The overall purpose of the Komaridi Catchment Conservation Area Project (KCCAP) was <i>to conserve the KCCAP in perpetuity as a basis for sustainable development and the maintenance of biodiversity in the catchment with the</i></p>

<p>for SPBCP funding in 1995.</p>	<p><i>participation of landowner communities.</i></p> <p>Until 1999, the KCCAP was making considerable progress especially in its eco-tourism development component. This was brought to an abrupt stop in 1999 when ethnic tensions involving people from Malaita and Guadalcanal erupted. Fear for the safety of the workers in the project resulted in decision to halt SPBCP assistance on a temporary basis. Unfortunately, as the conflict continued for more than a year, SPBCP and the lead agency agreed to suspend support to the project indefinitely. This decision still stands despite the reported return to normal in the country.</p> <p>There is a possibility that the KCCAP could resume under a different programme of support in future when conditions in Guadalcanal are returned to normal. For the SPBCP however, the KCCAP has fallen by the wayside as an unsuspecting “victim” of a political unrest. Its future lies entirely on the speed with which the government can restore the confidence of the donors and local communities to again join forces for the conservation of the area’s biological diversity.</p>
<p>Arnavon Conservation Area, Solomon Islands. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1994.</p>	<p>The overall aim of the Arnavon Conservation Area Project (ACAP) is <i>to protect and sustainably manage marine and terrestrial ecosystems in and around the Arnavon islands for the benefit of the local communities of Kia, Waghena and Posarae and for the wider benefit of the Pacific region.</i></p> <p>The ACAP was one of the few existing areas “inherited” by the SPBCP. It has a longer history than many of the other CAPs. It also has had a longer period of time to monitor what impacts interventions were making on the biodiversity and people of the Arnavon islands.</p> <p>The success of the ACAP in protecting marine biodiversity is clearly evident in the monitoring data collected over the past several years. Indications are that a number of coral, shellfish and fish species are recovering very well. Population of sea turtles (especially the hawksbill turtle) is also reported to be on the increase. This is great news for the area, which is thought to be the largest rookery for this species in the Pacific region.</p> <p>The isolation of the ACAP from the main centers of commerce will continue to hamper conservation and management efforts. The recent ethnic tensions also affected the ability of the CASO and other project staff to move around freely. But despite these problems, the significance of the biodiversity of the ACAP and the presence of other collaborating organisations like TNC are likely to be sufficient to see the project through these hurdles. An assessment of the potential viability of the ACAP can be determined from the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three communities in the ACAP are showing far more commitment to the project following considerable effort put into community consultations and public awareness. There is still more work to do in this area but it is expected that greater support will be forthcoming once communities are once again invited into the CA to sustainably harvest resources that are in plentiful supply.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same CASO has been with the project since its inception. He is well respected by the communities, the lead agency and the collaborating agency. The continuing presence of the TNC after the SPBCP will be critical to the project especially since the lead agency (the Ministry of Forests, Environment and Conservation (MFEC) lacks the capacity to be of much help to the project. • Funding will be a major concern for the ACAP after the SPBCP. Despite its national, regional and global significance for biodiversity conservation, the donor community will be reluctant to invest in the Solomon Islands until peace and harmony is restored. That could take a long time. • Communities are already benefiting from the recovery of marine species that were once on the verge of disappearance. This will be the greatest reward for them.
<p>Ha'apai Marine Conservation Area Project, Tonga. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1995.</p>	<p>The overall objective of the HCAP is <i>to protect, improve and sustainably use the terrestrial and marine biodiversity of the HCAP as the basis for almost all cash and non-cash income within the area, now and in the future.</i></p> <p>The HCAP is the largest of the projects under the SPBCP in terms of area. This made the area extremely difficult to manage especially by one CASO. The CACC was made up largely of officials from government agencies that have a presence on Ha'apai, with the governor as chairman. In 1999, it was considered that the CACC, because of its large size, was ineffective and a proposal for its restructure was then put forward. The Ha'apai Management Committee (HMC) was proposed in 2000 as part of the transition strategy for the project. Formal approval of this committee is due soon.</p> <p>The future of the HCA could be determined based on the following assessment of its current status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the Multipartite last year (2000), the representative of the government of Tonga paid tribute to the SPBCP saying the SPBCP has been adopted as a model for protected area development in the other island groups of Tonga. Further, he assured the meeting that the government of Tonga will ensure that the project is maintained after the SPBCP. This includes government paying for the salary of the CASO. There is no reason to doubt this expression of support by the government of Tonga; hence it is safe to say that this project will survive the transition from SPBCP better than some. • The CASO has had several years of training and involvement in the HCAP and knows the project better than anyone else in Tonga. His continuing involvement is vital to the HCAP. The pledge made by the government representative last year for government to pay for the position will go a long way in ensuring the project continues after 2001. The CACC restructuring needs to be implemented as soon as possible. The sub-committees (Animals Control Sub-Committee and Marine Control Sub-Committee) need to be strengthened, but this should follow the implementation of the restructuring of the CACC. • Like all other CAPs, future funding support is critical to the HCAP. With the support of the lead agency, the CASO should be able to access other sources

	<p>outside government. The need for an out board motor boat is a priority so that the CASO and CACC are able to reach other islands in the group in their monitoring of the CAP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The immediate benefits from the HCAP will be realised when the giant clams are again available for community consumption. Whale watching has been talked about but is unlikely to eventuate in the next two years. The contribution by the project to the beautification and “greening” of Ha’apai appear to have been fully appreciated by the communities.
<p>Funafuti Marine Conservation Area, Tuvalu. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1995.</p>	<p>The main goal of the Funafuti Marine Conservation Area (FMCA) is <i>to conserve the marine and terrestrial biodiversity of Funafuti atoll based on the sustainable use of natural resources for the benefit of the Funafuti community and their descendants.</i></p> <p>The FMCA started to make considerable progress when an Australian volunteer was recruited in 1997 to assist the CASO and CACC implement the project. Since then, the government and the Funafuti Kaupule have been actively supporting the project including investing funds in the implementation of certain activities on the work programme. The CA has attracted other funding from outside SPREP and there is reason to believe that this interest by donors will continue for as long as the CASO and CACC are able to access these sources.</p> <p>A better assessment of the future for the FMCA could be made based on the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no question that the government and the Kaupule are fully behind the project. Both have provided grants to assist implement activities of the project. In addition, the government is looking at replicating the FMCA model in other islands of Tuvalu and is in the process of setting up a conservation trust fund to support such initiatives. For a small island country with very limited resources, Tuvalu has shown far more commitment to biodiversity conservation than many other PICs. • The Funafuti CASO has come a long way but still needs to show more responsibility and dedication to the job. He would need assistance in writing funding proposals and in accessing donors. Continuing support of the lead agency will be vital in this regard. • As stated before, the FMCA has demonstrated several times its ability to raise funding from other sources and as long as the project continues to function effectively, there is a possibility that this kind of support will continue, even increase. • Income generating options for Funafuti are limited. Although the area is known for its rich marine biodiversity, possibilities are constrained by the limited number of visitors to Tuvalu. For the local communities, the obvious recovery in marine species and populations is a source of joy and satisfaction for them which is probably greater than any revenues from eco-tourism and other sorts of enterprises that other CAPs are embarking on. <p>From a personal perspective, I think the FMCA will continue to exist after the SPBCP mainly through the commitment and support of the government and the</p>

	Kaupule which so far, have been very encouraging.
Vatthe Conservation Area, Vanuatu. Approved for SPBCP funding in 1994.	<p>The overall goal of the Vatthe Conservation Area (VCA) is <i>to conserve the biodiversity of the Vatthe Conservation Area through the adoption of an integrated conservation and development approach by customary landowners in association with government and non-government agencies.</i></p> <p>The VCA was one of the first projects approved for SPBCP funding; thus it is one of the few projects to have received more than 7 years of support. Land disputes within and between the two communities continue to be a main concern for the future of the CA. The situation is not helped by rumors of other mysterious development proposals that have so far, not been made public.</p> <p>The forests of Vatthe have been subjected to a number of severe cyclones causing serious damage over the years. The cyclones have also caused damage to the lodges and restaurants, which are the main revenue earners for the project. The area will continue to be vulnerable to cyclones and this may have a negative impact on the support and commitment so far shown by the two communities.</p> <p>Some comments on the future of Vatthe follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frictions between the two communities of Sara and Matantas remain a sensitive issue, which is likely to be sparked again by members living outside the two communities. The CASO and CACC will need to continue working on this issue through continuous meetings and dialogue with them. • The CASO has been with the project since its inception. He is now planning to leave the project at the end of 2001. He is confident that the manageress of the lodges and restaurant will be able to step in as CASO after he departs. I share his confidence in the manageress but of course, it remains to be seen if our confidence is well placed. The Vila-based CACC may need to devolve more responsibilities to the Luganville CACC so that decision-making can happen “closer to home”. • Vatthe has taken the initiative of setting aside some of the revenues earned from visitors to the CAP for the future of the project. This however is not going to be adequate and the project will therefore need to continue looking for other sources of funds. This should not be a major concern for the project as both the CASO and the lead agency are quite capable of doing this job. The Vanuatu Bungalow Association has also helped market the CA on its web site and this should help attract other donors to the project. • The communities of Sara and Matantas are already benefiting from the VCA and there is every reason to believe that the benefits will increase, as more tourists become interested in the project and what it has to offer. Care will need to be exercised to ensure that the distribution of benefits do not become additional fuel to the already existing potentially explosive situation between the two communities.