

# DARWIN INITIATIVE

## FINAL REPORT



### ***BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION TRAINING – PACIFIC ISLAND STATES***

#### ***ICPL ABERYSTWYTH***



*Darwin Initiative Conservation Training Course students planting mangroves with villagers at Tagaqa, Locally Managed Marine Area, Fiji, October 2002.*

# DARWIN INITIATIVE

## FINAL REPORT



### ***BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION TRAINING – PACIFIC ISLAND STATES***

***INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR  
PROTECTED LANDSCAPES***

***ABERYSTWYTH***

***ROUND 7***

***162/8/009***

## CONTENTS

	Page
1. Darwin Project Information .....	4
2. Project Background/Rationale .....	4
3. Project Summary .....	5
4. Scientific Training and Technical Assessment .....	6
5. Project Impacts .....	8
6. Project Outputs .....	11
7. Project Expenditure .....	13
8. Project Operation and Partnerships .....	13
9. Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson Learning .....	15
10. Darwin Identity .....	17
11. Leverage .....	18
12. Sustainability and Legacy .....	18
13. Post-Project Follow Up Activities .....	19
14. Value for Money .....	20
15. Appendix I: Project Contribution to Convention on Biological Diversity .....	21
16. Appendix II: Outputs .....	23
17. Appendix III: Publications .....	26
18. Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts .....	27
19. Appendix V: PICCC Course Participants .....	29
20. Appendix VI: Year One Trainee Conservation Projects.....	30
21. Appendix VII: Year Two Trainee Conservation Projects.....	31
22. Appendix VIII: ECTF Project Monitoring, Referee's Comments.....	32
23. Appendix IX: Summary of Trainee's Daily Monitoring Sheets.....	33
24. Appendix X: Example of End of Phase Evaluation.....	34
25. Appendix XI: Example Press Release.....	35

# ***Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species***

## ***Final Report***

### **1. Darwin Project Information**

Project title	Biodiversity Conservation Training – Pacific Island States
Country	South Pacific region (13 island states)
Contractor	International Centre for Protected Landscapes, Aberystwyth
Project Reference No.	162/8/009
Grant Value	£125,800
Starting/Finishing dates	April 1999 – October 2002

### **2. Project Background/Rationale**

This project is located in the South Pacific region and has so far undertaken the direct training of 28 biodiversity conservation practitioners from 13 developing nations: American Samoa, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu. The project responded to the problem of too few, insufficiently trained conservation practitioners in the region, as identified through needs-assessments carried out by international donors and the “South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme” (SPREP) which represents the governments of the region. This lack of capacity had also been identified by the University of the South Pacific (USP) which is the principal academic and technical training centre in the region.

The project was relevant to Darwin Initiative aims because, although the Pacific Ocean island states have only moderate overall levels of biodiversity, they have a relatively large number of unique and specialised plant and animal species of great importance for human use. The local communities of the Pacific islands are overwhelmingly reliant on these natural resources and, with population increases and rising material expectations, there has been a disproportionate amount of habitat and species loss in the region. The Pacific island states therefore established the SPREP to coordinate the efforts of member governments in tackling environmental problems in the region. In its Action Plan, SPREP identified loss of biodiversity on and around Pacific islands as the major environmental issue which is threatening the livelihoods of human communities in the region. It identified “inadequate distribution of protected areas, a dearth of trained conservation specialists and a complete lack of biodiversity management training facilities in the region” as key issues to be addressed. The SPREP “Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region 1999-2002” recommended the establishment of a training centre in the Pacific to support biodiversity conservation extension work with local communities. It also identified the urgent need for professional upgrading of

existing biodiversity conservators. Because of low staffing levels, geographical remoteness and difficulties of communication in the region, the Action Plan also recommended that the distance-learning model of training delivery be developed to address the need for environmental skills-transfer.

In preparation for this project, a Memorandum of Understanding was drawn up between SPREP and the UK partner, the International Centre for Protected Landscapes at Aberystwyth (ICPL), which has eleven years of experience in the delivery of biodiversity management training through short courses and distance learning. This Darwin Initiative project was therefore an officially-endorsed response to the biodiversity conservation needs of the South Pacific nation states, and directly reflected the host country's environment and development priorities. The project also formed part of the SPREP nation's commitments as signatories to the International Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

### **3. Project Summary**

The purpose of the project was to promote the conservation and effective management of the biodiversity of Pacific Island States by: 1) establishing a conservation management training and extension centre in the region; 2) developing short-course materials for biodiversity conservation and management training, and running four, 2-week local training courses for 30 participants each at the training centre (programme to continue after the conclusion of Darwin Initiative funding); 3) establish with USP, a distance-learning centre for postgraduate biodiversity conservation and management training (within existing infrastructure); 4) develop training materials for, and initiate the distance learning programme. As this was a Round 7 Darwin Initiative project, no Logical Framework was required at its inception.

The overall objectives remained constant throughout the project. However, in response to changing local needs and SPREP's member government's evolving priorities, emphasis shifted within the project from extensive training (large numbers of personnel over short periods) to intensive training (smaller numbers for much longer periods). The practical expression of this was that four times fewer personnel than planned were directly trained, but for four times as long. In fact, the training input per person was considerably more than this, as the two-week course originally envisaged was expanded to eight weeks duration. It was also split into two phases, with an intervening five-month period devoted to applied conservation project work which was not envisaged in the original proposal.

The operational plan was changed slightly (postponement of one of the training courses due to the political coup in Fiji and the temporary proscription on travel to the island by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in the year 2000). A request for this change was acceded to by the Darwin Secretariat at that time.

One specific objective of this project was only partially achieved during the currency of Darwin funding. This was to have the postgraduate distance-learning programme in Biodiversity Conservation and Management up-and-running by the end of the initial three-year period. The project was able to prepare and deliver to USP, the essential distance learning materials required. However, as a result of feed-back from the short-

course trainees, a need was identified for inclusion of an even greater range of local case studies in the postgraduate material. This, coupled with the slippage due to the political coup in Fiji, contributed to a time-lag in tailoring the distance-learning materials to current local conditions in the Pacific. The process for validating the distance-learning programme by the University authorities was also slower than expected. However, the committee process for adoption of the programme has now been concluded, and the University of the South Pacific Senate recently gave its blessing for the new course to begin.

In all other respects however, this project has achieved, and in many cases considerably exceeded its objectives. This is particularly true of the amount and quality of the short-course training materials produced, and the impact and outreach of the short course programme as delivered. A major unforeseen spin-off of the programme, has been its significant input into existing biodiversity conservation projects in the South Pacific, and its encouragement of new environmental initiatives throughout the region. The programme has thereby garnered much positive publicity and attracted significant extra funding from other donor agencies, which is contributing to its ongoing popularity and sustainability. Time spent by UK staff in the host country also exceeded that planned, and was supported through additional funding leveraged from non-Darwin sources.

Article 12 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (“Research and Training”) is most relevant to the field of impact of this project. The first part of each of the Darwin Initiative Pacific conservation training courses specifically addresses international and regional conventions and treaties, including the CBD. In the ensuing training, emphasis is given to particular aspects of the Convention which are of most relevance for community-based conservation in the Pacific (see percentage contributions flagged-up in Appendix I).

#### **4. Scientific, Training, and Technical Assessment**

This project has been primarily a training and capacity building activity, and its main outputs have been educational materials and individual trainees who have received professional upgrading. Short course trainees were selected by the SPREP on the basis of their prior learning aptitude (from formal qualifications and manager’s recommendations), their geographical origin, and their importance as key players in environmental initiatives at both grass roots and policy-making levels in the South Pacific. A balance of representatives from the State and NGO sectors was enrolled, with equal representation from the three main geographical regions of the Pacific (Micronesia, Melanesia and Polynesia). Despite strenuous efforts, only 30% enrolment of female participants was achieved, due to underlying gender disparity in the pool of environmental practitioners within the region.

The short-course content was developed during consultations between the project partners in the UK and the Pacific. The initial plan to run two, 2-week courses per year, was modified when it became clear that the level and requirements of applicants and their project managers justified a much longer period of training. The course programme was therefore extended to 8-weeks contact time inclusive of field work. This comprised an initial four-week study period at USP (“Phase 1”), followed by five-months mentored

project work in the trainees' home countries ("inter-phase"), and then a further 4-week follow-up training period at USP ("Phase 2")(some trainees in Year 1 were only able to stay for two weeks of Phase 2). This arrangement allowed trainees to apply the skills acquired during Phase 1 of the training, to an existing or new conservation project in the field, and to have this work assisted and mentored by their tutors. Assistance with evaluation, writing-up and publishing the results of each project was then provided for during and after Phase 2 of each course. This innovative approach to the applied training of biodiversity conservation managers, grew out of the learning process that the project partners experienced during their first year of collaboration on training materials development (after objectives and outputs for the Darwin project had been set). It accords with the philosophy and practice of "action research" and "adaptive project management" that is current in integrated conservation and development work around the world. However, it held significant extra financial implications for the project partners, in terms of having to bring the trainees twice to USP from remote locations in the Pacific, and accommodating them at the training centre for four times as long.

It is a tribute to the perceived quality of the training programme that SPREP and the New Zealand Overseas Development Agency agreed to provide generous additional funding to allow this "split" training format to be employed. However, the provision of mentoring to the trainees during the inter-phase period involved the tutors in far greater "contact" time than had originally been planned. This was absorbed by the tutors among their other work commitments, and the process was fortunately eased by the rapid expansion of digital links and e-mail communication that took place across the Pacific during the course of the project.

Much of the writing-up of inter-phase projects was conducted and mentored during Phase 2 of each year's course, and this work often allowed for formal mid-term reports to be completed for ongoing projects. This was greatly appreciated by trainee line managers who gave glowing testimonials regarding their staff's enhanced performance after return to their home projects:

*"I'm very keen for Harry to come back to you for the second phase of the programme, as he returned from the first session with much more confidence and he was much more effective in his work"*

**Bill Raynor (USAID-TNC), Project Manager, "Grow Low" Campaign, Pohnpei, May 2001, referring to Harry Saul, PICCC Year 1 trainee, Federated States of Micronesia.**

Some of these reports became the basis of new project bids to donors, which have in turn secured further support for environmental initiatives in the region, e.g. a World Heritage Site candidacy (Samoa) and a national pollution-control scheme (Tonga) (see Appendix ).

Core materials for the "Pacific Islands Community-based Conservation Course" (PICCC) were collated in a two-volume training manual of 700 pages. This material is also available on CD-ROM (a copy of the PICCC CD-ROM accompanies this submission). Sample schedules for the Darwin Initiative are also included on the CD-ROM.

Each topic within the short-course training programme schedule was supported by four sets of materials, viz:

- 1) Individual session outlines – “Activities”
- 2) Overhead projection transparencies – “Acetates”
- 3) Trainer’s materials – “Notes”
- 4) Trainee’s background materials – “Readings and hand-outs”

The students were provided with much additional material in support of case studies, laboratory and computing work, site visits and field excursions.

Training was delivered by a partnership of the Darwin Initiative-funded tutors from the UK and the Pacific, assisted by other staff from USP, and many visiting lecturers. External input was provided by, for example, Fiji Government Officers, staff of large and small NGOs working in the region (e.g. WWF, Conservation International, Birdlife International, Fiji National Trust, Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific etc) and several donor agencies (e.g. DFID, USAID and Japan Aid (JICA)). Graduates of the Darwin Initiative Pacific Conservation courses were issued with course-completion certificates accredited by SPREP and the University of the South Pacific, and bearing the Darwin Initiative logo.

Although significant research outputs were not envisaged in this predominantly training-oriented project, the assistance given to trainees with applied conservation work between Phases 1 and 2 of each course, resulted in much *de novo* investigatory work. The results of much of this work have been published in USP’s “Technical Report” Series, and are listed in Appendix . Copies of the Technical Reports are available from ICPL and USP.

## **5. Project Impacts**

That this project has substantially achieved its primary purpose is evidenced by:

- 1) Enhanced training management capacity among extension staff at SPREP headquarters in Samoa.
- 2) Established capacity for short-course training in biodiversity conservation and management at the University of the South Pacific.
- 3) Two new cohorts of professionally upgraded environmental management practitioners, all working on applied biodiversity conservation projects throughout the Pacific region.
- 4) A full set of distance-learning materials for postgraduate biodiversity conservation and management training delivered to USP, and approval granted by the university authorities for this programme to begin.

Significant additional project impacts have included the promotion of many existing and new conservation initiatives in the South Pacific region (see Appendices and ), and the securing of considerable extra funding from outside donors to enhance the programme’s sustainability.



The successful training and research outcomes of this project directly support Article 12 of the CBD (Research and Training). They also support many of the other Articles in the Convention, due to the specific coverage of these issues in the Darwin Initiative PICCC training materials (see Appendix I). The host institutions in the Pacific (SPREP and USP) and interested donors have been highly satisfied with the results of this Darwin project, and intend to continue with both the short-course delivery, and the postgraduate distance-learning programme at USP. ICPL will continue to assist within the limits of future funding constraints.

In addition to these direct, project-related outcomes, there are many, less easily-quantified “invisible” benefits that have accrued to biodiversity conservation in the Pacific as a result of this Darwin Initiative project. For example, there has been immediate benefit at the grass roots level through course participants re-echoing PICCC training to professional colleagues and project beneficiaries in their conservation extension work with local communities. The trainees and their managers were asked to estimate how many stakeholders had benefited from this process, and a figure of between 400 and 600 extra persons receiving training had resulted from this “cascade” process during the 5-month course inter-phase period alone. This emphasises another valuable impact of the programme which was not fully foreseen at its inception, namely the positive impact of the “training of trainers” approach. Year 1 course feed-back had identified the need for more input on the technical and behavioural aspects of training delivery. Coverage of the this aspect was therefore enhanced in the Year 2 course, and resulted in a much higher level of “multiplier effect” through re-echoing as reported by the trainees and their line managers.

There has also been discernible impact at the policy-making level as a result of the key advisory positions now held by some of the trainees in their home country’s decision-making structures. As there are relatively few locally-trained and experienced environmental managers in the Pacific, and as the island States themselves are often so small, the PICCC graduates have frequently found themselves being asked to contribute to policy formulation and environmental planning at the highest level when they return to their home countries. Examples include:

- 1) The Marshall Islands participant who has advised his country’s Environment Ministry on nationwide planning for community-managed conservation areas.
- 2) The Samoan trainee who is assisting his government with environmental planning for the entire coastal zone of Samoa.
- 3) The participant from the Federated States of Micronesia who is managing a national awareness campaign to discourage “slash-and-burn” agriculture and the planting of subsistence crops in ecologically sensitive mountain-forest habitat.
- 4) The trainee from Vanuatu who has been asked to stand as a Member of Parliament in her country’s elections.

The evidence that this Darwin project has improved local capacity to further biodiversity conservation work in the host countries, is made clear in the Reports on the projects

which were promoted by this training (Appendices VII and VIII). The potential for future impact of the trainees on biodiversity conservation in the Pacific is high for the following reasons:

- 1) All of them have stayed in their existing or related jobs and are applying their skills directly to biodiversity conservation management at both grass roots and/or decision-making levels (see Appendix ).
- 2) Many of the trainees achieved promotion and/or higher levels of responsibility after returning to their home country projects.
- 3) There was unanimous agreement among the trainees (in post-course evaluation) that they had benefited enormously from the training, and were now in a much better position to be able to apply their skills in community-based natural resource management in their home countries.
- 4) The tutors received glowing testimonials from many of the trainee's managers, emphasising their increased value to the projects upon which they were engaged and to the organisations of which they formed part.
- 5) The hard evidence of successful fund-raising and exciting new environmental initiatives achieved by several of the trainees after their return home, e.g. the UNESCO World Heritage Site development in Samoa and the Australian Aid-funded waste-disposal programme in Tonga (see Appendix ).
- 6) The pursuit of further biodiversity conservation management studies by several of the participants. An example is Year 1 trainee John Ericho from Papua New Guinea, who has begun the ICPL MSc in Protected Landscape Management by distance-learning, so that he can remain in his key role as an extension worker on the Crater Mountain Conservation Area Project in PNG.

Another positive impact of the project was the promotion of partnerships for conservation activity that were fostered through the cooperative working arrangements of the project contributors. The UK partner (ICPL) has now worked successfully for six years with SPREP and USP, and the network was extended during the course of the project to include many new training collaborators from government departments, donor agencies, NGOs and the private sector. Relationships developed during some of the site visits and field excursions have developed into ongoing project partnerships. Due to the multi-disciplinary nature of the training, interdepartmental collaborations at USP were also fostered by this Darwin project. Fijian Government agencies assisted, e.g. the Department's of Housing and Environment, Internal Affairs, Forestry, and Fisheries, and NGOs such as WWF-Pacific and the Fijian Nature Foundation also collaborated on the PICCC programme. Significant assistance was received from the private sector, especially among tourism interests, and this led to a two-way flow of ideas and practical support, for example, on the environmental impact of new tourism developments on the Fijian coastline. Collaboration also took place with the representatives of several donor agencies in the region, e.g. DFID, USAID, JICA.

The social impact of this project on local communities has been:

- 1) Immediate, as evidenced by the project outcomes listed in Appendices . Many of these are predominantly grass roots-based initiatives involving strong community participation.
- 2) On-going, as shown by the 400-600 stakeholders benefiting from re-echoing of training during one year's course inter-phase period alone.
- 3) Long-lasting, due to the trainee's commitments to remain in their extension posts, achieve promotion, attract additional donor-funding and pursue further relevant training. In addition, many of the projects upon which the trainees are now engaged, have local community "ownership", multi-partner support and built-in sustainability criteria. Several of them are proving to be models for the kind of resource protection and sustainable-use that is crucial for community survival in the Pacific region. A good example is the "Fijian Locally Managed Marine Areas" (FLMMA) programme, upon which USP and the PICCC Year 2 trainee Alifereti Naikatini are collaborating. This project received the UNDP "Equator Award" 2002 at the World Conference on Sustainable Development ("Earth Summit"), in Johannesburg in August 2002.

## **6. Project Outputs**

Project outputs included institutional training capacity, short-course and distance-learning materials, professionally upgraded trainees, published papers, print and broadcast media publicity material and additional leveraged funding (see Appendix II). Less quantifiable outputs include the impact of the approximately 28 conservation projects being carried out by the trainees in the Pacific, that were begun, developed and/or written-up as a result of the direct training input and 5-month mentoring period (see Appendices ). Impacts also include benefits due to re-echoing of training by course participants, upon return to their home countries.

The only significant short-fall on the original project commitment, was the failure to have the planned distance-learning postgraduate programme in Biodiversity Conservation and Management up-and-running by the end of the Darwin funding period. The project was able to achieve its output commitments in this regard (preparation and delivery of the distance learning materials to the University of the South Pacific). However, the predicted milestones regarding student enrolment on the course have been delayed for the following reasons:

- 1) Feed-back from the Pacific indicated a need for the inclusion of a wider range of local case studies in the postgraduate material, before final adoption.
- 2) Slippage took place due to the political coup in Fiji, and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office's proscription on travel to the country half-way through the project.

- 3) The process for validating the distance-learning programme by the USP authorities was slower than expected

However, the committee process for the adoption of the distance-programme has now been concluded, and the University of the South Pacific Senate recently gave its blessing for the course to begin. It is expected that the programme will rapidly become one of the most important training tools for environmental managers in the Pacific region. It should also be one of the first of USP's suite of postgraduate distance-learning programmes to be purveyed throughout the Pacific region by means of the latest remote-learning technology.

Soon after this Darwin project had begun, and as a result of the trawl for short course trainees on the programme, our Pacific partners SPREP and USP identified the need for more intensive and thorough training of a smaller number of conservation field-officers than had been envisaged at the proposal stage. The practical result was that, instead of training a total of 120 practitioners for two weeks each, the project signed up 30 participants for eight weeks training each (i.e. an equal amount of person-week training time, but with greater opportunity for individual interaction at the trainee-tutor level). In the event, 28 practitioners were able to attend the 8-week programme during the two year training period of the project.

As an additional response to SPREP and USP's feedback early in the programme, the decision was made to "split" the 8-week course into two phases of 4-weeks duration each, separated by a 5-month period of project work. This arrangement allowed trainees to develop applied biodiversity conservation project ideas during Phase 1 of the course, and conduct these projects with tutor mentoring during the "inter-phase" period back in their home countries. The trainees were also encouraged to re-echo relevant parts of their training to professional colleagues and other project stakeholders in the local communities where they worked. In feed-back, the trainees and their managers indicated that this process produced a "multiplier effect" benefitting an additional 400-600 persons during the 5-month inter-phase period of Year 2 training alone.

Phase 2 of the course then included time for project assessment and writing up, again with the assistance of the course tutors. It also resulted in the publication of many of the Project Reports in accessible form (see Appendix ). This imaginative and pragmatic course structure was a direct response to the practical needs of applied biodiversity conservation work in the region, and was greatly appreciated by the trainee's project managers and team leaders across the Pacific.

Taking the course extension and project mentoring time into account, the effective "contact" time between tutors and trainees was much greater than envisaged in the original project proposal. This additional work-load was absorbed by the project partners without additional funding. However, the necessity for bringing the trainees twice instead of once to USP, often from very remote parts of the Pacific, and then having them stay for eight weeks instead of two, had significant financial implications for the project sponsors. Furthermore, the Year 1 trainee's requests in feed-back, for more practical

exposure to “real-world” negotiations with village communities in local conservation projects, led to longer and therefore more expensive periods spent away from the USP training facility during the second training year of the project. Fortunately, SPREP was able to obtain additional support from the New Zealand Overseas Development Agency for trainee travel and subsistence, while the UK partners were able to secure support for the extra visits to Fiji necessitated by the “split” course-phasing, from Granada Enterprises and the British High Commission in Fiji. These amounts contributed to the £265,500 additional resources accruing to the project, as indicated in Output 23. This total amount includes the funding from NZODA for SPREP’s ongoing training activity, which is helping to ensure the legacy of the Darwin short-course programme in the Pacific. Another example of outside resources secured for the project was the 150 volumes from the Dorling Kindersley “Essential Managers” series (10 books each for 15 trainees) donated and shipped out to Fiji free-of-charge by Anthony Forbes Watson, Chief Executive of the The Penguin Group (UK) Ltd (see Appendix ).

Therefore, apart from the delay in establishment of the distance-learning course, most of the output commitments on this Darwin Initiative project have been greatly exceeded. Not only was individual trainee contact-time and in-country staff time increased, but dissemination outputs in terms of research papers and publicity were significantly expanded, as was the amount of additional funding won for the programme. Details of project publications are given in Appendix III.

The progress of the Darwin Initiative training courses in Fiji was reported in SPREP Newsletters, and the interest stimulated in the programme has led to contacts with several other training institutions which will be contributing to the ongoing training programme in the future. The training courses were also visited by representatives of some of the world’s largest aid programmes (USAID, JICA, DFID) and this is also expected to contribute to sustainability of the programme through additional subvention from these and similar sources in the future. ICPL and its partners will continue to publicise this programme in the Pacific, as the short courses continue and the distance-learning programme gathers momentum. A paper reporting the results of the programme has been commissioned for the Journal of the International Rangers Federation, and this will also help to spread the information on best practice that has been gained through the project experience.

## **7. Project Expenditure**

Expenditure adhered closely to the proposed budget throughout the project, and finances were audited by ICPL’s accountants – Francis, Jones and Davis of Aberystwyth. The accounting details are supplied separately from this submission.

## **8. Project Operation and Partnerships**

As noted above, training activities adapted to evolving local needs through ongoing

consultations with our project partners. The main result of this was the shift in emphasis from short-term training for a large number of participants, to longer-term training for fewer participants. It also resulted in the splitting of the short-course training programme into two phases, with an intervening period of mentored project work.

ICPL collaborated with SPREP and USP as the main and most active partners in the project. Due to its inter-governmental coordinating role and substantial donor funding, SPREP is the leading environmental agency in the Pacific. USP is the principal provider of tertiary and post-experience training in the region, and has the highest concentration of environmental specialists in the South Pacific (discounting the Pacific rim nations). USP leads on research and training for biodiversity conservation, and top-level staff from the institution were our partners in this project. Initially, our paid Darwin Initiative collaborator was Mr Don Stewart, SPREP training coordinator based at USP. After Mr Stewart moved to a new post in New Zealand part-way through the project, our principal staff partner became Professor Bill Aalbersberg, Director of the Institute of Applied Sciences at USP. Prof Aalbersberg has been, for example, a prime mover in the development of the Fijian Locally Managed Marine Areas programme (FLMMA). This project was awarded the UNDP “Equator Prize” 2002, at the Johannesburg Earth Summit.

ICPL, SPREP and USP collaborated in designing and adapting the training materials, and staff from all three organisations taught on the training courses. As the programme developed, several other organisations based or working in the Pacific Region showed interest in the programme and were drawn into the delivery of the training courses. This provided the trainees with a still broader perspective, as well as offering the opportunity for more specialised interactions between trainees and individual experts. These organisations included:

WWF-South Pacific Programme	Peace Corps
DFID	Hideaway Resorts Ltd
Birdlife International	Mt Koroyanitu National Park
Rhode Island University	Sigatoka Sand Dunes National Park
Fiji Ministry of Housing and Environment	Fiji National Trust
Fiji Ministry of Forestry	Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific
Fiji Ministry of the Interior	SEAWEB
Fiji Ministry of Fisheries	

Activities on the project were influenced by the priorities of Fiji’s Biodiversity Strategy Office through Environment and Interior Ministry involvement in the training, and by wider regional biodiversity conservation interests focussed through SPREP’s involvement in the programme. During the lifetime of the project, collaboration occurred with several other biodiversity conservation projects in the host country of Fiji, but also widely due to linkages with many of the trainee’s parent organisations and governments.

The trainees represented 13 different nations (American Samoa, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Marshall Islands, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu) and this contributed to very broad international reach and scope of the project. In addition, several donor agencies working in the international arena contributed to the programme (NZODA, DFID, JICA, AusAid, USAID). Other organisations with international remit who assisted with or are contributing to the programme in the future, included the British High Commission in Fiji, the Equator Initiative and the MacArthur Foundation.

The local partnerships have continued to be active beyond Darwin funding, with the short-course series set to continue alongside the distance-learning programme. Our USP staff partners, including Prof W Aalbersberg and Prof R Thaman (Professor of Biogeography), are influential at high government levels in the planning of national biodiversity strategy, while SPREP continues to be the principal agent for international conservation strategy in the South Pacific region. Many of the trainees themselves have reported success in influencing policy and management decisions in their own countries, after returning from the Darwin training courses.

Due to time constraints during the first year of short-course training, limited exposure could be given to practical community participation techniques in real-world field situations in Fiji. This was addressed during the second year of the programme, when trainees took part in actual government-sponsored negotiations with local communities for the creation of new conservation areas on the Fijian coast. The trainees also assisted with ecological survey work related to private sector developments on the Fijian coast, and contributed to a shore-line protection by planting mangroves at the Tagaqe Locally Managed Marine Area (see front cover). These initial partnerships formed with local communities and the private sector proved most fruitful, and are expected to lead to greater contributory involvement of trainees in local projects and “action research” during the teaching phases of future short courses.

## **9. Monitoring and Evaluation, Lesson learning**

Training impact during the courses was measured against written pre-course and/or start-of-course expectations. Progress during Phases I and 2 of the course was assessed by formal daily monitoring sheets and an end-of-phase evaluation (Appendix ). Results from these evaluations provided guidance on how to tailor ensuing course-work yet more closely to trainee’s needs (Appendix ). Trainees and their line managers provided informal feed-back during the inter-phase period of project mentoring and execution.

Results of these assessments were uniformly positive, with all trainees indicating that they had benefited substantially from the programme. For example, pooled scores from all trainees evaluating the Year 2, Phase 2 programme on scales out of five for 14 points of content, tutors, presentation etc., averaged 88%. The recurring sentiment was that the trainees wanted more of the training, both for themselves and for colleagues who they also thought could benefit. Small dissatisfactions tended to centre on the presentational abilities of some of the external contributors. These were usually persons who presented briefings on the work of outside agencies, but who were themselves not trained teachers/lecturers.

Lessons learned from Year 1 of the training were incorporated into Year 2's activities. The principal response was the increased level of participatory as well as observational field work included in the course, which involved the trainee's contribution to real-world community-based conservation initiatives on the island of Fiji.

Feed-back from trainee's managers indicated considerable satisfaction with their staff member's performance upon returning from the Darwin Initiative course. Several managers stated that they were particularly pleased that trainees were now able to take on greater responsibilities in their grass-roots conservation extension work, and also in formal project planning and management roles.

An indicator of the project's success, according to both trainees and managers, was the renewed enthusiasm and sense of purpose with which the trainees re-joined their projects during the course inter-phase period. This, coupled with the keenness of the trainees to complete project write-ups during Phase 2 of each course, was good evidence of the

positive impact that the training was having on its recipients. Furthermore, the content of the published hard-copy Project Reports is confirmation of the real-world impact that the trainees were having at their applied conservation project sites. These initiatives were nearly all practical examples of participatory environmental management in action at the grass-roots level in the Pacific Region. They are the most tangible proof that the Darwin Initiative project was achieving its purpose of promoting the conservation and effective management of the biodiversity of Pacific Island States. They also confirm the deep commitment of the trainees and their enhanced capacity to carry this work forward beyond the phase of Darwin Initiative funding.

As indicated above, internal evaluation of the project's training impact was conducted at the end of each phase of the courses and at the conclusion of the whole course (Appendix ). Learning points were incorporated into the next phase of training. External evaluation was carried out by SPREP using the standard monitoring procedures applied to its training programmes. SPREP was eminently satisfied with the progress of the project and continued throughout to supply training staff to assist on the programme. SPREP demonstrated their approval of the way in which the project was evolving, by devoting more of its and NZODA's resources to the programme, in order to subsidise the "split" course structure and expanded schedule of practical field work. The project was also subjected to the standard assessments of the Darwin Initiative monitoring group (ECTF) and its referees, and this included an assessment at the training facility in Fiji carried out through the auspices of the British High Commission in Suva, Fiji. Referee's statements are included in Appendix .

The Year 2001 ECTF referee's evaluation concluded that "This appears a well thought-out and comprehensive project". The suggestions for more time to be devoted to participatory processes and local "ownership" issues were echoed by trainee feed-back, and were followed up by our incorporation of extensive village-level applied conservation project work in the second training year. The Year 2002 evaluation indicated that "The project is clearly achieving some important results under difficult conditions" (a reference to the slippage due to the coup in Fiji). The concern regarding the delay in the implementation of the distance-learning programme is addressed in Section 6 above (Project Outputs).



Lessons that the project partners have drawn from this project are:

- 1) The key requirement for flexibility and responsiveness to adapt to changing local needs and conditions (“adaptive project management”). We feel that this was a major strength of our partnership, in that we were able to re-jig the training at short notice to allow for externally enforced postponements, “split” training delivery, extended project mentoring, and considerably more practical field work than had been envisaged. All of this had significant extra financial and staff-time implications for the programme.
- 2) Willingness to devote the extra-time required of staff by new project circumstances and the necessity to source the extra funding needed without having to call on the project lead sponsor (i.e. the Darwin Initiative). Again we were very successful at this, attracting substantial additional funding into the programme, while at the same time staying completely within the budget of the Darwin Initiative grant.
- 3) Not to “bite off more than you can chew”. Given the extra time and (non-Darwin) resources expended on the highly successful short course training programme in Fiji, it proved beyond the capability of the partners to have the distance-learning programme up-and-running by the time that Darwin funding ceased. The output commitment of delivering the training materials was achieved, but the political coup in Fiji and the length of time needed for the committee approval process was not foreseen. However, now that the official go-ahead to launch the course has been given, the future of the distance-learning programme seems bright. USP senior management are keen for the postgraduate Biodiversity Conservation and Management course to form part of their flagship programme of distance-learning opportunities currently being rolled out across the Pacific region.

## **10. Darwin Identity:**

The Darwin Initiative logo was used on all publicity and training materials associated with the project, including Course Schedules, Training Manuals, Project Reports and Newsletters. Considerably more dissemination outputs were achieved than were originally envisaged in the project proposal, including papers published, conference attendance, national newspaper reports, newsletters and national TV and radio features(see Appendix 2).

The national print and broadcast media interest in this project in Fiji, coupled with the involvement of senior staff from several Government Ministries and the British High Commission, have contributed to a much wider familiarity with the Darwin Initiative in the principal host country. Similarly, the re-echoing of their training by the short-course participants to an additional 400-600 people in the inter-phase of the second year programme alone, indicates the “multiplier-effect” that this process is having on Darwin Initiative profile in the twelve countries to which the trainees have returned. Furthermore, the information on the Darwin courses in the SPREP Newsletter has ensured an even greater spread of Darwin Initiative awareness across the wider Pacific region.

The use of the logo and other forms of publicity summarised above, have ensured that the

this project and the Darwin Initiative as a whole are seen as extremely worthwhile contributions of the British Government to the conservation of biodiversity and promotion of sustainable livelihoods in the South Pacific region. This has helped to redress the perception, due for example to its non-membership of SPREP, that the UK has not been as fully engaged in environmental issues in the Pacific as it might have been. Working closely with SPREP on this project therefore, and achieving such a broad spread of impact across 13 Pacific nations, has done much to rectify this misconception.

## **11. Leverage**

£265,500 in additional resources were attracted into this programme from the New Zealand Overseas Development Agency, SPREP, the British High Commission, Granada Enterprises and Penguin (UK) Ltd. This exceeds by 336% the original project commitment for leveraged funding, and does not take account of the extra time and institutional resources devoted to the project by training staff who adapted to the postponement due to the coup, the “split” training delivery, the extended project mentoring and the expanded field-work component. The leverage process is continuing beyond the conclusion of Darwin funding, with current applications to several international donors to support the ongoing short-course and distance-learning programmes (e.g. MacArthur Foundation, Equator Initiative, NZODA etc).

Also not reflected in the outputs, is the extra funding won by the trainees after return to their home countries, and which is now being expended on new environmental projects across the Pacific. The need for training in project-pursuit and fund-raising was specifically identified during pre-course planning, and a whole “module” on this topic was therefore included in the programme (see Appendix and course content on CD-ROM). Project staff were able to coach the trainees on trends in development aid, donor agency priorities, and “how to make successful grant applications” as part of each course. This component was particularly appreciated by trainees, and resulted in several new proposals being submitted upon return to their home projects. For example, Year 1 trainee Faafetai Sagapolutele successfully petitioned AusAid (Australia) for funding to eradicate the alien rat population at Nuutele Island, Samoa. Since the successful conclusion of this project, the Island’s candidacy for World Heritage Site status has been upgraded. Similarly, Year 1 trainee Sione Faka’osi also succeeded in attracting funding from AusAid for a national waste-management programme in Tonga that has involved local communities for the first time in pollution-control and re-cycling.

## **12. Sustainability and Legacy**

The prime aim of this project - to establish local capacity for biodiversity conservation management through short-course and distance-learning methods of training in the South Pacific - has been achieved. The training materials have been prepared and handed over, and are fully adaptable to the changing conditions in the region. The short-course model has been piloted, refined and repeated, and is continuing with the full support of the leading environmental organisation in the Pacific (SPREP), the leading training institution (USP), and donors who have pledged their ongoing support for the scheme. The distance learning initiative has been brought to the launch phase and, based on

results elsewhere in the world (e.g. ICPL's equivalent programme in East Africa that has been running successfully for several years) should also create a lasting impact on biodiversity conservation planning and management in the Pacific region. Project resources and staff have remained in place and are being built upon at SPREP and USP. The UK and Pacific partners are still regularly in touch to promote the ongoing short-course and distance-learning programmes together.

Another enduring legacy of the project is the wider impact that the trainees are having on biodiversity conservation and management in the Pacific region. They are applying their new skills and capabilities through individual project activity and advisory inputs to strategic planning in a dozen nation-states of the South Pacific. These influences will continue to spread throughout the region as future trainees undertake the programme. The project partners have continued to keep in touch with course "alumni", who have been assisted with project write-ups, new grant applications and the securing of funding for further advanced training (e.g. MScs and PhDs).

### **13. Post-Project Follow up Activities**

Based on the successful outcomes of this project, and cognisant of the continuing need for support to maintain the growth of the main source of *local provision* in postgraduate distance-learning for biodiversity conservation in the world's largest geographical region, there is strong justification for continued assistance to this programme from Darwin Initiative sources.

There is a vital requirement for conservators with strategic biodiversity planning and management skills to fill key administrative and project management positions in governments and NGOs of the Pacific island states. The need is urgent in order to address the problems of global warming and sea-level rise, and the pressures on biodiversity and natural resources caused by population increase and economic development in the region. The legacy of this Darwin Initiative Pacific Training programme will only be fully realised when the distance-learning component has been running smoothly for some time (there is a minimum two-year lead-time for participants to graduate from the programme). However, the key advantage of the open-learning model is that participants stay in-post and can begin to apply their new skills immediately upon commencement of their training. They also have access to "real-time" mentoring support from their tutors when pushing forward their grass-roots conservation initiatives.

Distance learning is the fastest growing mode of education world-wide according to the United Nations University, and the open-learning model offers an obvious solution to the problem of remote access faced by far-flung island states in the Pacific region. For this reason, SPREP and USP are embracing the distance learning model as a commitment to the Darwin Initiative project follow-up activities. However, SPREP and USP are still in need of specialist assistance to guide them through the early years of the biodiversity conservation and management programme distance-learning programme. The partnership of ICPL, SPREP and USP are therefore keen to be considered for Darwin Initiative post-project funding that would allow for further exchange of staff exchanges and student

enrolment. This would allow ICPL to continue its monitoring, evaluation and quality control role during the academic and administrative development of the programme.

#### **14. Value for money**

For a total cost of only £125,800, the Darwin Initiative has established strong *local capacity* for the delivery of short-course and distance-learning training in biodiversity conservation management in the South Pacific region. 28 key individuals representing 13 different nations have each received 8 weeks of direct training inclusive of field work in Fiji, plus 5-months and more of project mentoring. They have also re-echoed their experience to hundreds of other stakeholders in community-based natural resource management projects across the Pacific region. Dozens of conservation projects have been assisted and written-up as a result of the project activity, and many public and private sector agencies and civil society organisations have been brought into partnership for conservation action by the programme. Double the Darwin subvention has been raised from other sources to support the programme and drive it forward, and the Darwin Initiative imprint is firmly enshrined in the crucial conservation work that this project is leaving as a lasting legacy in the South Pacific region.

Compared to the per-person cost of comparable post-experience courses at UK universities for example, the direct training impact alone represents excellent value for money. When the other impacts, multiplier effects and future “invisible earnings” for conservation and the securing of people’s livelihoods are taken into account, the value for money represented by this project more than justifies the investment devoted to it. It is a clear testament to the vision and efficiency of the Darwin Initiative concept for “seed-corn” funding of biodiversity conservation measures across the globe.

**Author(s) / Date**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Shaun Russell". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dr Shaun Russell  
Programme Manager  
International Centre for Protected Landscapes

20<sup>th</sup> September, 2003.

## 15. Appendix I: Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity

The Darwin Initiative Pacific Islands Community-based Conservation Courses included training in all of the areas covered by the Articles listed below. Individual trainees specialised in one or other of these areas, and in some cases have been able to influence their home governments at the policy level on these issues. However, the project as a whole can be classified as having had its principal impact in the general area of training and research, as reflected in the percentages entered below.

<b>Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity</b>		
<b>Article No./Title</b>	<b>Project %</b>	<b>Article Description</b>
<b>6. General Measures for Conservation &amp; Sustainable Use</b>	3	Develop national strategies which integrate conservation and sustainable use.
<b>7. Identification and Monitoring</b>	8	Identify and monitor components of biological diversity, particularly those requiring urgent conservation; identify processes and activities which have adverse effects; maintain and organise relevant data.
<b>8. In-situ Conservation</b>	8	Establish systems of protected areas with guidelines for selection and management; regulate biological resources, promote protection of habitats; manage areas adjacent to protected areas; restore degraded ecosystems and recovery of threatened species; control risks associated with organisms modified by biotechnology; control spread of alien species; ensure compatibility between sustainable use of resources and their conservation; protect traditional lifestyles and knowledge on biological resources.
<b>9. Ex-situ Conservation</b>	2	Adopt ex-situ measures to conserve and research components of biological diversity, preferably in country of origin; facilitate recovery of threatened species; regulate and manage collection of biological resources.
<b>10. Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity</b>	8	Integrate conservation and sustainable use in national decisions; protect sustainable customary uses; support local populations to implement remedial actions; encourage co-operation between governments and the private sector.
<b>11. Incentive Measures</b>	4	Establish economically and socially sound incentives to conserve and promote sustainable use of biological diversity.
<b>12. Research and Training</b>	50	Establish programmes for scientific and technical education in identification, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity components; promote research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of

		biological diversity, particularly in developing countries (in accordance with SBSTTA recommendations).
<b>13. Public Education and Awareness</b>	3	Promote understanding of the importance of measures to conserve biological diversity and propagate these measures through the media; cooperate with other states and organisations in developing awareness programmes.
<b>14. Impact Assessment and Minimizing Adverse Impacts</b>	8	Introduce EIAs of appropriate projects and allow public participation; take into account environmental consequences of policies; exchange information on impacts beyond State boundaries and work to reduce hazards; promote emergency responses to hazards; examine mechanisms for re-dress of international damage.
<b>15. Access to Genetic Resources</b>	2	Whilst governments control access to their genetic resources they should also facilitate access of environmentally sound uses on mutually agreed terms; scientific research based on a country's genetic resources should ensure sharing in a fair and equitable way of results and benefits.
<b>16. Access to and Transfer of Technology</b>	1	Countries shall ensure access to technologies relevant to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity under fair and most favourable terms to the source countries (subject to patents and intellectual property rights) and ensure the private sector facilitates such assess and joint development of technologies.
<b>17. Exchange of Information</b>	2	Countries shall facilitate information exchange and repatriation including technical scientific and socio-economic research, information on training and surveying programmes and local knowledge
<b>19. Bio-safety Protocol</b>	1	Countries shall take legislative, administrative or policy measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities and to ensure all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis, especially where they provide the genetic resources for such research.
<b>Total %</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Check % = total 100</b>

## 16. Appendix II Outputs

Please quantify and briefly describe all project outputs using the coding and format of the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures.

Code	Total to date (reduce box)	Detail (←expand box)
<b>Training Outputs</b>		
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis	
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained	
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained	
3	Number of other qualifications obtained	
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training	
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students	
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)	
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students	
5	Number of people receiving other forms of <b>long-term</b> (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification( i.e not categories 1-4 above)	
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of <b>short-term</b> education/training (i.e not categories 1-5 above)	28 trainees at 8-weeks each. Commitment was for 120 trainees at 2-weeks each; but contact time was quadrupled in response to stakeholder needs for quality instead of quantity (explained in Section 6 above)
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	16 training weeks (exceeded 8 week commitment by 100%). 10 months mentored conservation project work was also conducted (not envisaged in the original project proposal)
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s)	2 (2 vols + CD-ROM short-course training manual, and 8 vols distance-learning manual). Exceeded stated commitment by addition of digital media to hard-copy output.
<b>Research Outputs</b>		
8	Number of weeks spent by UK project staff on project work in host country(s)	10 weeks. Exceeded commitment of 6-weeks by 67%. 16 person-weeks in-country exceeded commitment of 12 person-weeks by 33%.
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (s)	
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.	
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for	1 (paper on this project commissioned

<b>Code</b>	<b>Total to date (reduce box)</b>	<b>Detail (←expand box)</b>
	publication in peer reviewed journals	by Journal of the International Ranger Federation – in prep). Equals commitment.
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere	17 (see Appendix ). This is an additional output, not envisaged in the original project proposal.
12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country	
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic information) and handed over to host country	
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)	
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)	
<b>Dissemination Outputs</b>		
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work	
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops <b>attended</b> at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	1 (World Parks Congress, Durban 2003). This is an additional output, not envisaged in the original project proposal. Due to the interest shown in this project by conservation trainers, the results of the project will be exposed at several more national and international meetings in the future.
15a	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	6 (Fiji national, SPREP international) (exceeds commitment by 200%)
15b	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	
15c	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in UK	
15d	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in UK	No publicity article on the project has been released in the UK (commitment was for one). However, this will be remedied by the forthcoming paper in the Ranger's Journal (see 11a above).
16a	Number of issues of newsletters produced in the host country(s)	3 (SPREP newsletters). This is an additional output, not envisaged in the original project proposal.
16b	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(s)	2000 (trans-Pacific). This is an additional output, not envisaged in the original project proposal.
16c	Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK	30? This is an additional output, not envisaged in the original project proposal.
17a	Number of dissemination networks established	
17b	Number of dissemination networks enhanced or extended	
18a	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(s)	1 (Fijian national TV news). This is an additional output, not envisaged in the



<b>Code</b>	<b>Total to date (reduce box)</b>	<b>Detail (←expand box)</b>
		original project proposal.
18b	Number of national TV programme/features in the UK	1 (incidental, in BBC 1 documentary about Project Leader's family in Fiji). This is an additional output, not envisaged in the original project proposal.
18c	Number of local TV programme/features in host country	
18d	Number of local TV programme features in the UK	
19a	Number of national radio interviews/features in host country(s)	2. This is an additional output, not envisaged in the original project proposal.
19b	Number of national radio interviews/features in the UK	
19c	Number of local radio interviews/features in host country (s)	
19d	Number of local radio interviews/features in the UK	
<b>Physical Outputs</b>		
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)	
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisations established	2 (Capacitation: SPREP Training Unit, Apia, Samoa and Distance-learning Unit, Institute of Applied Sciences, University of the South Pacific, Fiji). Equals project commitment.
22	Number of permanent field plots established	1 (Mangrove monitoring plot at Tagaqe Local Marine Management Area, Fiji). This is an additional output, not envisaged in the original project proposal.
23	Value of additional resources raised for project	Approx £265,500 (exceeds commitment by 379%, and contributes to post Darwin project sustainability).

## 17. Appendix III: Publications

Provide full details of all publications and material produced over the last year that can be publicly accessed. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website Publications Database.

Mark (\*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report

Type *	Detail	Publishers	Available from	Cost £
<i>(e.g. journal paper, book, manual, CD)</i>	<i>(e.g. title, authors, journal, year, pages)</i>	<i>(name, city)</i>	<i>(e.g. contact address, email address, website)</i>	
MANUAL*	Community-Based Training for the Pacific Island States: A Manual for Trainers and Facilitators Vols 1 & 2	ICPL Aberystwyth © C. Falzon	International Centre for Protected Landscapes Aberystwyth SY23 3AH UK <a href="http://www.protected-landscapes.org">www.protected-landscapes.org</a>	P.O.A.
CD-ROM*	Community-Based Training for the Pacific Island States: A Manual for Trainers and Facilitators. CD-ROM	ICPL Aberystwyth © C. Falzon	International Centre for Protected Landscapes Aberystwyth SY23 3AH UK <a href="http://www.protected-landscapes.org">www.protected-landscapes.org</a>	P.O.A.
REPORT*	Project Reports from the 2002 Pacific Island Community-based Conservation Course. IAS Technical Report No. 2002/12 (ed. W Aalbersberg)	IAS, USP, Suva, Fiji	Institute of Applied Sciences, University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji <a href="mailto:aalbersberg@usp.ac.fj">aalbersberg@usp.ac.fj</a>	Free + postage
REPORT*	Case Studies from the 2002 Pacific Island Community-based Conservation Course. IAS Technical Report No. 2002/13 (ed. W Aalbersberg)	IAS, USP, Suva, Fiji	Institute of Applied Sciences, University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji <a href="mailto:aalbersberg@usp.ac.fj">aalbersberg@usp.ac.fj</a>	Free + postage
MANUAL	Protected Landscape Management Postgraduate Training Manual (8 volumes)	© ICPL Aberystwyth	International Centre for Protected Landscapes Aberystwyth SY23 3AH UK <a href="http://www.protected-landscapes.org">www.protected-landscapes.org</a>	P.O.A.

## 18. Appendix IV: Darwin Contacts

To assist us with future evaluation work and feedback on your report , please provide contact details below.

<b>Project Title</b>	BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION TRAINING –PACIFIC ISLAND STATES
<b>Ref. No.</b>	162/8/009
<b>UK Leader Details</b>	
Name	Dr Shaun Russell
Role within Darwin Project	Project Leader and Trainer
Address	International Centre for Protected Landscapes, Unit 8E Science Park, Aberystwyth SY23 3AH
Phone	01286 881868
Fax	01286 882920
Email	sruss@gwyned.u-net.com
<b>Other UK Contact (if relevant)</b>	
Name	Charles Falzon
Role within Darwin Project	Training materials development and delivery
Address	International Centre for Protected Landscapes, Unit 8E Science Park, Aberystwyth SY23 3AH
Phone	01970 622620
Fax	01970 622619
Email	chuck.enviro@virgin.net
<b>Partner 1</b>	
Name	Prof W Aalbersberg
Organisation	Director, Institute of Applied Sciences
Website address	www.usp.ac.fj/ias/
Role within Darwin Project	Host country lead partner. Training materials development and delivery
Address	Institute of Applied Sciences, University of the South Pacific, Laucala Bay Campus, Suva, Fiji
Fax	00 679 302548
Email	aalbersberg@usp.ac.fj
<b>Partner 2 (if relevant)</b>	
Name	Frank Wickham, Training Officer
Organisation	South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme
Role within Darwin Project	Liaison and trainee support
Address	Frank Wickham, SPREP, Apia, Samoa
Fax	00 685 20231
Email	Frank Wickham <irc@sprep.org.ws>

PICCC Course participants – 2001  
PHOTO

PICCC Course participants -2002  
PHOTO

## 19. APPENDIX V: PICCC COURSE PARTICIPANTS

### YEAR 1 TRAINEES (2001)

1. Miram Ankeid, EPA/Jaluit Conservation Project, Majuro, Marshall Islands
2. Alice Athy, Environment Unit, Port Vila, Vanuatu
3. Nathaniel da Wheya, Environment and Conservation Division, Solomon Islands
4. John Ericho, Research and Conservation Foundation, Boroko, Papua New Guinea
5. Afele Failagi, Division of Environment and Conservation, Samoa
6. Sione Faka'osi, Environment Planning and Conservation Section, Ministry of Lands, Tonga
7. Robert Jackson, Development Review Commission, Kosrae, Federated States of Micronesia
8. Ian Karika, Takitumu Conservation Area, Rarotonga, Cook Islands
9. Simione Koto, Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific, Fiji
10. Ilebrang Olkeriil, Palau Conservation Society, Koror, Palau
11. John Pita, Arnavon Marine Conservation Area, Solomon Islands
12. Faafetai Sagapolutele, Division of Environment and Conservation, Samoa
13. Harry Saul, The Nature Conservancy, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia
14. Unaisi Tawake, Koroyanitu Conservation Project, Fiji
15. Masani Togiamana, Community Affairs Officer, Huvalu Forest Conservation Area Project, Niue

### YEAR 2 TRAINEES (2002)

1. Latu Afioga, District Officer, Aleipata Marine Protected Area, Samoa
2. Pulea Etiseli, District Officer, Safata Marine Protected Area, Samoa
3. David Kau, Parks and Wildlife Ranger, Baiyer River Sanctuary, Papua New Guinea
4. Alifereti Naikatini, Senior Technician, South Pacific Regional Herbarium, Fiji
5. Bruno Manele, WWF Marine Conservation Coordinator, Western Province, Solomon Islands
6. Modi Pontio, Community Trainer, Milne Bay Marine Conservation Programme, Papua New Guinea
7. Fatima Sauafea, Head of Community-based Fisheries Programme, American Samoa
8. Wayne Salavea, Extension Officer, Community-based Fisheries Programme, American Samoa
9. Pitasoni Tanaki, Chairman, Hakupu Heritage and Cultural Park Executive Committee, Niue
10. Rolenas Tavue, Community Conservation Officer, Vathe Conservation Area, Vanuatu
11. Neneteis Teariki, Biodiversity and Conservation Officer, Environment and Conservation Division, Kiribati
12. Lameko Tesimale, Environmental Education Officer, Division of Environment and Conservation, Samoa
13. Donald Waleani, Village Demonstration Worker, Gela Island, Solomon Islands

## 20. APPENDIX VI: YEAR ONE TRAINEE CONSERVATION PROJECTS\*

1. Miram Ankeid (Marshall Islands): Local co-management and planning of conservation areas in the Marshall Islands.
2. Alice Athy (Vanuatu): Establishment of a botanical garden and traditional medicine clinic at Rango Rango, Vanuatu.
3. Nathaniel Lix da Wheya (Solomon Islands): Leatherback Turtle tagging and nest monitoring survey, Sasakolo nesting beach, Isabel Province, Solomon Islands.
4. John Ericho (Papua New Guinea): Boundary mapping and land-use analysis at Crater Mountain Conservation Area, PNG.
5. Afele Failagi (Samoa): Infrastructure management planning for the coastal zone of Samoa.
6. Sione Faka'osi (Tonga): Solid waste management in Lifuka and Foa, Ha'apai: a participatory and collaborative management approach.
7. Ian Karika (Cook Islands): Geographical information system mapping of the Kaakepai Bird Reserve, Rarotonga.
8. Robert Jackson (Federated States of Micronesia): Biological and economic values of a *Terminalia corolensis* stand.
9. Simione Koto (Fiji): Conflict management for the Cuvu "Coral Garden" and "Waibulabula" Projects.
10. Ilebrang Olkeril (Palau): Conflict management between key stakeholders in the Rock Islands Conservation Area, Palau.
11. John Pita (Solomon Islands): Household survey of the Waghena community on the socio-economic impacts of a Marine Protected Area.
12. Faafetai Sagapolutele (Samoa): Baseline survey for the rat eradication programme at Nuutele Island, Samoa.
13. Harry Saul (Federated States of Micronesia): Protecting Pohnpei's native forests by extending the "Grow Low" campaign.
14. Unaisi Tawake (Fiji): Traditional knowledge as an interpretive tool in Fijian conservation areas.
15. Masani Togiamana (Niue): Resource Assessment - Ana Marine Reserve, Niue.

\* Copies of PICCC Year 1 Project Reports available upon request from ICPL and USP.

## **21. APPENDIX VII: YEAR TWO TRAINEE CONSERVATION PROJECTS\***

### PROJECTS

Island's Struggle for Sustainability: Challenges in Establishing Marine Protected Areas in Gizo, Solomon Islands - Bruno Manele (Solomon Islands)

An Analysis of the Community Engagement Program for Milne Bay Community-Based Coastal and Marine Conservation Project, Papua New Guinea - Modi Pontio (Papua New Guinea)

The Naboka Mangrove Forest: Importance and Interpretation - Alivereti Naikatini (Fiji)

Human Impacts on the Distribution of the Nanerri (*Mimusops eiengi*) - Rolenas Tavue (Vanuatu)

Cultural Uses of Terrestrial Flora of North Tarawa Conservation Area - Neneteiti Teariki Ruatu (Kiribati)

Stakeholder Planning and Consultation for the Integration Of Conservation and Infrastructure Management - Lameko Tesimale (Samoa)

Aleipata Marine Protected Area Community-Based Permanent Baseline Study - Latu Afioga (Samoa)

Safata Marine Protected Area Draft Management Plan - Focus Group Consultations: An Exercise in Raising Awareness, Understanding and Getting Feedback from Key Social Groups - Pulea Ifopo (Samoa)

### CASE STUDIES

Challenges of Dealing with Land Issues in Community-Based Conservation Projects - Rolenas Tavue (Vanuatu)

Prohibition of Fish Traps in Aleipata Marine Protected Area in Samoa - Latu Afioga (Samoa)

The Impacts of Infrastructure Development on the Coastal Environment of Fagaloa Bay, Upolu Island, Samoa - Lameko Tesimale (Samoa)

Competing Interests in Biodiversity Conservation: A Case Study of the Milne Bay Community-Based Coastal and Marine Conservation Project - Modi Pontio (Papua New Guinea)

Over-Exploitation of Terrestrial Resources in North Tarawa Conservation Area - Neneteiti Teariki Ruatu (Kiribati)

The Korotogo Mangrove Forest Case Study - Alifereti Naikatini (Fiji)

On the Race for Eggs: A Case Study on the Overall Outcome of the Megapode Management on the Island Of Simbo, Solomon Islands - Bruno Manele (Solomon Islands)

\*published by the University of the South Pacific in the Institute of Applied Sciences Technical Reports Series, 2002/12 and 2002/13

## 22. APPENDIX VIII: ECTF PROJECT MONITORING – REFEREE’S COMMENTS

2001

“All the initial concerns and queries were answered after further information was forwarded by the Project Leader. This appears a well thought out and comprehensive project.

This is no criticism of the project but I wonder if a little more time could be effectively spent in looking at participatory processes as a way of building consensus and, hopefully, avoiding conflicts over the way in which the biodiversity and conservation programmes are implemented. I note, from the workshop outline, that one and a half days are indicated for working through participation and conflict management although the field exercise following these inputs may well integrate these concepts.

In the same context I note that later course will be targeting local village conservation officer level and I wonder if there is any plan to later take the ideas out to train at village level to build indigenous capacity and enable a greater sense of ownership of ideas. (This may be outside the remit of the project but a consideration for the future?) It does, as we are all aware, often place considerable conflicts when "outside" biodiversity and conservation issues seem to intrude on locally held beliefs and ways of managing natural resources. Initiatives coming from people in the locality who are directly affected by shortages or imposition of restrictions are more effective than externally driven initiatives. I recognise that belief systems are being dealt with at the beginning of the programme and this should enable the great variety of experiences (with 12 nationalities!) to be discussed.”

2002

“The project is clearly achieving some important results under difficult conditions. The main concern is for the delay in the implementation of the distance learning programme as mentioned elsewhere.

Although the project write-ups (listed in Appendix 2) were unexpected, they are rightly welcomed in the annual report as they extend the potential benefits of the training programmes. It would be helpful to know how the course participants will follow up their projects. This particular activity could be usefully expanded in future perhaps through finding partners, advisors or collaborators to assist with project development. Or perhaps this is already taking place? Regarding the current batch of project reports, it would be helpful to have some assessment of the quality of the project work, and of how representative it might be when compared with the range of threats and challenges to the region's biodiversity.”



## 23. APPENDIX IX: SUMMARY OF TRAINEES' DAILY MONITORING SHEETS

### SUMMARY OF DAILY MONITORING SHEET (Day 11: Monday 26 February 2001) - 12 respondents

#### 1. What sessions were most effective?

- All the sessions today were very very interesting
- Charlie and Shaun's sessions were interactive and lively, so it was good
- Today's sessions were one of the best so far (for the past weeks), very practical and applicable; a lot of visual aid and interesting; sessions were short and we knocked off early
- ICDP and SOE (strategy and site level reporting)
- Six steps for integration
- Sessions were most effective • Last session
- All sessions were of benefit
- Sessions were the best because it used real examples and it forced us to use what we learned to integrate in the sessions; good use of visual aids
- Case study on SWOT; video presentation; first time ever we finished on time!
- Generally today's sessions were very interesting with the two gentlemen from England. The session on SOE 2 was most effective as some of it relates to the situation back home

#### 2. What sessions could have been improved?

- Needed handouts to read up and be conversant in the discussions
- Generally okay
- None
- Morning session
- All the sessions were well presented
- For the case study, it would have been good if we had a copy of the case study beforehand
- Hand out on case study could have been given in advance so that we can read it the night before, it will save a lot of time on group exercises
- Some additional input on the 6 steps to integration by way of group discussions and presentation

#### 3. What would have made the sessions more effective?

- More participation from participants
- Working on a case study
- Pre-handout for the next day sessions
- Someone to clean tables so there would be no ants
- Eagerness of participants to interact with facilitators

## 24. APPENDIX X: EXAMPLE OF END OF PHASE EVALUATION

### PICCC 2002

#### Phase 1 Evaluation

##### Participant feedback - suggestions for additional content and materials, Phase 2:

- Environmental Information Systems: GIS full session and practice needed; information-exchange protocols and the use of database software.
- Conflict management case study from each participant (possibly from their projects) that could be addressed by the whole group as a problem-solving exercise
- More practice at EIA, particularly in conjunction with a field visit
- More practice at inter-personal skills development, to enhance capability for mobilisation of participation in community projects
- Overview and additional clarity on the interrelationships and integration of different methodologies such as BAP, SoE, EIA, SEA etc.
- More field work and site-visits, e.g. to an ICD project where participatory rural appraisal is being undertaken
- More on simple and inexpensive techniques for grass roots extension work and outreach programmes
- Communication: training on how to design and establish a website for our work/projects
- Information on how to obtain field equipment and other relevant materials for survey and project work, e.g. biological supplies catalogues and websites
- Information on small-grant schemes in the Pacific
- Establish a network of course alumni to allow for interchange and collaborative project visits (funding required)
- Letters of recommendation from the course providers to sponsors and line managers, detailing the enhanced skills levels of the participants and their consequent suitability for taking on additional responsibilities (i.e. promotion and salary increases)!

##### EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONS IN POST-COURSE GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:

1. Please indicate how you have used your PICCC training
  - a) Specific areas of your work that have benefited (names of projects/tasks)
  - b) How many other people (e.g. colleagues, project stakeholders) have benefited from the training input and materials that you have received?
2. How do you think you will be using your PICCC training in the future?

## 25. APPENDIX XI: EXAMPLE PRESS RELEASE

(PREPARED BY PICCC YEAR 1 COURSE PARTICIPANTS AND ISSUED TO PRINT AND BROADCAST MEDIA IN SUVA, FIJI, March 2001)

### “CONSERVATION CRUSADERS CONVENE”

Over the last month, the University of the South Pacific (USP) has played host to 15 conservationists from across the Pacific, who have important roles as the region explores new approaches to address its needs for development and environmental protection.

The first Pacific Islands Community-based Conservation Training Course has been running at the Institute of Applied Sciences (IAS) at the Laucala Bay campus of USP. The course has attracted key environmental management personnel from 11 Pacific nations: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu and Fiji.

The course is supported by the UK Government's Darwin Initiative programme of aid for conservation of biological diversity in developing countries, and the New Zealand Pacific Initiative for the Environment through the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). Trainers from SPREP, USP, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) Pacific, the Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific (FSP), and the International Centre for Protected Landscapes (ICPL) whose materials have been adapted for the course, have been working with the participants on exercises that aim to simulate and resolve major problems of conservation and development in the Pacific region.

The group has carried out field exercises at Colo-I-Suva Forest Park, Mt Koroyanitu National Park, Verata Tikina Community-managed Marine Area, Sigatoka Sand Dunes National Park, Lami Refuse Dump and the new Naboro Landfill site. Among its many tasks the group has practised negotiation skills in land-tenure conflicts, designed an environmental interpretation policy for a forest area, developed a business plan for a conservation-based micro-enterprise, studied donor-spending on environmental aid in the region, and analysed the impacts of tourism on Pacific ecosystems.

Miram Ankeid of the EPA/Jaluit Conservation Project in the Marshall Islands commented: “We all hope to apply what we have learned here, back in our own home countries.” “It has been a high pressure programme but very worthwhile” said John Ericho of the Research & Conservation Foundation in Papua New Guinea. Says Faafetai Sagapolutele of the Division of Environment and Conservation in Samoa: “We really have learned a lot on this course and the skills I have acquired will benefit my work as a biodiversity manager in my home country.” “Our studies of pollution management initiatives in Fiji are very relevant to problems we are facing in Niue” said Masani Togiamana of the Huvalu Forest Conservation Area Project. And Alice Athy of the Government Conservation Unit in Port Vila, Vanuatu said “Our exposure to conflict-resolution in local community-based conservation projects has opened up my mind to very useful new techniques. I will definitely apply them to problems of natural resource use in Vanuatu.”

Dr Shaun Russell of the International Centre for Protected Landscapes in the UK says: “The training programme has emphasised that preservation of the diversity of plant and animal life in the Pacific Islands is best assured when local communities benefit economically from conservation. Small-scale conservation-based enterprises, including locally owned and managed tourism operations, are one way of doing this.”

Prof. Bill Aalbersberg, Director of the Institute of Applied Sciences at USP says: “This is the kind of practical, problem-solving training course that is most relevant to our needs here in the Pacific. The programme will continue later in the year here in Fiji, with a further four-week course in September. In the interim participants are practising what they have learned by carrying on conservation projects back at their home sites. We plan to run more such courses in ensuing years, including a distance postgraduate programme for environmental managers from across the region.”