

**ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES AND INVOLVEMENT OF PARTIES:
OBSERVATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS**

Analysis to understand the efficacy of collaboration in Pohnpei must first begin with a look at the parties, the role they play, and their appropriate fit for collaboration. This chapter will examine the specific challenges facing participants, particularly those dealing with capacity, legitimacy, and clarity of authority. The quality of participation that allows collaborative processes to function effectively will also be analyzed. An effective participant is defined as a party that represents its interests, is accountable to its constituencies, has the ability to contribute to the collaborative process and is considered a resource (e.g. generate ideas, provides information/expertise, provides funding, etc.), and has the authority to agree to the strategies or solutions devised by the collaboration as well as capacity to implement activities.

The analysis continues with examining how parties came to be involved (through the education workshops) and why they continue to be involved (derived benefits such as skill development and learning opportunities). The ability of parties to work together and ways of improving the collaborative process were also analyzed. Though no one clear structure of working together was identified, all those interviewed stated that working together was key for watershed management. Lack of coordination of activities and communication between parties were seen as issues to address for improving the collaborative process. Similar to the previous chapter, key observations are derived from interviews and linked with challenges and accomplishments.

The chapter concludes by summarizing the issues examined in both this chapter as well as in Chapter Three to identify five key areas to focus efforts to improve efficacy of watershed management on the island. The five key areas are: 1) enforcement; 2) building capacity in both communities and the Division of Forestry to co-manage; 3) developing political will for participatory management and commitment to a collaborative approach; 4) increasing communication between groups and improving overall coordination; and 5) mitigating effects of shifting to a cash economy.

Figure 7. Summary of results for party roles and challenges

Parties	Ideal Roles	Collaborative participation challenges
Division of Forestry	Technical assistance and enforcement	Lack of clear roles and responsibilities for itself; ineffective leadership; inability to garner state funds
Non-governmental organizations	Consultant providing technical, capacity-building, and fundraising assistance	Overburdened with majority of management responsibilities and coordination of activities resulting in inequality between parties
Municipal governments	Increased involvement in watershed activities	Lack of legitimacy due to the area being public lands, lack of funding, lack of infrastructure and personnel to conduct activities
Traditional leaders	Hands-on involvement and active support	Traditional leaders are not always accountable to their communities; lack of accountability measures that can be applied to traditional leaders; individual personalities affecting efficacy
Communities	Manage and coordinate activities for their watershed areas	Lack of skills and capacity to manage; lack of people to take on such roles; lack of credible representatives as well as institutions to engage in collaboration

The Unique Roles, Contributions, and Challenges of Organizations and Parties

The primary parties involved with watershed management on the island are: the Division of Forestry, non-governmental organizations (namely The Nature Conservancy

and the Conservation Society of Pohnpei), traditional leaders at both the village and wehi levels, and municipal governments. As with many efforts involving multiple parties, collaborative efforts and organizational structures evolve to take advantage of strengths and to mitigate weaknesses. As expressed by a state agency representative, “that’s what’s good about a team, shore up each other’s weaknesses.” Involving multiple parties also helps to insure effective management stated one person, “the more organizations involved, the more stable the situation...the way it [watershed management program] has evolved, it has optimal buy-in of groups that it didn’t before.” Indeed, during the interviews, parties from all segments of the program agreed that everyone should work together to manage the watershed, “in order to have a successful watershed management program, all should be involved.” Another stated it as a “responsibility [that] is shared by everyone.”

However, when participants were asked about the different roles each group played in watershed management, not all agreed about whether or not current roles were an appropriate fit regarding responsibilities, management, effectiveness, and ways in which parties should be working together. Indeed, the current roles organizations and parties fill have resulted from the evolution of the program and specifically the challenges and deficits regarding capacity the parties have tried to address and overcome. As such, the current situation does not reflect what role certain organizations and institutions should ideally play in watershed management and whether or not this leads to more effective management. The following sections will first look at current roles played by organizations and parties, reveal the opinions of those interviewed on roles each should be fulfilling, and then analyze the appropriate fit in terms of capacity and efficacy

of these expected roles.⁵⁶ This discussion will also continue to reference additional challenges and accomplishments derived from Chapter Three and interviews.

The role of the state as represented by the Division of Forestry. Though the 1987 law endows the Division of Forestry (DoF) with management and regulatory responsibilities for the watershed, the backlash by villagers against DoF as well as the lack of funding and capacity issues (limited staff and natural resource management expertise) have prevented DoF from taking on this management role. In addition, part of the role of DoF is fund generation through budget requests for watershed management activities from the state. However, though it is not clear what prevents DoF from effectively garnering such funds from the state, this role has also been problematic for the division.⁵⁷ As the agency having the backing of the 1987 law and representing the state, DoF should also be able to provide parties with advice on the legitimacy and accountability of watershed management strategies and activities against what has been legislatively outlined and authorized. However, this guidance is also absent. As one person noted, “it [watershed management] should be the state’s responsibility because the law says so...but state can’t meet its responsibilities yet.”

Given these issues, the NGO community, namely The Nature Conservancy and Conservation Society of Pohnpei, have stepped in to fill these roles because it has the

⁵⁶ The challenges facing effective collaboration regarding fit and capacity of the parties involved are more extensively examined in Appendix E.

⁵⁷ Given that Pohnpei is still a developing state and has relied on Compact funding from the U.S., the state may not have funds to appropriate to watershed management activities or may not feel, given competing issues of education, health care and overall development, that the watershed merits funding. Another possible reason why DoF has been unable to garner state funds may also deal with the fact that the agency itself is still developing and has gone through several reorganizations. As a result, a budgetary process in which yearly budget submissions to the state may not have reached the normative stage, thereby disrupting fund generation. Another reason may also be lack of a key decision-making figure with leadership and authority skills able to effectively steer budgetary requests to the state for watershed management activities.

resources and capacity to do so. As such, the role of DoF has been delegated to a more supportive position where it is involved in activities such as education initiatives in schools, assisting farmers with nursery seedlings, attending meetings of the PRMC, and conducting limited outreach with communities. However, given the fact that the watershed areas are public lands and the 1987 law is a state law endowing the DoF with management responsibilities, the involvement of the NGO organizations (though understandable given the vacuum of capacity), has implications for accountability for DoF. In other words, the NGO organizations have taken over much of the DoF role so that DoF has no incentive to improve its capacity to take on a much larger role and involvement in watershed management activities as laid out by the law. This release of responsibilities to NGOs can lead to a debilitating dependence by DoF on others to fulfill its role.⁵⁸ The current situation also raises expectations of other parties involved that the NGO organizations should have the role they currently play (that this is the norm), placing an unfair burden on NGOs while also further decreasing expectations (and incentives) for the state to step up to its responsibilities.⁵⁹ As one person noted, “now, government is subservient to the public interest groups, which is not good for watershed management. Government has lost confidence in itself in this area.” A similar

⁵⁸ Such a situation can also foster resentment when the capacity and resources available to one organization is so unbalanced as to create feelings of inequity with other parties in the collaboration.

⁵⁹ Given the current realities of the situation (e.g. lack of capacity, expertise, staff, funds), it will take time for DoF to develop the capacity to take on such a larger role in management. In fact, the author does not contend that DoF should take on a coordinating role (during the interviews, only one person thought the state should play a coordinating role). In many collaborative cases in the U.S. where federal agencies, also charged by law for management responsibilities and facing lack of funding and capacity, do not play coordinating roles, but instead are one of many other parties involved in the collaborative effort. However, unlike the DoF, these federal agencies play significant roles because they provide the legitimacy, technical knowledge, funds, advice, and solution generating skills for collaborative efforts. Whether DoF can take on such a role remains to be seen. However, the author makes the point of the deficit in DoF’s role to underlie the effects the current situation has regarding future implications for effective watershed management.

observation was also made recently by a UNDP consultant assessing a grant to the watershed management project:

The impression gained during the MTE [mid-term evaluation] is that NGO execution of the Project has contributed to government agencies feeling less interest in central issues, less responsibility for the success of the WFR. They do not feel engaged in the Project as partners with shared ownership of the expected Outcomes...the challenge is for the NGO Executing Agency to use the Project to assist government to address this failure [organizing management of the WFR] rather than the NGO taking on the management responsibility itself, which would not be a long-term solution (Hunnam 2002, 15).

However, despite the capacity deficits of the DoF, a major accomplishment of the watershed program has been the change in the attitudes of not only the DoF but also other state agencies regarding approaches to the activities they conduct. Namely, state agencies now engage in actively reaching out to and engaging communities in their activities and programs. As one government representative noted, “agencies have learned to educate first and let people decide.” The idea that communities must be engaged in the process of developing activities, policy, or legislation is a large shift from the regulatory approach first used by the state in 1987. In addition to the Division of Forestry, this recognition of the importance of communities in gaining support for state activities has permeated to other state agencies such as the Department of Agriculture, Lands, and the Pohnpei Environmental Protection Agency through development of community outreach programs.

When participants were asked what role the state should play in watershed management, the most frequently cited answer across the parties was provision of technical assistance, with enforcement a close second. Other roles revolved around funding, supporting the role and involvement of traditional leaders, and outreach

involving communications and education. (It is interesting to note that only two people thought DoF should be responsible for management and conservation of the watershed and two others felt the state should have no role at all.)

The role of non-governmental organizations. Beginning with The Nature Conservancy and now the Conservation Society of Pohnpei, the NGO organizations have filled the role of coordinating and organizing efforts to move watershed management forward on the island. Examples of such work include working with communities to develop alternative income generating activities, creating reserves, educating people about natural resource management, working with the state to develop grass roots legislation, lobbying for funds to lay the boundary line, coordinating state agency activities with overall efforts, and working with municipalities to establish co-management legislation and creating reserves. In large part, they have been successful in accomplishing these tasks because they have worked closely with the communities and do not have the problems with trust associated with the state agencies. Consequently, the NGOs are in a unique role of being able to play facilitator/intermediary for all parties involved. In addition, they have the resources (e.g. staff, expertise, funding, energetic and dedicated leaders) for the successful role they play. As one Pohnpeian put it bluntly, “only NGO is doing stuff, the others are only lip service.”

Indeed, the involvement of the NGOs has also been critical as one of its representatives was identified as a key factor in moving watershed management forward on the island. When participants were asked questions regarding accomplishments and successes of the program, the most often cited element to these successes was the involvement of Bill Raynor, director of The Nature Conservancy. As one individual

noted when asked what contributed to the successes of the watershed program, “Bill’s great leadership. He had enough perspective to try different things and to regroup, keep the ball rolling. He has traditional leaders, non-profit, and government experience.” Indeed, the skills and qualities that made Bill Raynor effective in his position were: he was a risk taker always ready to try new approaches and ideas; effective at organizing partners and activities; provided the momentum and energy to move the program forward; had knowledge of the high language and adopted Pohnpeian ways; was equally competent in the non-profit world and internationally; was respected and found credible by those involved; was dedicated and passionate about the work; and was able to provide resources (both financial and training) to allow the program to move forward.⁶⁰

The role of NGOs as described by many interviewees should be that of consultant. People felt that NGOs should provide technical support, training, capacity building and expertise. NGOs were also seen as entities that should assist with funding for watershed management activities. Providing education was also another big role people saw NGOs fulfilling. Other roles included conducting research, bridging the relationship between the state and communities, acting as a checks and balance system on state activities, being a driver of change, and developing alternative activities to sakau farming.

⁶⁰ Indeed, it is no coincidence that Madolenihmw and U, municipalities experiencing high levels of watershed management activities and progress, are both home to Bill Raynor and Willy Kostka, CSP director and another dynamic key figure. This further supports the notion that the presence of key individuals as facilitators of project progress is important. This finding, existence of a key figure as a facilitating factor in projects, is consistent to other ecosystem and collaborative natural resource management projects (Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000, 108). Other factors for success mentioned by participants were: having energy and patience, and education of people on watershed issues and the program. Additional attributes noted by the researcher are: involvement of different parties, availability of funding as well as capacity resources, the support of key individuals, hard work and the many hours put in by participants, development of plans to guide activities, experimentation with different strategies, and working with multiple parties.

The role of municipal governments. Involvement of municipal governments evolved in response to the state's move away from adopting co-management of watershed areas with communities. As such, the role of the municipal government today is almost as a substitute for the state. Municipal governments are developing legislation for co-management of reserves, laying the boundary line, and practicing enforcement.⁶¹ In other words, municipal governments are addressing the shortfall of the state to effectively manage the watershed. The representatives of municipal governments who were interviewed felt they were better fit to assume these roles because the watershed areas were within their municipalities and were therefore their responsibilities. As one head municipal government representative stated when asked why municipal governments would be better watershed managers, "because each municipality has its own government and traditional chiefs and we can work together." The state was seen as unable to understand issues particular to municipalities because they were not from these areas, did not live on these lands and therefore could not understand the issues and problems, "none are from [this municipality], why should they care." A traditional leader shared a similar view, "they [communities and municipalities] are the ones affected by these resources, but people in government, they are in offices, they don't know what happens, they don't know what's happening."

The fact that involvement by municipal governments is a new development in watershed management may have contributed to the lack of overwhelming consensus regarding opinions on the role they should play. As such, very few respondents proposed roles. Some roles that were mentioned included conducting monitoring activities for sakau planting encroachments, providing communities with materials to conduct

⁶¹ There are five municipalities and the degree to which each has adopted these roles varies.

activities, developing alternative activities to sakau farming, establishing conservation laws, and having the authority over management of watershed areas. As one interviewee stated, “the state government should amend the [1987] law to give municipal governments a role in watershed management.”

Though municipal governments can (and do) play an important role in buttressing state efforts at watershed management, similar capacity issues (e.g. well-trained staff and funding) facing the state also affect the ability of municipal governments to effectively play such a role. Unlike the state, the concern is not so much about having the will to pass co-management conservation legislation (as evidenced by the recent success of legislation passed by Madolenihmw’s municipal government allowing communities to designate reserves). The concern lies in the capacity to implement such legislation (and its associated activities and responsibilities). Municipal government revenues are derived from the same Compact funding that constrains the state. Municipal governments only receive funding from the state and FSM national government for specific projects such as building new roads and infrastructure development. Only a small portion of their revenue is collected locally through business licenses, fines resulting from violation of municipal laws, and mangrove cutting fees (a significant conflict of interest if municipal governments are seen as avenues for conservation). This dependence of funding provides similar capacity issues that plague the state, interfering with effective management of the watershed. As such, some fear that municipal governments could create yet another institution that must be given considerable time to develop capacity to manage watershed areas and to organize and coordinate activities, thereby adding another level of complexity to overall watershed management activities. Moreover, municipal

governments are limited in watershed management because the lands are public state lands and the area is governed by a state law.

The role of traditional leaders. As respected leaders and gatekeepers to communities, traditional leaders have played a less direct role than other parties (with the exception of the Nahnken of Nett who, during the education workshops, organized community meetings and directed workshops with the WSC). However, their role in watershed management is critical. As commented by a state agency representative, “you cannot go through a municipality without permission of traditional leaders, that is the way it is done, you get their permission to enter.” Another put it as, “traditional leaders are the ones that work with the people. If this doesn’t happen, our water will go bad.” Still another stated, “procedure of going through soumas, they are the ones have a lot of people work in the forest, government can’t tell people to come down.” In essence, their role is one of providing support to watershed management activities by giving approval for other parties such as NGOs, state agencies, and municipal governments to conduct work in the municipalities and within kousapws.

Indeed, traditional leaders would often cite during interviews that it was their role and responsibility to be involved with watershed management. As one traditional leader shared, “[it’s] my responsibility to manage resources, my title, there is a responsibility to help people.” Often times, involvement will include attendance at community meetings and activities, selection of participants from kousapws to participate in watershed management activities or committees, and receiving reports on activities. The effectiveness of this role of advisor and support through consent and guidance (similar to their overall role as leader for the community) can be understood by an example shared

by an NGO representative, “traditional leaders are still very much fathers of people, particularly in face-to-face communication and relationships... for example, we put up a radio announcement [about a meeting] no one shows up, but when we go through nahnmwarki and he informed section chiefs we got a lot of people who come and show up.”⁶² However, the fulfillment of this role is often dependent on the individual traditional leader himself (e.g. their personalities, specific politics within that community, past history with the watershed program, their own views of what their roles and responsibilities to their communities are). As such, effectiveness of traditional leaders in these roles varies across municipalities.⁶³

Indeed, when participants were asked to comment on current challenges facing watershed management, issues concerning conflicts of interest and legitimacy of some traditional leaders were cited often. The challenges are associated with certain traditional leaders not listening to their people or being duplicitous in their words and actions concerning watershed management support and activities for other motives (e.g. compensation, politics of titles, fight against state to assert their own authority prior to colonial era). Several from communities and those working with traditional leaders noted this challenge, “involve traditional leaders, but at the same time, they break the laws. They are the ones pushing the people uplands...they just want to get involved to get

⁶² Though this quote highlights the influence traditional leaders have in communities, it also brings into question the reasons behind community participation. Communities may only be involved with watershed management activities because the traditional leader supports it. If this is the only reason why communities are involved, issues of sustainability and quality of participation surface.

⁶³ This comment and related issues will be further examined later in this chapter. However, to note here, in some situations, traditional leaders have used the watershed management program as a way to gain back some of their authority over lands that were taken during colonial times. Others have used the program to not benefit their communities, but themselves while still others have professed support of the program and its activities, encouraging communities to cease sakau planting in the uplands, while still continuing the practice themselves. In this way, involving traditional leaders can be a double-edged sword for watershed management and assessing incentives and motives is particularly critical in such instances.

compensation. In the end they are not protecting the watershed,” “soumas are also politicians...sections chiefs selected as contributions to nahnmwarkis,” “governor has authority on land and control over public lands...the chiefs’ argument is if we can maintain hold on people, can control the land...traditional leaders are trying to redefine their roles and responsibilities against state leaders,” “there is a [mangrove] channel here...one of the traditional leaders cleared the mangrove, all the trees died, full of sediment...most of the village chiefs listen to their people, but not this one. He’s different, he can’t listen to his people,” “all the nahnken wanted to do was be listened to, not talk about things.” Similar concerns that chiefs do not represent communities were echoed in a study conducted by Daniel Hughes focused on how the U.S. governance system interacted with Pohnpeian traditional political structures. An interviewee noted doubtfully, “a noble would not really be concerned with the good of the people” (Hughes 1969, 43). Additionally, another concern that must be addressed is the event when the job of municipal chief magistrate is sometimes filled by individuals who are also traditional chiefs. In one interview, Hughes noted in Nett where this occurred (the Nahnmwarki was also the chief magistrate for the municipal government), council men found it difficult to argue with the chief magistrate at council meetings because he was also their traditional chief.

Similar to state senators, it is also a challenge for traditional leaders to make hard decisions concerning the watershed as it is their responsibility to take care of their people and insure their livelihoods. As one villager put it, “[chiefs] find it difficult because they are leaders of the group. When the group finds it difficult, asks for help. Even if soumas think it’s [upland forest conservation for watershed] good, hard to ignore needs of the

people.” There is also a built in conflict of interest as well since traditional leaders depend on the tributes (e.g. sakau and other agroforestry products) the community bestows upon them in exchange for honorary titles, making it hard to turn aside requests to plant in the uplands. As one Pohnpeian put it, “reciprocating is big in our culture.” The other related challenge tied to traditional leaders was lack of coordination between them. As one community organizer put it, “no coordination among village chiefs...other soumas don’t follow the action plan.” Another stated it as, “everyone wants to be talking chiefs, not all of them want to be working chiefs.”

The interviews revealed a push for traditional leaders to take on a more hands-on approach to watershed management. Examples of this included helping with enforcement, implementing management activities (as defined by the Community Action Plans), directly instructing members in their communities to stop planting sakau in the uplands, and managing the watershed areas themselves.⁶⁴

The role of communities. Over the past 16 years, community involvement has taken on many roles from participation in the PRAs to development of Community Action Plans, from coordinating watershed activities within villages to conducting education workshops on natural resource management and the importance of healthy watersheds, and implementing alternative income activities. Community members have also assisted with monitoring for sakau clearings and helping to develop management

⁶⁴ Part of this call for increased involvement of traditional leaders can also be understood in the larger context of efforts to strengthen and revive traditional leadership on the island (and in the region as a whole). The traditional leadership system has been weakened through many years of colonial rule as well as introduction to western consumption patterns and ideas. During the author’s stay on the island, a region-wide traditional leaders conference was held in which traditional leaders from Palau and other FSM states came to discuss ways to strengthen traditional leadership systems and insure its future survival.

plans and creating reserves. The Community Conservation Officers program is where most activities and roles of communities reside and have been channeled.

Actual implementation and management of watershed areas was seen by many as the role of communities (e.g. enforcement, monitoring, CAPs). However, it must be noted that these views were mainly held by state agencies and NGOs, with a few in communities agreeing. As one politician noted, “main role of people should be managers. State can’t manage it all. Municipal and state assisting the communities to manage and NGOs...work with communities better.” Community members did agree that they should have responsibility for management activities, however, comments did not go beyond this to define responsibilities, “as a Pohnpeian, I believe that the role of Pohnpeian people is to manage the watershed and the role of government is to assist in technical support and funding. But primary management should be with the people themselves as resources.” The benefits of having communities manage the watershed themselves lie in the effectiveness of its approach. As noted by several who work with communities, “people tell each other what is good to do, this is more effective,” “telling is not enough...they do the job and others will listen to them because they are one of the community,” “better to work from within the community...they ask themselves why it is important and then will ask their neighbors and so forth and it will work,” “deal with communities only way it will work, if conservation deals with communities, I [politician] can approve it.”

Indeed, though communities have taken on significant roles, due to capacity issues (training, funding), much of their effectiveness in these roles is still very much reliant on the NGOs and state agencies. As such, the major hurdle facing communities in

taking on a more independent role and fully assuming co-management is this reliance, particularly the reliance on these organizations for taking the lead to organize, coordinate, and develop plans and initiatives for watershed management activities.⁶⁵ Despite the work with PRAs and CAPs, communities still do not see themselves in this type of leadership role. As one woman in a village said, “sponge farm is no good and management of forest reserve...CCOs they don’t have a work plan to follow, they wait for people from government...if possible, [good] to have an assistant once a month to tell them what to do...the knowledge is with them [government].” Another stumbling block to communities taking on a co-management role has been the difficulty in finding energetic, dedicated, skilled, key individuals within communities to galvanize watershed management and lead such initiatives. Part of the problem of finding individuals (as well as sustaining involvement of communities generally), also originates from the fact that communities continue to be treated by the state as resource users and not managers. As an NGO representative noted, “need to get them [communities] to the point where they feel ownership and attachment. Now they are distant because it’s public lands, because it’s not their own.”

Improving the Collaborative Process

When participants were asked how the different organizations and parties should manage the watershed, there was overwhelming agreement that all should work together. However, there was no overlap in responses on one organizational structure outlining ways in which all parties should work together to share responsibilities and roles for

⁶⁵ It must also be noted that such activities should be framed against day-to-day livelihoods and responsibilities. Most people are farmers or fishermen and some of these watershed management activities require large amounts of time and commitment that may be unrealistic given the way people live.

watershed management. Despite this absence of response overlap concerning organizational structure, views tended to fall into three categories: 1) municipal governments, the state, and traditional leaders should share management and enforcement roles; 2) municipal governments and traditional leaders should fulfill management roles; and 3) the role of the state should be to consult with traditional leaders on management of watershed areas. The first two situations were expressed by representatives from state, municipal, and NGO organizations, while the third was expressed by municipal, NGO, and traditional leaders. With regard to enforcement specifically, similar to ways of working together, no overlap in responses on partnership structures emerged. However, the partnership structure of involved parties that were suggested fell into four categories: 1) all parties involved with enforcement; 2) state and communities conducting enforcement; 3) municipal governments and communities conducting enforcement, and 4) the state, municipal governments, and NGOs conducting enforcement.

Given the challenges and issues outlined in the previous examination of roles, these ways of working together should be weighted against capacity building issues and existing capabilities. Ways of working together should also be considered against one of the major challenges that was identified as facing current watershed management on the island - clarity of authority for management activities. During interviews with the different groups involved in watershed management, there seemed to be a lot of confusion over who had authority for certain issues, roles, and responsibilities (as well as misunderstandings about past activities and events). The three major groups sharing this confusion were the DoF, municipal governments, and traditional leaders. Often, this confusion would manifest itself through inactivity and assigning of fault as one group

would state that they did not have the authority to conduct certain activities, when in fact they did. Communication and clarity between the state and communities is particularly lacking. These issues were particularly a problem regarding enforcement as no group had a clear idea of where the authority lay or what activities were authorized. As one person stated, “that’s one problem, enforcement of areas is really weak, nobody is really up to date on their responsibilities.” Such clarity is required to address problems such as sakau planting encroachment by people from other municipalities into protected watershed areas, a management challenge cited by several respondents.

The other challenge linked to leadership was capacity building and training. It seemed that groups or individuals tasked with leadership responsibilities were not provided adequate training in the form of continuation and follow-up training and capacity building. As one community woman noted, “[we] need training to manage these areas.” There is also no infrastructure or support to train people interested in forestry or keeping people informed of activities outside of Pohnpei that could assist with watershed management.⁶⁶

As a result, when participants were asked what steps should be taken in the next five years for watershed management, respondents agreed that improving coordination, planning, and relationships among different parties and activities was critical. Though no one recommendation received support across the different parties, the responses given revolved around the common theme of improving coordination, planning, and

⁶⁶ Similar to Hawaii, Pohnpei suffers from a situation called the brain drain in which the island’s brightest and most skilled leave for lack of opportunities (both job and educational) thereby creating a dearth of candidates to involve in watershed management and no incentive to create such infrastructural support. As one person noted, “the best and the brightest go to business or politics.” A U.S. federal agency personnel noted that a benefit of the Trust Territory days was scholarships to train forestry personnel. Such scholarships or similar forms of training are no longer available.

relationships between the groups involved. Examples are: traditional leaders developing a unified vision for management of watershed areas and using the traditional leaders' council to implement activities, improving coordination and working relationship between the state and traditional leaders as well as among agencies, legitimizing the authority of the PRMC, increasing partnerships with more communities as well as improving coordination between and within communities, creating opportunities so people get to know each other, hiring a coordinator (or coordinating group) for the watershed areas to define and assign responsibilities and roles, state support of CCOs, achieving island-wide uniformity of activities, and involving the College of Micronesia with training individuals for watershed management.

Involvement with the Program

A segment of the interview questions was devoted to understanding how partners became involved with the program, aspects they enjoyed about their involvement, what continued to keep them involved, and the challenges of being involved. The answers provided can inform partners on the effectiveness of strategies regarding outreach as well as ways in which to sustain involvement by parties, often cited as a challenge in collaborative, multi-party efforts (Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000, 117).

Education workshops were key in introducing parties to the program. The education workshops conducted in the early 1990s were cited most often by those interviewed as their introduction to and beginning involvement with the watershed management program. The workshops were particularly most cited by traditional leaders and members of the villages (which provide insight into the effectiveness of the workshops as a strategy for outreach). Another interesting finding, possibly related to the

workshops as a secondary effect, was the third most cited answer - involvement through association with friends, neighbors, and relatives. The second most frequent response was jobs, as in the watershed management was part of one's job responsibilities.⁶⁷ Other answers were: appointment by traditional leaders to participate in watershed management activities, passage of the 1987 law, and appearance of the surveyors in 1990.

Parties continue to be involved for benefits. Aside from the fact that it was part of their job or their roles as traditional leaders (highest cited response), no other responses were significant with regard to frequency as various reasons were provided as to why those interviewed continue to be involved. However, ultimately, the theme that drew these motivations together is one of benefits. Put simply by one traditional leader, "if no program, if someone just tells me, I will not follow, but since it has benefits I participate."

The overwhelming benefit noted by all participants were the learning and skill development opportunities brought about by involvement. The response most often given when asked what people liked about being involved with the watershed program was the opportunity to learn (e.g. how to work in teams, with other agencies, developing community knowledge, gaining natural resource management training, development of new skills, learning about conservation and ecology). This answer was given most by those in the NGO community and state agencies. Those in the communities (traditional leaders, villagers, municipal governments), cited taking care of the watershed and

⁶⁷ This reflects the fact that almost a third of those interviewed came from state agencies, NGOs, and the U.S. Forest Service where the 1987 law originated and responsibilities for watershed management fell into their domains.

keeping its waters clean through restoration, prevention, and protection.⁶⁸ The different responses provided by different segments of those interviewed could provide managers with insight into how to sustain involvement as well as support by these parties in watershed management activities.

With regard to skill development, involvement with the program allowed parties to develop both personal and professional skills. Personal skill development often dealt with relations to others. Responses included learning how to speak in front of large groups, to deal with different groups, and the problems communities encounter. Other personal skills revolved around knowledge acquisition such as ecology, bio-diversity, and connection of upland forests to coastal areas.

With regard to professional skill development, people across all segments interviewed cited natural resource management (both island-wide as well as within their own communities/areas) as the skill learned most. Other skills included balancing top-down and bottom-up approaches, developing their own conservation programs, and learning how to work with communities.

Other less frequently cited responses for reasons behind involvement included: 1) protecting the resources (e.g. protection of sacred places; protection of the water supply and quality); 2) personal benefits (e.g. provide information to others on how to protect

⁶⁸ Both answers given correlate with thinking developed in the environmental stewardship psychology field concerning involvement with conservation behaviors and activities. Based on the Reasonable Person Model (RPM), this field has demonstrated that people adopting environmentally responsible behavior often do so because of internal, intrinsic motivations caused by commonalities in the human condition and the way humans process information for survival. RPM contends that 1) people are motivated to know, to understand what is going on (they hate to be confused or disorientated); 2) people are motivated to learn, discover, explore and prefer to acquire information at their own pace in response to their own questions; and 3) people want to participate (because they hate feeling incompetent or helpless) and to play a specific role (one which they feel only they can fill) in what is going on around them (Kaplan 2000, 498). The following responses, given by two individuals closely involved with management efforts, seem to support the RPM theory, “people are talking about it now and people are more welcoming to the message. It gives me a sense of accomplishment,” “you get to know people and people to know you. You get respected...people stop me and ask questions, ask for help, seen as a problem solver.”

their natural resources and serve as advisor; working with communities to help them manage their natural resources; getting to know people and allowing others to know you, respect gained by those in the community because of one's work; the challenging nature of the program; interaction with traditional leaders, authority for enforcement, and having sakau close to homes to avoid walking to upland areas); and 3) personal/social values (e.g. witness damaging changes in the land from the past when they were children such as drying up of streams, decrease in bird and fish populations; to benefit the people and future of Pohnpei; inspired by those involved; education of people about resources).

The challenges associated with being involved in watershed management repeat some of the challenges already discussed in this chapter as well as in Chapter Three. Most responses noted the biggest challenge of being involved occurred at the beginning when involved parties were blamed for the law and chased by villagers. This response was highest amongst the state and NGO groups. Other responses, weighted more toward communities (traditional leaders, villagers, municipal governments) and NGOs dealt with enforcement issues (lack of it as well as authority to conduct it), dealing with people unwilling to listen, interfering with people's livelihoods (farming), the slow nature of the process causing frustration (particularly when dealing with multiple parties), and involvement of politics (e.g. stands not taken by politicians for fear of not being re-elected, internal politics within villages concerning traditional leaders).

A Review of Current Issues: Five Key Areas to Focus Efforts

Several issues and challenges were identified for watershed management in both this chapter as well as in Chapter Three. Challenges ranged from developing sustainable

funding to addressing coordination of activities; from finding dedicated people to improving the capacity of those currently involved; from gaining the support of key leaders to lobbying for legislation. Despite the number of issues highlighted, there were five main challenges which seemed to encompass or relate to all of the issues and can be seen as the most critical to address in order to improve efficacy of watershed management on the island. They are: enforcement; building capacity in both communities and the Division of Forestry to co-manage; developing political will for participatory management and commitment to a collaborative approach; increasing communication between groups and improving overall coordination; and mitigating effects of shifting to a cash economy.

Enforcement. With the boundary line for the Watershed Forest Reserve being finalized in the coming years, enforcement takes on a more immediate and pressing concern. The challenge is creating an effective process through which enforcement is carried out. Issues are: how will enforcement be conducted, how will it be funded, who will conduct enforcement, who has the authority to prosecute violations, how will enforcement be made known on the island, how will conflict be handled, and what will be the process/procedures for enforcement.

Building capacity in both communities and the Division of Forestry to co-manage. Given that Pohnpei's watershed management approach has been heavily community-based (resulting from initial community consultations in the early 1990s and the inability of the state to manage these areas itself), building capacity within communities to undertake natural resource management continues to be a large challenge. Capacity in communities suffers from varying degrees of effectiveness and more

importantly, sustainability. These issues include: how to support communities in becoming effective partners in participatory management and ending reliance on NGOs to provide direction; pinpointing what institutions within communities can take on authority for participatory management from the state and can work as intermediaries between communities and other entities (e.g. NGOs, municipal governments, financial institutions); finding dedicated individuals to represent communities and coordinate watershed management activities; continuing to cultivate support from both communities and traditional leaders; sustained training and feedback to support continual capacity building and motivation; and improving the quality and ability of communities to participate.

Similar to communities, the Division of Forestry also faces the challenge of developing capacity such as expertise in management to serve in advisory roles to communities and municipal governments, defining a role for itself in watershed management, attracting qualified and motivated candidates, improving leadership, learning how to garner funds for watershed management activities, and developing relationships with communities to overcome trust issues. Such issues are part of a larger problem facing Pohnpei's state government of improving infrastructure, creating efficiency in how the government conducts its business, and improving its work ethic and management style.

Developing political will for participatory management and commitment to a collaborative approach. The challenge concerning the state is developing its political will, whether at the legislative or executive branch, to recognize communities as legitimate partners in watershed management activities. Specifically, political will for

participatory management refers to legislation or legal agreements instituting participatory management. To a certain extent, this recognition of legitimate management partners can be extended to municipal governments as well. The state does not have enough funding, personnel, and in some people's eyes, legitimacy to effectively manage the watershed areas and WFR. As such, it is critical for the state to work collaboratively with communities and other parties to implement its mandate in the 1987 law. Legislation is the first step toward showing commitment to this collaborative approach. However, commitment must also be developed in the attitudes and activities of state agencies working in the collaborative. The Division of Forestry must show its commitment to this collaborative approach by engaging partners as resource managers and as equals in the decision-making process.

Increasing communication between groups and improving overall coordination.

One of the biggest challenges facing effective watershed management on Pohnpei that came clearly through the interviews was lack of communication between all of the involved parties resulting in confusion, misinformation and misconceptions concerning one another and watershed activities. There needs to exist some kind of forum or structure (e.g. coordinating group or organization) that meets often and has mechanisms to allow for consistent information flow to all parties. Such a structure would also help to clarify roles and responsibilities for all entities involved, as well as how they interrelate with one another (e.g. who has authority to do what, who are the decision makers, what are the processes, jurisdictions, and so forth). Such a structure could also address the related challenge of the program not having a systematic framework for reviewing its activities and progress. Through such adaptive management (in which monitoring and

collection of information on activities provides critical feedback to all parties on the progress of watershed management activities), an assessment of strategies, parties' incentives, leadership dynamics, proactive approaches to meeting challenges, and other elements of managing a program can be reviewed.

Mitigating effects of shifting to a cash economy. The transition of Pohnpei from a subsistence economy to that of a cash economy will continue to pose a major challenge for managing watershed areas on the island. The continued decrease in Compact funding, which has basically supported Pohnpei's cash economy, will affect the state's ability to appropriate funding for watershed activities as well as to provide jobs (the public sector is the largest employer on the island), leaving commercial sakau farming as the only other viable income generating alternative for many islanders. As such, the challenges ahead revolve around creating diversified sources of revenue such as developing private industry and attracting foreign investment. Mitigating the effects of a move toward a cash economy on Pohnpei's traditional lifestyles and community structures will also be one of the biggest challenges faced by the watershed in the future.

These five main challenges will provide the basis for analysis in the following chapter. By examining the experiences of other community-based and collaborative natural resource management case studies, lessons addressing the five main challenges will be explored in Chapter Five.