

E1577

Vol. 3

**Beneficiaries Assessment Report
for the
Smallholder Agriculture Development Project
(SADP)
Papua New Guinea**

January 2007

G. Koczberski and G.N. Curry
Curtin University of Technology
Perth
Western Australia.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Project Description	1
2. Aims and Objectives of the Beneficiaries Assessment	3
3. Key Beneficiary and Stakeholder Groups	4
3.1 Main Beneficiaries	5
3.1.1. Oil Palm Smallholders	5
3.1.2 Non-oil palm communities	7
3.1.3 Oil Palm Organisations	13
3.1.4 Local-level Government Institutions	14
3.1.5 Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and Community Groups	15
3.2 Key Stakeholder Groups	16
3.2.1 Customary Landowners	16
3.2.2 Oil Palm Milling Companies	16
4. Stakeholder Analysis Matrix	19
5. Views of the Beneficiaries	23
6. Beneficiaries Participation Framework	34
References	42

List of Tables

Table 3.1. Beneficiary and stakeholder identification for Bialla, Hoskins and Popondetta.	4
Table 3.2. Characteristics of smallholder groups and their relationship to each other.	6
Table 3.3. Estate and smallholder production details for Bialla, Hoskins, and Popondetta.	17
Table 4.1. Bialla Stakeholder Analysis Matrix.	19
Table 4.2. Hoskins Stakeholder Analysis Matrix.	20
Table 4.3. Popondetta Stakeholder Analysis Matrix.	21
Table 5.1. Beneficiaries Assessment for Component 1: Smallholder Productivity Enhancement .	24
Table 5.2. Beneficiaries Assessment for Component 2: Local Governance and Community Participation .	29
Table 5.3. Beneficiaries Assessment for Component 3: Project Management and Institutional Support .	32
Table 6.1. Beneficiaries Participation Framework for Component 1: Smallholder Productivity Enhancement (replanting, infill and road upgrading) .	35
Table 6.2. Beneficiaries Participation Framework for Component 2: Local Governance and Community Participation .	38
Table 6.3. Beneficiaries Participation Framework for Component 3: Project Management and Institutional Support .	40

1 Introduction

The Beneficiaries Assessment (BA) and the Beneficiaries Participation Framework (BPF) presented in this report begin with a Stakeholder Analysis and build on the social and institutional assessments in the report titled *Social Assessment Report for the Smallholder Agricultural Development Project*, hereafter referred to as the "SA Report". The BA was informed by background information on each oil palm growing area derived from a literature desk review, findings from the fact-finding workshop in Port Moresby and, most importantly, on interviews, meetings and focus groups conducted with potential beneficiaries during the Social Assessment (for further details see the SA Report).

1.1 Project Description

The development objective of the proposed SADP is *to improve the living standards of rural communities in selected areas of oil palm growing provinces*. This is to be achieved through: (a) increasing smallholder oil palm sector productivity through capitalising on existing infrastructure; and (b) promoting sustainable local governance and community participation mechanisms. Three oil palm schemes are included in the Project; these are located at Hoskins, Biella and Oro. These objectives are to be achieved through three project components described below.

Component 1: This component will support: (a) planting additional oil palm blocks, each 2 ha in extent (up to 9,000 ha) along existing provincial access roads through in-filling on land still available within the areas covered by oil palm infrastructure in response to smallholder demand; (b) the upgrading (reconstruction) of provincial access roads to existing smallholder oil palm blocks (about 600 km), and maintaining all existing and upgraded roads used for Fresh Fruit Bunch (FFB) collection, with the establishment of sustainable financing mechanisms for road maintenance; and (c) enhancement of smallholder productivity through improved extension services.

Component 2: This component will develop and demonstrate sustainable mechanisms for community participation into local development, through the provision of grants to community groups in the project areas and promoting participatory planning and local accountability at local government and community levels. This component will promote self-reliant local development through: (a) community mobilisation, facilitated by local facilitators; (b) identification and prioritisation of activities that would provide suitable solutions to local development constraints, through transparent processes at ward or community level; (c) participatory planning and budgeting at LLG level; (d) provision of small grant funding, with transparent conditions to ensure accountability and effective use of funds by recipient communities; (e) design and implementation of planned activities by the communities themselves, with support from district and LLGs, local CBOs, NGOs and service providers; and (f) capacity-development of CBOs, ward development committees, LLGs and province/district administration.

Component 3: This component will strengthen OPIC capacity in improving smallholder productivity through the provision of technical assistance and the establishment of a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system; strengthen OPIC and the institutions involved in assisting rural communities to define their priority needs, and the capacity of service providers to respond to these needs; and through OPIC provide support to and coordinate with existing HIV/AIDS awareness/prevention campaigns in the project areas.

OPIC will take overall responsibility for project management, coordination and performance of the project components. Component 1 implementation will be undertaken through OPIC and its field offices with the support of the milling companies and PNGOPRA. Component 2 implementation will be managed by a management agency contracted out by OPIC to i) set up Local Coordination Teams (LCT) at provincial level; ii) select and contract consultants and service providers to carry out all capacity building activities; iii) carry out M&E activities; and iv) assist OPIC in management and transfer of the grants themselves, and manage the grant accounts at the LLG levels.

2 Aims and Objectives of the Beneficiaries Assessment

The primary aim of the BA was to consult with beneficiaries to ensure their concerns and needs would be incorporated into the Project and to identify potential barriers to their effective participation. Further, the BA aimed to develop an informed understanding of the key issues affecting potential beneficiaries' participation in the opportunities and activities of the SADP. The three principal objectives of the BA were to:

- gain insights into the perceptions of beneficiaries and other local stakeholders regarding SADP;
- devise a framework for oil palm beneficiaries' participation in Project implementation, management, monitoring and evaluation; and
- devise a framework for non-oil palm beneficiaries' participation in Project activities.

In conducting the BA, the following issues were explored/assessed for each major beneficiary group:

- their strengths, needs and concerns;
- how social grouping affects opportunities to participate in and have equitable access to SADP activities;
- potential distribution of Project benefits amongst different social groupings;
- how each social grouping can facilitate or obstruct Project activities;
- identification of the most vulnerable and powerful social groupings in each oil palm region;
- strategies to promote beneficiaries' participation, particularly the at-risk or vulnerable groups;
- potential direct and indirect adverse impacts of the SADP on different social groupings; and
- means of mitigating adverse social impacts on different social groupings.

3 Key Beneficiary and Stakeholder Groups

The proposed Project includes the smallholder oil palm areas and selected LLG areas in WNB and Oro provinces. The main Project beneficiaries include:

- Oil palm smallholder households (VOP, LSS, CPB and LTC).
- Non oil-palm communities directly affected by the Project.
- Local government institutions.
- Community-based organisations (CBOs).
- Non-government organisations (NGOs).
- Church groups.
- Oil palm organisations (e.g., OPIC, OPRA and the oil palm grower associations).

In addition to the project beneficiaries several key stakeholders and stakeholder groups exist. These include:

- Customary landowners.
- Milling companies.
- Non-oil palm growers in or near areas to be affected by the Project.
- Provincial government departments.

The key beneficiaries and stakeholders by project area are listed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Beneficiary and stakeholder identification for Bialla, Hoskins and Popondetta.

STAKEHOLDERS	BIALLA	HOSKINS	POPONDETTA
Oil palm smallholders	VOP growers. LSS growers. CPB growers.	VOP growers. LSS growers. CPB growers.	VOP growers. LSS growers. CPB growers. LTC growers.
Customary landowners in oil palm growing areas	Present.	Present.	Present.
Milling Company	Hargy Oil Palms Ltd (HOPL).	New Britain Palm Oil Ltd (NBPOL).	Higaturu Oil Palms (HOP).
Oil palm smallholder extension/service providers	OPIC. Smallholder section of HOPL.	OPIC. Smallholder section of NBPOL.	OPIC. Smallholder section of HOP.
PNG Oil Palm Research Association (OPRA)	Present.	Present.	Present.
Oil palm grower associations	Bialla Oil Palm Growers' Association (BOPGA).	Hoskins Oil Palm Growers' Association (HOPGA).	Popondetta Oil Palm Growers' Association (POPGA).
Milling Company Transport Contractors	Transport provided by HOPL and contractors.	Transport provided by NBPOL.	Transport provided by HOP and contractors.
Non oil palm growers	Villagers/landowners.	Villagers/landowners.	Villagers/landowners.

Provincial Government Departments	Department of Lands. Department of Agriculture and Livestock. Department of Community Development. Department of Works.	Department of Lands. Department of Agriculture and Livestock. Department of Community Development. Council of Women. Department of Works.	Department of Lands. Department of Agriculture and Livestock. Department of Community Development. Division of Home Affairs. Department of Works.
Local Level Government (LLG)	Bialla LLG.	Mosa LLG. Talasea LLG. Hoskins LLG.	Oro Bay LLG. Kokoda LLG.
NGOs	The Nature Conservancy.	The Nature Conservancy. Mohonia na Dari.	Conservation Melanesia.
Church Groups	Catholic Church. Catholic Women's Association. Lutheran Church. South Seas Evangelical Church. Assemblies of God. United Church.	Catholic Diocese of Kimbe. Catholic Women's Association. Lutheran Church (Mothers' group). South Seas Evangelical Church. Assemblies of God. United Church.	Anglican Diocese of Popondetta. Anglican Health Services. Lutheran Church.
CBOs	Village-based sporting, youth and women's groups. Landowner groups. BOPGA. LSS ethnic associations.	Village-based sporting, youth and women's groups. Landowner groups. HOPGA. LSS ethnic associations.	Village-based sporting, youth and women's groups. Landowner groups. POPGA.

3.1. Main Beneficiaries

3.1.1 Oil Palm Smallholders

The most important beneficiary group that will influence the success of the Project is existing and new oil palm smallholders. Smallholder production contributes 44% to total oil palm production in the three schemes, and the sustainability of the smallholder sector relies on an ongoing replanting program and the transport efficiencies provided by road upgrading and infill.

In the oil palm industry, smallholders are categorised into two major groups: village oil palm (VOP) growers who reside in villages and cultivate oil palm on customary land; and Land Settlement Scheme (LSS) growers, who were recruited from elsewhere in PNG to reside on State leased land. Within these two groupings are various social groupings, such as women and youth, and growers with varying access to land and tenure security. These sub-groupings within the VOP and LSS smallholder categories are important to acknowledge when seeking to optimise social development outcomes, minimise adverse Project impacts on

vulnerable groups, and to ensure participation of the different social groupings within the project area. Table 3.2 summarises the main characteristics of the various categories of smallholders. Further information is presented in Sections 2 and 3 of the SA Report.

Table 3.2. Characteristics of smallholder groups and their relationships to each other.

SMALLHOLDER CATEGORIES	CHARACTERISTICS
VILLAGE OIL PALM (VOP) HOUSEHOLDS	<p>Households planting oil palm on village customary land, and typically members of principal landowning group. VOP blocks are subject to customary law and inheritance rules. Most VOP blocks are 2 ha, and productivity is generally low. Many VOP households have access to land to plant other cash crops and most pursue a range of livelihood strategies including marketing of other cash crops, garden foods, fishing and waged employment. Customary activities remain central to daily life and the requirements of customary exchange often drive people's motivation to harvest their palms.</p> <p>In some villages, VOP households belonging to minor clans have been given permission to plant oil palm on land belonging to another clan in the village. Now, many of these 'guest' households are finding their attempts to replant oil palm being challenged by the village landowning group.</p>
CUSTOMARY PURCHASE BLOCK (CPB) HOUSEHOLDS	<p>These are households planting oil palm on customary land that has been 'purchased' or 'leased' from customary owners, usually within the last 10 to 15 years. CPB households are typically migrants from other provinces seeking land for livelihood security. Oil palm plantings range from 2- 6 ha and productivity is high and similar to LSS growers.</p> <p>Nearly all CPB blocks are located at Hoskins. Tenure is often insecure because land remains under customary law and some land has been 'sold' illegally to outsiders or 'sold' without the full consent of customary clan members.</p> <p>There are roughly 900 CPB blocks in Hoskins, 40 in Bialla and less than 20 in Popondetta. They are a vulnerable smallholder group.</p>
LAND TENURE CONVERSION (LTC) HOUSEHOLDS	<p>In Popondetta approximately 450 ha of village oil palm has been planted as LTC blocks, which under the Land Act could lead to the customary tenure rights being converted to individual or freehold title. Households growing oil palm on LTC blocks were not members of the principal landowning group, but belonged to minor clans in the village. Therefore, they are 'guest' lineages. Many LTC growers believe they have freehold title.</p> <p>Some households that have planted oil palm on LTC land are having their right to replant challenged, with demands for the return of the land or for the payment of compensation before replanting.</p>
LAND SETTLEMENT SCHEME (LSS) HOUSEHOLDS	<p>Households residing on Land Settlement Schemes (customary land alienated by the State for State agricultural leases). LSS households resettled from over-populated regions of PNG, with major ethnic groups from the Sepik, Highlands, Morobe and Gazelle Peninsula. Most LSS growers have planted 4 ha to 6 ha of oil palm and productivity is higher than that of VOP growers.</p> <p>Many LSS households at Bialla and Hoskins face severe land shortages and economic pressures as a consequence of population growth. Social instability and family disharmony is associated with heavily populated blocks.</p> <p>Oil palm income alone is generally inadequate to support the growing population on the LSSs and most households must access alternative incomes sources to meet household needs.</p> <p>LSS households at Popondetta occasionally experience intimidation from customary landowners who do not accept the validity of State agricultural leases. Those most affected live on blocks neighbouring customary land. At Popondetta there is strong</p>

	opposition to LSS growers replanting.
WOMEN	Women have access to oil palm income through the Loose Fruit Mama Scheme which pays women directly for their work collecting 'loose fruit' on family oil palm plots. This is a major income source for women. Most women have limited control over block management decisions such as replanting, expansion of oil palm or household budgets. Women are also responsible for general household welfare and most supplement their oil palm income with cash earned from selling garden produce at local markets. Women on the LSSs are losing access to garden land as their blocks become fully planted to oil palm.
YOUTH	Many youth have limited access to oil palm income due to cultural norms regarding reciprocal household labour and land ownership. Often fathers seek to limit sons' control over oil palm income and block management, resulting in problems recruiting their sons' labour during harvesting. High rates of youth under-employment exist on the LSSs in WNB and Oro. Initiatives like the Mobile Card can improve income opportunities for young men.
ELDERLY	Many household heads on the LSSs are elderly. The authority of elderly growers in block management (e.g., replanting) is increasingly being challenged by sons/daughters who wish to have greater control of the income and management of the block. Also many elderly leaseholders do not have Wills specifying inheritance of the block which often is the cause of disputed ownership claims affecting production and management on the block following the death of the leaseholder. Elderly growers without co-resident sons/daughters have limited access to labour and low productivity.
CARETAKERS	Some blocks, mostly LSS blocks, have 'caretakers' managing the block of absentee leaseholders. Caretakers are less able to make farm investment decisions and depend on leaseholders for organising farm investments (e.g., replanting loans). Sometimes caretakers are poorly compensated for work on the block when oil palm payments are made to the leaseholder, thereby undermining production incentives. Long-term caretakers sometimes claim 'ownership' rights to the block after many years of inadequately compensated work. The Popondetta LSS has many caretaker blocks.

3.1.2 Non-Oil Palm Communities

There are several broad types of non-oil palm communities in each project area. Although there are some similarities across them, they are also important differences. The main categories of communities are:

- Indigenous ethnic/language groups, making up the customary landowning groups.
- Residents of informal urban or rural settlements (urban – on the edges of the town settlements of Bialla, Hoskins, Kimbe and Popondetta; rural – usually small transitory camps around areas of relatively high employment opportunities such as plantations or logging areas).
- Residents of formal urban settlements (Bialla, Hoskins, Kimbe and Popondetta);
- plantation, mill or logging company employees residing in housing compounds provided by their employers;

The first two categories of non-oil palm communities are relevant to SADP and are discussed further below.

Indigenous Ethnic/Language Groups

The indigenous ethnic/language groups in the Project areas of WNB and Oro provinces comprise the dominant non-oil palm group, both in terms of population and land area. In both provinces the indigenous ethnic/language groups are relatively homogeneous in terms of culture, social organisation and land tenure systems.

The indigenous people in the project area of Oro Province, come from one large cultural and ethnic group known as the "Orokaivans". The language spoken is Orokaiva, which has several dialects. The Orokaivans occupy the area which extends approximately 100 km northwards from the Hydrographers Range and from the coast around Oro Bay inland to the foothills of the Owen Stanley Range (Waddell & Krinks, 1968).

The Orokaivans comprise seven tribes each occupying its own territory (Banks, 1993), with a high degree of cultural uniformity across the seven tribes. Each tribe consists of several patrilineal clans and sub-clans. Subclans and clans are usually made up of two or more lineages (Williams, 1930) which can trace their origin to a common ancestor. Typically, an Orokaivan village is made up of several clans, and members of a single clan can be spread across neighbouring villages (clans and subclans are largely exogamous, i.e., people marry out of their clan/subclan). Thus, a resident of a village may have closer kinship ties with members of other villages than with co-resident villagers.

Disputes and warfare were common among tribes and clans in the pre-colonial period. Warfare ceased long ago, although disputes within and between clans can arise relating to theft, sorcery, pigs or land. Generally, however, there are no major cultural, ethnic or resource conflicts between Orokaivan tribes or clans, and people identify very strongly with being "Orokaivan".

The indigenous people of WNB Province comprise of seven major ethnic/tribal groups and approximately 25 indigenous languages. From west to east along the coast in the project area the following ethnic (tribal) and language groups are present:

- The Bakovi people. The Bakovi comprise two language groups: the Bula language group occupying the northern part of the Talasea Peninsula and the Bola language group covering most of the Talasea Peninsula south of the Bula language area and east to Gaungo Village.
- The Nakani. This is the major tribal grouping in the Project area and comprise of the Bebeli language group which occupies the area between Gaungo VOP and Hoskins to the east, and the Nakanai language group which extends from Hoskins eastwards to just past Bialla.
- The Mengen. This ethnic/tribal group occupy land east from Bialla to around Navo (the location of Hargy's second oil palm mill). Their territory extends through to the south coast. They belong to the Mengen language group.

- The Meremera. The territory occupied by the Meramera ethnic/language group extends from a little west of Ulamona Village over the provincial border into East New Britain.

There are several language groups south of the coastal ethnic/tribal groups which have some involvement with the project area, often as plantation labourers. They include the following ethnic/language groups from west to east:

- Aigon (in the mountains south of the Bebeli language group);
- Mangseng (the mountainous area south of the central Nakanai – most of their territory is in ENB);
- Mamusi (the mountainous area south of the central Nakanai and extending through to the south coast – most of their territory is in ENB);
- Pele-Ata (the mountainous area south of the eastern Nakanai);
- Kol (the mountainous area in the east of the project area with the Meramera and the Mengens on their northern and western borders respectively – nearly all of their territory is in ENB).

Whilst there are minor variations in the subsistence and agricultural systems of the various ethnic and language groups, they share similar cultural and social systems. The different ethnic and language groups do not appear to have been in conflict since the colonial period, perhaps because population densities were historically very low. There is considerable intermarriage across tribal and language groups, with much movement of people between groups.

Further, there is also a history of trading and social relationships between the different groups with some groups having rights to resources in the other's territory (e.g., fishing and hunting rights). Overlapping resource rights are the result of marriage, migration (especially around the coast), and the outcome of special customary exchange relationships that have, at some point in the past, conferred rights of access on non-resident groups. The people of Vavua and Koimumu Villages in Hoskins LLG, for example, have rights to fish the waters of Tarobi, Matilulu and Kaiamu villages in the Bialla LLG area because they can trace their lineage to a matrilineal ancestor shared in common with the people of latter three villages.

In WNB and Oro provinces, members of indigenous ethnic/language groups reside in villages. The social organisation of village communities is based on kinship in which the component clans and subclans can trace their genealogies to a common ancestor. Most members of a village community are able to define themselves in relation to all other community members in terms of kinship. Kinship structures the social and economic relations of village communities, for example, through determining access rights to resources (land, forest and marine resources) and the labour that can be drawn upon for subsistence and commercial activities. It is important to note, however, that kinship on its own is often insufficient to legitimise access to resources. Resource rights based on kinship are validated through participation in customary activities and meeting one's obligations to relatives. Failure to meet customary obligations can weaken descent-based resource rights. Villagers who move away for extended periods

will sometimes find their rights to village resources undermined if they failed to maintain their exchange obligations during their absences (e.g., not remitting cash to village relatives).

For various reasons, mostly to do with poor accessibility or land constraints, some villages have not taken up smallholder oil palm production and are dependent on other forms of income such as cocoa, copra, labour migration or the marketing of produce at local markets. Some of these villages are accessible only by sea, or on foot and therefore rely on intermittent buyers of cocoa and copra, or buyers of marine products such as trochus shell, beche-de-mer and shark fin (Koczberski *et al.*, 2006). In the Popondetta region, there are extensive tracts of *Imperata* grassland with soils too poor for smallholder cash crop development (they would require large inputs of fertiliser to make cash crops viable). Villages located on these grasslands have generally been dependent for income on labour migration and local markets (sales of garden foods and wild pig meat). Recently, some of them have entered joint partnerships with HOP to establish mini estates of oil palm where high inputs of fertiliser have overcome poor soil fertility. However, villages on the grasslands without oil palm mini estates are impoverished relative to communities with export cash crops such as oil palm.

Access to village land for the cultivation of food crops, and access to other resources such as wild game, forest products and marine resources, is governed by customary land tenure arrangements (see Section 2.3 of the SA Report for a fuller discussion of the principles of customary land tenure in the projects areas). In northern WNB social structure and customary tenure are predominantly matrilineal with access through the mother's lineage so that a man has primary rights over his mother's property, and these rights pass to his sisters' sons on his death (rights vested in his eldest sister's eldest daughter). In the Popondetta area, land tenure and social structure are strongly patrilineal with men inheriting the tenure rights of their fathers, and women moving to their husband's village after marriage. In both regions, territorial boundaries at the village scale are usually natural markers such as mountain ridges, rivers and streams. Within village territories, clan or subclan boundaries may be demarcated by trees or palms (e.g., mango, coconut and betel nut) and ornamental plants such as *tanget* (*Cordyline* spp). Parcels of land vested in one clan group may have a range of other tenure rights superimposed on them which allow clan or family groups from outside the primary clan group, or village community, access rights to all or a portion of the resources (e.g., hunting rights). These modifications to land tenure are the result of marriages, adoptions, the movements of people between villages, and the outcome of special customary exchange relationships that have, at some point in the past, conferred rights of access on non-resident groups.

Tenure rights are usually flexible and pragmatic, and able to accommodate the changing demographic and economic needs of the community and its component families. Decisions regarding access to resources such as game, forest resources, mangroves, or the exploitation of specific resources for subsistence or commercial purposes (e.g., rattan) must be agreed upon by all members of the resource-holding group, though clan leaders have more influence on decision-making than ordinary villagers (see below). In WNB, the planting of perennial cash crops like cocoa (and oil palm) is leading nuclear family groups to claim exclusive rights to

these resources. Stands of cocoa are being inherited by sons and daughters, rather than sisters' sons, so that tenure is becoming more individualised and closer to a patrilineal system. In Popondetta, where perennial cash crops have been planted, the patrilineal system is becoming stronger as land devoted to cash crops becomes 'owned' by particular patrilineages, rather than, as with garden land, reverting to the common pool of clan land during fallows. In both project areas, export cash cropping is leading to the emergence of more individualised forms of land tenure.

Village Leadership

In WNB, the position of clan leader is tied to particular matrilineages, with men inheriting the status from their maternal uncles. Everyone knows his or her position in the clan and the identity of their clan leader. While clan leaders exercise considerable authority over the clan's resources, this control is not absolute, and they should consult with and gain the consensus of the senior men and women of their clan when making decisions regarding the clan's resources.

In Popondetta, there is a stronger element of competition in leadership status with bigmen earning their reputations and status as clan leaders. However, in both WNB and Popondetta, modern forms of leadership are important. Nowadays, Local Level Government (LLG) representatives, ward councillors, members of village ward committees, village court magistrates, church leaders and school teachers are exercising more authority in village communities. These people are often highly respected members of their communities, and in former times they may have held positions of traditional clan or subclan leaders.

Regarding SADP activities in non-oil palm communities, it is **recommended** LLG and Ward councillors be the initial contact point within each community (see Section 4.2 of the SA Report and Section 3.1.4 below for further details of the LLG system). The councillor is the 'official' representative of the community, and will organise meetings between the communities and SADP personnel. While initial dealings with the community may be through the councillor, it is likely that as SADP activities become established and people come to understand the nature of the work, other people, more directly involved in SADP activities (e.g., church leaders, local community group leaders), will replace the councillor as liaison person with the community.

Once initial contact has been established with the community through the councillor, SADP personnel should identify the local clan leaders and involve them in decision making regarding SADP activities. In the matrilineal societies of WNB it is important to involve female clan leaders who tend to be less public in their leadership roles than men but who nevertheless exercise authority behind the scenes. Clan leaders still command considerable respect and authority in their communities and without their active support, it is unlikely that SADP-supported activities will succeed or gain the support of the broader community.

Informal Urban and Rural Settlements

In all three project areas there are informal rural and urban settlements. We have avoided the term 'squatter' settlement because many of these settlements have been developed under special arrangements with customary landowners. For example, many of the migrant residents of the beachside urban settlement of

Laleki on the western edge of Kimbe town, have informal tenancy arrangements with the customary landowners from Kulungi Village. These settlers, who are dependent on night fishing for the livelihoods, often pay 'rental' fees in cash and fish for their housing sites and for access to land for food gardening. Similarly, in informal rural settlements such as those in the Biialla project area, customary landowners have allowed migrants to establish small settlements in return for rental payments of cash and labour. The customary landowners sometimes draw on the labour of settlement residents for the clearing of bush for new food gardens or to harvest export cash crops.

These small informal rural settlements tend to consist of migrants from the one language and ethnic group. For example, in the Biialla region the Social Assessment team visited two settlements dominated by Wosera migrants from the East Sepik Province, and visited another one dominated by migrants from the Southern Highlands. These settlements tend to have a few 'core' residents who maintain the relationship with the customary landowners. Most of the residents are transitory visitors to the province searching for work. They reside with relatives in the settlement while they look for work and will move to a plantation compound when a job and house become available. These settlements are nodes in migration networks linking people from villages in other provinces with job opportunities in plantations.

The informal urban settlements at Biialla, Hoskins, Kimbe and Popondetta are home to diverse ethnic and language groups. However, within each settlement there tends to be a spatial clustering based on language/ethnicity. For example, in the informal settlement in the foothills on the southern edge of Kimbe town, many different ethnic and language groups are represented, but each tends to be an enclave based on language and ethnicity. Social and economic interactions tend to be focused strongly on one's own group with little interaction across groups. There remains much distrust amongst the different language/ethnic groups and fear of violence and sorcery is a primary factor in this spatial clustering of language/ethnic groups.

Given the language and ethnic division within these informal urban settlements, group decision-making and social control relies on respected community leaders. These leaders often gain their respect and authority from the positions they hold in the community which enables them to operate across ethnic groups to resolve conflicts and mobilise the community for community development projects. Leaders can have a range of positions such as local magistrates, ward committee members, church leaders and teachers.

The residents of informal urban settlements tend to focus on urban activities for their livelihoods like formal employment (e.g., business houses in town) and/or the marketing of produce at the town or roadside markets. Many of the products sold by urban residents at town markets are manufactured goods such as cigarettes (sold singly), matches, newspaper (for smoking), torch and radio batteries, kerosene, lollies, instant noodles, etc., but many women purchase betel nut, tobacco or lime in bulk from women in rural villages and resell these products in smaller lots at town markets. In contrast, the long-term residents of informal rural settlements tend to rely on gifts or cash from relatives who have found work with

plantation or logging companies or on the sale of garden produce at local markets. However, the long-term residents of these settlements make up a small proportion of the total population of residents because these settlements are a staging post in labour migration for most residents.

Administratively, each non-oil palm community (indigenous ethnic/language groups, residents of formal and informal urban settlements, and company employees) in WNB and Popondetta is represented under the local government system. The administrative units below the provincial level in declining size are: District, LLG, Ward and Census Unit. The census unit typically corresponds to an individual village, a plantation or school compound, several sections of an urban centre, or any informal urban or rural settlements. The census unit is the smallest spatial unit for which census data are available.

The configuration of administrative units is perhaps best illustrated with a couple of examples. In WNB Province there are two districts: Talasea and Kandrian/Gloucester. The Talasea District, which includes the project areas of Bialla and Hoskins, is made up of six LLGs: Bialla Rural, Bali/Vitu Rural, Hoskins Rural, Kimbe Urban, Mosa Rural and Talasea Rural. One of these, the Bialla Rural LLG, consists of 19 wards, each with its own councillor and village ward committee. Wilelo Ward, for instance, contains two census units: Wilelo Land Settlement Subdivision and the nearby Kerakera compound which houses plantation labourers employed by Hargy Oil Palm. To take another example, Bialla Urban Ward, which comes under Bialla Rural LLG, consists of seven census units that include both formal and informal settlements in the town.

In summary there are no communities in WNB or Popondetta that are not represented by the local government system whether they are indigenous landowners or migrant settlers from other provinces.

3.1.3 Oil Palm Organisations

The key oil palm organisations, OPIC, OPRA and the oil palm grower associations are important beneficiaries. The strong working relationships amongst palm oil companies, smallholder growers, OPIC, OPRA and the grower associations are a well established feature of the nucleus estate-smallholder system in PNG.

The Oil Palm Industry Corporation (OPIC) is a quasi government extension agency established in 1992 following the devolution of extension services to the provinces (World Bank, 2003). OPIC has a vital role to play in ensuring that efforts to increase smallholder productivity translate into increased wellbeing for the intended Project beneficiaries. OPIC liaises with government, milling companies, the various grower associations and OPRA, and has demonstrated a capacity to work successfully with these industry stakeholders.

OPIC's primary role is to promote and encourage increases in smallholder productivity by the more efficient provision of extension services to smallholders. OPIC's capacity to contribute positively to SADP goals, and in particular to ensure equitable participation in project benefits, is best demonstrated through the introduction of the Mama Loose Fruit Scheme (and more recently the trial at

Hoskins and Bialla of the Mobile Card (see Koczberski *et al.*, 2001; Curry & Koczberski, 2004). Under the Mama Loose Fruit Scheme, the milling companies pay women directly for collecting loose oil palm fruit on family plots, thereby providing an incentive for women to participate in oil palm production and benefit from an independent income (see Section 4.5.2 of the SA Report). The Mobile Card trial was designed to overcome labour supply constraints during harvesting caused by the uncertainty or irregular payment of hired and family labour. This initiative was in response to OPRA's research that indicated that unreliable payments contributed to under-harvesting on LSSs and to a large pool of under-employed youth, especially on the LSSs (Koczberski & Curry, 2003; Koczberski & Curry, 2004).

OPRA conducts agricultural research and development for the milling companies and smallholder growers, and provides technical support and services to the industry. The main areas of research include: agronomy; crop nutrition; entomology; plant pathology and smallholder livelihood studies. OPRA has an impressive record of winning external research funding, conducting high quality research, fostering links with international researchers, and maintaining a tightly focused research programme all of which have delivered considerable benefits to the companies and smallholders. The organisation has a good working relationship with the milling companies and smallholders.

Each project area has an *Oil Palm Growers' Association* which represents smallholder interests to industry bodies including OPIC, OPRA and national and provincial governments. Its chair sits on the OPIC board and members of the Executive represent smallholders at Local Planning Committee meetings (see Section 4.4 of the SA Report for further discussion). The various oil palm grower associations have good networks through their smallholder constituencies.

3.1.4 Local-level Government Institutions

The Organic Law on Provincial Governments and Local-level Governments, 1995, defined a new system of relationships amongst the national, provincial and local governments which provided the foundation and structure for Local Level Government (LLG). Under the law, LLGs were given new powers and responsibilities to be providers of local development and service delivery (e.g., water and power supply, social services, housing, aid posts and clinics, maintaining peace, and providing community sport, recreation, and cultural and industrial shows), and to enact laws, with the aim of improving the delivery of basic services.

The six LLGs that will be potential beneficiaries in the SADP are:

- Mosa LLG, WNB.
- Hoskins LLG, WNB.
- Talasea LLG, WNB.
- Bialla Rural LLG, WNB.
- Oro LLG, Oro Province.
- Kokoda LLG, Oro Province.

The structure of the LLGs, with member representation from local wards, including female representatives from local women's organisations, provides a sound foundation for developing strong linkages with communities. In addition, there are many experienced and respected community leaders elected to LLGs who are highly motivated and keen to initiate development and services in their areas. However, despite the good intentions of many LLG representatives, the lack of financial and management capacity to initiate local-level development has meant that there are few opportunities for the poor to access basic services and community development programs. Moreover, as outlined in the Institutional Assessment (Section 4 of the SA Report), there are also acute skills shortages and inexperience in managing community service provision projects among local councillors and LLG representatives. The ineffectiveness of LLGs to perform their duties has resulted in a lack of trust and respect for local LLG and ward representatives among many community members because there is an absence of any physical evidence of their work (e.g., improved infrastructure or service provision).

3.1.5 Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and Community Groups

Generally, NGOs and community groups do not have a strong effective presence in WNB and Oro provinces. The main providers of non-state services in WNB and Popondetta, and the most stable and effective organisations, are those associated with the various churches. The church and church-based organisations are central components of village life both in a spiritual sense and as service providers. In many rural areas of WNB and Oro provinces, the churches are the only organisations providing services for people. When government services such as aid posts are closed because of a lack of funding or staff shortages, it is often the established churches that people rely on to fill the gap. Moreover, church organisations are the most important vehicles through which the local population, particularly women, participate in civil society.

The NGO community is very small in WNB and Oro provinces, with the most effective and notable NGOs being environmental NGOs. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in WNB and Conservation Melanesia in Popondetta both have international links and strong on-the-ground presences. The Nature Conservancy has been successful in developing links with NBPOL and LLGs in its attempt to address degradation of marine environments in the Hoskins-Bialla region.

Apart from the formalised groupings of church organisations and NGOs, there are numerous informal village-based groups and committees. Activity levels of village-based groups tend to fluctuate through time depending on the specific purpose of the group at a particular point in time. For example, village groups (usually based on kinship) may form to achieve particular goals, such as constructing a fish pond, poultry project, cocoa fermentary or village tradestore. Once a project has been established the group may disband, but re-form when a new need is identified. Thus, these village groups tend to wax and wane depending on the perceived needs of the community or kinship group. The fluctuating activity levels of these groups should not be interpreted as a failure of the group, but as an indication of the capacity of these groups to mobilise labour, capital and other resources when there is an identified need in the

village/community. Sports, music and youth groups are some of the more important social and civil organisations available to young men in the villages. Women are more often associated with church-based women's or mothers' groups.

Smallholder ethnic associations exist on the LSSs in each project area, although the activity and influence of ethnic organisations fluctuates in response to levels of ethnic tension, leadership and perceived opportunities for repatriation. For example, in the 1990s the East Sepik Welfare Association at Hoskins was actively pursuing opportunities for resettlement and employment in the East Sepik Province. However, their efforts failed and the association is currently inactive. Presently, the Morobe Ethnic Association at Hoskins is channelling considerable time and resources to lobbying the provincial authorities of Morobe and Gulf provinces and the national Department of Agriculture and Livestock (DAL) to support a repatriation plan for Morobe settlors.

3.2 Key Stakeholder Groups

3.2.1 Customary Landowners

Customary landowners are a key stakeholder group. As landowners, they can significantly influence the outcome of the Project. Although most VOP growers are themselves landowners, there are many VOP blocks located on land belonging to another clan or subclan. As outlined in Table 3.2, CPB and LTC oil palm blocks are located on customary land, and despite agreements between growers and landowners that allow the grower access rights to the land, customary landowners remain a powerful group in determining ongoing access to the land. Similarly, in some areas of Hoskins and Popondetta, the customary landowners do not fully acknowledge leaseholders' rights to occupy LSS block on state agricultural leases, and they have been known to demand compensation payments from leaseholders. Both the Hoskins and Popondetta LSSs have experienced evictions of settlers by local customary landowners. At Popondetta intimidation of leaseholders by customary landowners in some subdivisions is a major disincentive to increasing production and replanting (for further discussion see Section 2.2 of the SA Report).

3.2.2 Oil Palm Milling Companies

The milling companies are an important stakeholder group as they perform the following functions:

- Transport smallholder fruit fortnightly from the roadside edge of smallholder blocks to the mill, mostly using their own transport fleet.
- Process FFB from both their own estates and from smallholder growers.
- Pay growers for their fruit and maintain an accounting system that enables deductions from each grower's FFB payment for credit advanced for block development and farm inputs.
- Provide essential production inputs on credit (e.g., seedlings for planting and replanting, and fertiliser and tools).

New Britain Palm Oil Limited (NBPOL) is PNG's largest oil palm operation, with four mills at Mosa, Kumbango, Kapiura and Numundo, extending over an area of

approximately 150 km from Talasea on the Willaumez Peninsula to its eastern boundary at Ala River. The company has both plantation estates and mini-estates on lease-lease-back arrangements with customary landowning groups. It is the only milling company exporting both crude and refined palm oil. In 2004, smallholders contributed approximately 32% to total production (Table 3.3). Smallholders receive interest-free company credit for farm inputs such as tools, fertiliser and seedlings. Repayment of company loans are deducted at 50% of the grower's gross income. NBPOL has an effective working relationship with OPIC and the company General Manager and Smallholder Liaison Officer regularly attend OPIC's Local Planning Committee meetings.

NBPOL was the first company to introduce the Mama Loose Fruit Scheme in 1997 and, in conjunction with OPIC, has since trialled other smallholder payment cards, such as the Mobile Card and C Card, both of which are designed to increase smallholder productivity and generate income for youth. NBPOL collects smallholder fruit on a fortnightly basis with its own transport fleet. Visits to VOP and LSS growers indicate growers in most areas have confidence in the transport system. That is, they are confident that their harvested fruit will be picked up by company trucks close to the scheduled time. Smallholder confidence in the reliability of fruit pickup schedules by the transport fleet is an important motivating factor for growers.

Table 3.3. Estate and smallholder production details for Bialla, Hoskins, and Popondetta.

	BIALLA*	HOSKINS*	POPONDETTA*
Company	Hargy Oil Palms Ltd	New Britain Palm Oil Limited	Higaturu Oil Palms (a Cargill company)
Ownership	SIPEF, Belgium	Kulim (Malaysia) Berhad (72%), WNB Provincial government (15%), others (13%)	80% CTP Holdings Pte Ltd (Singapore), 20% IPBC (PNG Gov.)
Total estate area (ha)*	6,315	30,447	8,997
2004 estate production (tonnes FFB)*	144,948	616,135	130,272
Number of LSS blocks	1,851	2,350	929
Number of VOP blocks	1,593	3,614 (+ 857 CPBs)	5,191
Total smallholder area (ha)	12,026	24,064	14,285
2004 smallholder production (tonnes FFB)	134,700	286,145	142,291
% smallholder production to total production (2004)	48.1%	31.7%	52.2%
Total 2004 production* (tonnes FFB)	279,648	902,280	272,563

* Data source: 2004 OPRA data; 2004 OPIC data and data provided by Higaturu Oil Palms.

Hargy Oil Palms Limited (HOPL) shares its western border at the Ala River with NBPOL. The company services approximately 3,500 LSS and VOP growers and has two mills — one at Bialla, the other at Navo. In 2004, smallholder production accounted for approximately 48% of total production, with smallholdings consisting of 65% of the total area planted to oil palm (Table 3.3). Currently, the company has K4 million in outstanding credit (interest-free) with smallholders for seedlings and fertiliser. Under a previous management regime, HOPL ceased providing smallholders with credit for replanting, which resulted in many smallholder areas being long over-due for replanting. The large amount of credit extended to smallholders is partly attributable to this 'catch-up' in the smallholder replanting programme. Credit is recouped through a 50% deduction from growers' gross monthly oil palm income. The company works closely with OPIC, and together they are overseeing the Bialla Oil Palm Growers' Association's smallholder Growers Trust Fund (Section 3.12.2 of the SA Report). They are also currently trialling a new payment system to create a market in hired labour in the smallholder sector (Mobile Card). HOPL collects smallholder fruit with a mix of contractor and company trucks.

Higaturu Oil Palms (HOP) is located at Popondetta and has recently been acquired by Cargill Tamasek Plantations Holding Pty Ltd. The company has a mill at Sigaru and a newly constructed mill at Mamba in the Kokoda area. The company has both plantation estates and mini-estates, the latter on lease-lease-back arrangements with local landowning groups. Smallholders contribute approximately 43% to total production (Table 3.3). The company provides credit to growers at 8% interest and loans are repaid through a 30% deduction from gross monthly payments to growers. HOP regularly attends OPIC LTC meetings, and the smallholder section of the company works closely with OPIC. HOP collects smallholder fruit using company trucks and contractors. With the recent acquisition of HOP by Cargill Tamasek Plantations Holding Pty Ltd, there has been significant investment in upgrading the transport fleet and expanding the milling capacity of the company.

4 Stakeholder Analysis Matrix

An assessment of the influence and importance of the various beneficiaries and stakeholders to the success of the Project is presented in Tables 4.1–4.3 for Bialla, Hoskins and Popondetta. ‘Influence’ refers to the power that stakeholders can exercise over decision-making directly to hinder or facilitate SADP’s implementation. Stakeholders who are important to the Project are those whose needs will be met by the Project as well as those whose interests are similar to SADP objectives. The tables identify stakeholders who:

- have the potential to facilitate or hinder the implementation of SADP;
- are critical to the success of the Project;
- lack power and status, but are crucial to the success of the Project.

The information presented in the tables will form the basis of the strategies developed to achieve Project objectives for optimising social development outcomes.

Table 4.1 Bialla Stakeholder Analysis Matrix.

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDER GROUP OVER PROJECT		IMPORTANCE OF STAKEHOLDER GROUP FOR SUCCESS OF PROJECT	
	H=High M=Medium L=Low	C1= component 1 C2= component 2 C3= component 3	H=High M=Medium L=Low	C1= component 1 C2= component 2 C3= component 3
LSS households	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
VOP households	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
CPB households	L	(C1)	L	(C1)
Female smallholders	L	(C1)	H	(C1)
Youth in smallholder households	L	(C1)	H	(C1)
Elderly smallholders	M	(C1)	H	(C1)
Smallholder caretakers	L	(C1)	H	(C1)
Customary landowners not selling land to outsiders	L	(C1)	L	(C1)
Customary landowners selling land to outsiders				
Milling company	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
OPIC	H	(C1 & C3)	H	(C1 & C3)
OPRA	L	(C3)	M	(C3)
Oil palm growers’ association	M	(C1 & C3)	L	(C1 & C3)
Non oil palm growers	L	(C2)	H	(C2)
Provincial government departments	M	(C2)	L	(C2)
Local Level Government (LLG)	H	(C2)	H	(C2)
NGOs	M	(C2)	H	(C2)
Church groups	H	(C2)	H	(C2)
CBOs	M	(C2)	H	(C2)

Table 4.2. Hoskins Stakeholder Analysis Matrix.

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDER GROUP OVER PROJECT		IMPORTANCE OF STAKEHOLDER GROUP FOR SUCCESS OF PROJECT	
	H=High M=Medium L=Low	C1= component 1 C2= component 2 C3= component 3	H=High M=Medium L=Low	C1= component 1 C2= component 2 C3= component 3
LSS households	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
VOP households	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
CPB households	L	(C1)	H	(C1)
Female smallholders	L	(C1)	H	(C1)
Youth in smallholder households	L	(C1)	M	(C1)
Elderly smallholders	M	(C1)	H	(C1)
Smallholder caretakers	L	(C1)	H	(C1)
Customary landowners in oil palm growing areas	H	(C1)	L	(C1)
Milling company	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
OPIC	H	(C1 & C3)	H	(C1 & C3)
OPRA	L	(C3)	M	(C3)
Oil palm growers' association	M	(C1 & C3)	L	(C1 & C3)
Non oil palm growers	L	(C2)	H	(C2)
Provincial government departments	H	(C2)	L	(C2)
Local Level Government (LLG)	H	(C2)	H	(C2)
NGOs	M	(C2)	H	(C2)
Church groups	H	(C2)	H	(C2)
CBOs	M	(C2)	H	(C2)

Table 4.3. Popondetta Stakeholder Analysis Matrix.

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDER GROUP OVER PROJECT		IMPORTANCE OF STAKEHOLDER GROUP FOR SUCCESS OF PROJECT	
	H=High M=Medium L=Low	C1= component 1 C2= component 2 C3= component 3	H=High M=Medium L=Low	C1= component 1 C2= component 2 C3= component 3
LSS households	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
VOP households	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
CPB households	L	(C1)	L	(C1)
Female smallholders	L	(C1)	H	(C1)
Youth in smallholder households	L	(C1)	M	(C1)
Elderly smallholders	M	(C1)	H	(C1)
Smallholder caretakers	L	(C1)	H	(C1)
Customary landowners in oil palm growing areas	L	(C1)	L	(C1)
Milling company	H	(C1)	H	(C1)
OPIC	H	(C1 & C3)	H	(C1 & C3)
OPRA	L	(C3)	M	(C3)
Oil palm growers' association	M	(C1 & C3)	L	(C1 & C3)
Non oil palm growers	L	(C2)	H	(C2)
Provincial government departments	M	(C2)	L	(C2)
Local Level Government (LLG)	H	(C2)	H	(C2)
NGOs	M	(C2)	H	(C2)
Church groups	H	(C2)	H	(C2)
CBOs	M	(C2)	H	(C2)

Several points emerge from Tables 4.1–4.3 that should be given close attention during Project design and implementation.

- Smallholder groups with limited power and status, such as women, youth, caretakers and CPB owners will require specific attention to ensure they are involved in Project decision-making processes.
- Customary landowners will be key players with the capacity to either hinder or facilitate Project implementation and outcomes, especially at Hoskins and Popondetta. At Hoskins, the involvement of customary landowners will be critical in VOP areas of replanting and infill where there is a high proportion of CPBs. At Popondetta, customary landowners' interests would need to be taken into consideration regarding replant blocks on LSS subdivisions bordering customary land, and on infill and replant blocks (mainly LTC) on customary land where a significant proportion of blockholders are not from the landowning clan in the village (they may be from another village clan) (for further detail see Section 2 of the SA Report).

- OPIC, as the principal smallholder extension organisation, will have an important influence over the Project and its outcomes.
- Local community groups (especially NGOs and village-based groups) whilst important to the success of the project will have limited influence over the Project given their limited control over resources.
- LLGs have high influence and high importance to Component 3 of the SADP, but currently they lack the capacity to undertake the prescribed roles under SADP. They would first require a capacity building programme, particularly in the areas of project planning, management and budgeting, community needs assessment, and accounting and record keeping procedures (see Section 4.7 of the SA Report).
- Some churches, their associated groups and established NGOs, such as the TNC which operates in WNB, have much experience of managing community projects and providing services. They have skilled staff and are highly regarded by the community. SADP should, very early on, seek to develop partnerships with these organisations for the delivery of services. They might also serve a capacity building role for the LLGs, if they were willing to strengthen their ties with the LLGs (see Section 4.7 of the SA Report).

5 Views of the Beneficiaries

In gathering the views of beneficiaries, consultations focused on listening to a wide range of groups within the populations potentially affected by the Project. Discussions concentrated on gaining insights into the benefits that potential beneficiaries anticipated would result from the SADP, the relevance of the Project objectives for meeting their needs, and any possible negative impacts that they might perceive arising from SADP activities. The results of these consultations are presented in Tables 5.1–5.3. In addressing potential positive and negative impacts of the Project identified by beneficiaries, the tables also outline measures to ensure potential benefits are achieved and to mitigate negative impacts. These measures draw on many of the recommendations presented in the SA Report.

Table 5.1. Beneficiaries Assessment for **Component 1: Smallholder Productivity Enhancement.**

BENEFICIARY GROUP	EXPECTED BENEFITS	POSSIBLE NEGATIVE IMPACTS	RELEVANCE OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES TO BENEFICIARIES	MEASURES TO ENSURE BENEFITS AND TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS
<p>LSS, LTC and VOP smallholders</p>	<p><u>Replanting</u> Access to credit for replanting of tall palms. Long-term income benefits. Long-term improved household economic security. Improved living standards.</p> <p><u>Infill on VOPs</u> Increase in household income. More households in the village with access to oil palm income. Increased income opportunities for youth and women.</p> <p><u>Road Upgrade</u> Less disruption to harvest pickups, particularly at Popondetta and Bialla. Reduction of “No Go” roads in Popondetta. Improved smallholder confidence in transport schedules leading to increased motivation and higher productivity. Strengthened household livelihood security through more regular fruit pickups and increased opportunities to diversify income sources (e.g., improved access to informal markets for women - marketing of garden</p>	<p><u>Replanting</u> Temporary financial stress, particularly for populated LSS blocks and VOP growers with 2 ha blocks. Resistance to replanting by co-resident married sons and caretakers. Loan defaults on <i>markim mun</i> blocks by co-resident sons leading to increase in family conflict. For Popondetta LSS growers, some VOP growers, especially LTC and CLUA blocks, and CPBs at Hoskins, there may be increased risk of land disputes with customary landowners.</p> <p><u>Infill on VOPs</u> Future land disputes possible on CPB and CLUA blocks when blockholders are not from customary landowning clan.</p> <p>Increase in social problems such as drunkenness and</p>	<p>Some LSS and VOP growers (especially on highly populated LSS blocks) are resistant to replanting because of short-term income loss.</p> <p>Many growers would like to see project address poor water and housing conditions.</p>	<p><u>Replanting</u> To reduce financial stresses of replanting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ encourage income diversification (cultivation of local market crops in newly poisoned oil palm stands, small business development, encourage harvesting contracts on other blocks for heavily populated blocks – Mobile Card contracts); ▪ implement strategies to raise harvesting rates (Mama Loose Fruit Scheme and Mobile Card labour); reduce loan repayment rates from 50% of gross income to 30%; ▪ in longer-term move to a replanting levy on production that will obviate need for replanting credit. <p>Update leasehold titles on LSSs as soon as possible to ensure block management decisions (e.g., regarding replanting) are less likely to be disputed.</p> <p>Develop strategies to improve tenure security of Popondetta LSS growers.</p> <p>Ensure LSS growers, especially women, have sufficient access to land for food gardening (food security).</p> <p><u>Infill on VOPs</u> Adopt strategies that strengthen the tenure rights of growers on non-clan land (includes CPBs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ introduce Customary Land Tenancy Agreement (CLTA) which incorporates a land rental fee and a royalty based on production to be paid to landowners; ▪ design Statutory Declaration Form which sets out rights of VOP grower to transfer the user-rights to named children in

	produce).	gambling arising due to increased income.		<p>the event of death of blockholder before expiry of CLTA.</p> <p>When deciding locations of infill blocks, feeder and linking roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ position roads to maximise numbers of landowning clans with a feeder road into their own land.; ▪ ensure that sufficient land suitable for food cultivation remains accessible. <p>Introduce a voluntary savings and loans scheme based on a revolving fund to ensure that income gains from replanting, infill and road upgrading can be transformed into improved water supply and housing.</p>
CPB blockholders	<p><u>Replanting</u> (see above)</p> <p><u>Infill</u> (see above) Increased opportunities for members of highly populated LSS blocks to acquire land for their families</p> <p><u>Roads:</u> (see above)</p>	<p><u>Replanting</u> (see above) Right to replant may be challenged by customary landowners.</p> <p><u>Infill</u> (see above) Insecure tenure</p>	(see above)	(see above)
Female smallholders	<p><u>Replanting</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above) Improved social status of women. Greater female participation in the cash economy. Temporary increase in access to gardening land (replant areas).</p> <p><u>Infill</u></p>	<p><u>Replanting</u> Temporary loss of income (partially offset by temporary increase in access to gardening land in replant areas).</p> <p><u>Infill</u> Possible reduced access to</p>		<p>(see LSS, LTC and VOP above)</p> <p>Each replant or infill block should participate in the Mama Loose fruit Scheme.</p> <p>Where possible, loose fruit income should be paid directly into the bank accounts of women.</p> <p>Depending on loose fruit production track record, women should be able to access credit for their own wheelbarrows, particularly women on LSS blocks.</p>

	(see LSS, LTC and VOP above) <u>Roads:</u> Improved road access to informal markets, schools and health centres	gardening land, or food gardens displaced to more distant locations. Inequitable income gains within households		Ensure women's views on infill are taken into account in infill planting to ensure that they are not disadvantaged in terms of accessing suitable land for food production.
Youth on VOPs and LSS	<u>Replanting</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above) <u>Infill</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above) Income opportunities created for a new generation of oil palm growers. <u>Roads</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above)	<u>Replanting</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above) Temporary loss of income for some young families on highly populated LSS blocks. Increased potential for conflict between brothers on multiple household blocks. <u>Infill</u> Youth from customary landowning clan/group may be short of land for oil palm in the future (i.e., land with road access) if infill is mainly made up of CPBs.		(see LSS, LTC and VOP above) Make youth a focus of strategies to raise harvesting rates on VOP and LSS blocks (e.g., individual youth employed as Mobile Card contract workers on LSSs; and groups (youth/church/sports) employed as Mobile Card workers on VOP subdivision. Examine possibilities for recruiting youth from CPBs to work as contract (Mobile Card) labour on low producing VOP blocks. Ensure that the future needs of youth from landowning clan for access to land for oil palm are provided for in infill plans (e.g., CLTA arrangements (see LSS, LTC and VOP above).
Caretakers	<u>Replanting</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above) <u>Infill</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above) <u>Roads</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above)	The income gains from increased production from replanting/infill may not be passed on by the registered blockholder to the caretaker.		Encourage adoption of contracts between blockholders and caretakers that specify contract period and payment arrangements (payments to caretakers to be handled by milling company).

Elderly smallholders	<p><u>Replanting</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above) Benefits for elderly growers likely to be greater than for younger growers because of the difficulty of harvesting tall palms.</p> <p><u>Infill</u> Not likely</p> <p><u>Roads</u> (see LSS, LTC and VOP above)</p>	<p><u>Replanting</u> Resistance to replanting by elderly 'semi-retired' growers (reluctant to take on debt when cash needs are lower – fewer dependants).</p> <p><u>Infill</u> Not applicable.</p> <p><u>Roads</u></p>		Promote deployment of contract labour on blocks of elderly growers (e.g., Mobile Card). Promote as a "retirement income" strategy where a proportion of the income from the block is paid directly into the blockholder's bank account.
OPIC	<p><u>Replanting</u> More sustainable oil palm smallholder sector. Long-term increases in smallholder productivity, thereby improving the financial capacity of OPIC to undertake its activities.</p> <p><u>Infill</u> Increase in the numbers of smallholders growing oil palm, leading to increased revenue flow for OPIC.</p> <p><u>Roads</u> Stronger rural economy and better able to service smallholders, especially extension services. More efficient use of extension officers and vehicles.</p>	<p><u>Replanting</u> Risk of becoming embroiled in land disputes on LTC and LSS blocks at Popondetta, and over CPBs and LSS blocks at Hoskins.</p> <p><u>Infill</u> (see replant)</p>		(OPIC would play an important role in most of the strategies mentioned above) Strengthen Lands Section of OPIC in each of the project areas.
Milling Companies	<p><u>Replanting</u> More efficient smallholders sector</p>			Ongoing support of OPIC through LPC meetings and assistance/cooperation with OPIC to introduce various

	<p>leading to increased tonnage of fruit for processing.</p> <p><u>Infill</u> More efficient use of transport. Increased production leading to more efficient use of company production system (e.g., mill and transport capacity).</p> <p><u>Roads:</u> More efficient use of company and contractor transport fleet. More regular pickups of fruit, leading increased smallholder productivity through rising smallholder confidence in transport schedules. Improved relationship with smallholders.</p>			<p>initiatives to raise smallholder productivity.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Table 5.2. Beneficiaries Assessment for **Component 2: Local Governance and Community Participation.**

BENEFICIARY GROUP	EXPECTED BENEFITS	POSSIBLE NEGATIVE IMPACTS	MEASURES TO ENSURE BENEFITS AND TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS
<p>Local Level Governments and ward development committees.</p>	<p>Increased skills capacity in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ project planning, design, management and monitoring; ▪ financial planning and budgeting; ▪ administrative and technical skills; ▪ governance and transparency; ▪ community needs analysis. <p>Increased financial resources and enhanced skills to undertake community development projects in association with church organisations, CBOs, NGOs and ward development committees (enhanced role in community development).</p> <p>Strong and effective partnerships with CBOs, NGOs and church organisations.</p> <p>SADP funds will help overcome many of the constraints that hinder the effectiveness of LLGs</p>	<p>LLGs may not achieve improvement in community development and as a result may further strain their relationships and standing within communities.</p> <p>Risk that partnerships with CBOs, NGOs and church organisations may not develop sufficiently to yield development outcomes for communities.</p> <p>Project funding may further entrench a 'handout' mentality among recipients.</p>	<p>Careful monitoring of finances required. If possible, community development funds should be channelled through church organisations and NGOs, at least initially.</p> <p>Heavy emphasis on building skills capacity before funding for community development projects devolved to LLGs. If church organisations and NGOs were to be the lead partner in community development projects this would provide a safeguard to ensure successful project outcomes while the skills capacity of LLGs were being developed.</p> <p>Ensure a rigorous process in place for screening of funding applications and monitoring of funded projects.</p> <p>Ensure clear accountability mechanisms are in place and understood by LLG/Ward development committee staff.</p>
<p>Community and village-based groups, and women's groups</p>	<p>Increased financial support to initiate community development projects in association with LLGs/ward development committees.</p> <p>Strong and effective partnerships with LLGs/wards, NGOs and church organisations to deliver community development services.</p> <p>Increased skills capacity in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ bookkeeping, general budgeting and record keeping; 	<p>LLGs may be too ineffectual and slow in implementing projects thereby undermining CBO confidence in the capacity of LLGs to fulfil their side of the partnership.</p> <p>Risk that the project benefits may be 'captured' by one village clan/kinship group, thereby increasing inequalities within village communities.</p>	<p>Careful assessment of the capacity of CBOs and village-based groups to take on additional activities. Capacity not only relates to skills, but to time availability to take on additional work.</p> <p>If LLGs lack the capacity to be effective partners with CBOs, then LLGs should first partner with established NGO or church organisation that clearly have the capacity to carry the partnership.</p> <p>Careful attention must be given to the composition of</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ administrative and technical skills; ▪ community needs analysis. <p>Able to draw on resources/skills of support organisations (e.g., LLGs, NGOs, church organisations).</p>	<p>Project funding may entrench a 'handout' mentality among recipients.</p> <p>CBOs may be too short-lived to be effective.</p>	<p>village-based groups/CBOs to ensure project benefits are shared equitably. This may require the establishment of more than one village group/CBO in a community.</p> <p>There should be some financial or labour commitment to community development projects to prevent a handout mentality developing. It is critically important that the village group/CBO have primary responsibility for implementing projects and maintaining them afterwards (e.g., maintenance of aid posts).</p> <p>Only village-based groups that have some prospect of lasting for the life of a proposed project should be recruited..</p>
NGOs	<p>Enhanced role in community development projects</p> <p>Expanded capacity to undertake training of staff from LLGs, ward and other community-based groups.</p>	<p>Some international NGOs may be reluctant to work closely with LLGs because of perceived inefficiencies and corruption in LLGs. Partnership may therefore not develop much beyond window-dressing, a partnership on paper only..</p> <p>If community development projects fail or are delayed inordinately by LLGs not fulfilling their part of the partnership, then NGOs stand to lose their credibility, goodwill and standing in the community.</p>	<p>(see LLGs above)</p> <p>Because LLGs lack capacity to manage projects, primary responsibility for project management should be vested in the NGO, with the NGO acting as a mentor to the LLG. It might also be necessary for funding to be channelled through the NGO.</p> <p>According main responsibility in the partnership to well-established NGOs is more likely to result in successful project outcomes. LLG staff would develop capacity as the junior partner without risking project failure.</p>
Church groups	<p>Increased financial resources to undertake community development projects in partnerships with LLGs/ward development committees and CBOs (e.g., upgrading of aid posts).</p>	<p>Many established church groups reluctant to partnership with LLGs because of perceived inefficiencies and corruption in LLGs. May therefore resist collaboration.</p>	<p>(see LLGs above)</p> <p>Because LLGs lack capacity to manage projects, primary responsibility for project management should</p>

	<p>Some skills upgrading in area of IT and computers.</p> <p>Stronger links/partnerships with other services providers (LLGs, NGOs, CBOs) leading to more efficient delivery of services to communities.</p>	<p>If community development projects fail or are delayed inordinately by LLGs not fulfilling their part of the partnership, then church groups risk being tainted by their association with LLGs.</p> <p>Partnerships with LLGs may result in greater workloads for some church groups to the detriment of their core activities.</p>	<p>be vested in the church organisation, with the church group acting as a mentor to the LLG. It might also be necessary for funding to be channelled through the church organisation.</p> <p>The church organisation would be more likely to enter partnerships with LLGs if they feel that the risks of failure are minimised, because they have a controlling influence in the project both financially and managerially.</p> <p>According main responsibility in the partnership to well-established church groups is more likely to result in successful project outcomes. LLG staff would develop capacity as the junior partner without risking project failure.</p>
--	--	---	---

Table 5.3. Beneficiaries Assessment for **Component 3: Project Management and Institutional Support.**

BENEFICIARY GROUP	EXPECTED BENEFITS	POSSIBLE NEGATIVE IMPACTS	MEASURES TO ENSURE BENEFITS AND TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS
OPIC	<p>Enhanced capacity to respond to community demands by working with a range of community groups including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ grower associations (BOPGA, HOPGA and POPGA); ▪ women's groups; ▪ youth and sports groups; ▪ church organisations; ▪ customary landowner and ethnic associations. <p>Improved capacity to work with external and government agencies such as GoPNG HIV/AIDS awareness programs.</p> <p>Strengthened capacity to deliver extension services to growers, including women and youth.</p> <p>More efficient use of OPIC extension and administrative staff, and other resources.</p> <p>Increased revenue from grower levy as smallholder productivity rises.</p> <p>Improved staff morale.</p>	<p>Risk that additional roles and tasks may erode capacity of OPIC to undertake its core extension activities.</p> <p>Risk of being under-resourced for new or expanded roles.</p> <p>Possibility of being drawn into inter-group conflicts, such as land disputes (e.g., over LTC and LSS blocks at Popondetta, and over CPBs and LSS blocks at Hoskins).</p>	<p>New tasks and roles are adequately resourced, and are not simply added to extension officers' existing duties.</p> <p>Training needs analysis to identify training requirements of extension staff (e.g., one likely area for training is in the use of livelihoods approaches to assessing the situation of smallholder growers and identifying constraints on production).</p> <p>Develop or strengthen particular areas of OPIC to address some of the emerging needs of growers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ recruit an officer to initiate and coordinate collaborative education/awareness programs with community and external organisations (e.g., budgeting, small business training, HIV/AIDS, etc.); ▪ strengthen lands section to hasten updating of LSS lease and VOP records, as well as smallholder wills program (might involve secondment of staff to OPIC from the Lands Department); ▪ recruit female extension officer at Bialla and reserve position for female representatives on LPC at Bialla and Popondetta; ▪ stronger focus on extension initiatives to raise harvesting rates (e.g., Mama Loose Fruit Scheme and Mobile Card contract labour strategy).
OPRA	<p>Enlarged research program on smallholder oil palm production.</p> <p>Identification of key constraints on smallholder productivity, and development of new strategies to increase smallholder productivity.</p>	<p>Research program may become too focused on agronomic issues (e.g., fertiliser response trials in the smallholder sector) to the neglect of the social factors limiting production.</p>	<p>Recruit a Smallholder Research Officer trained to at least Masters level and with some training in social science research methods.</p> <p>Smallholder research programme to adopt a livelihoods approach to smallholder production issues. This would encompass:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ social factors determining production strategies;

	<p>More participatory research approach to OPRA's smallholder research program, thus ensuring the research meets the needs and priorities of smallholders.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ population growth; ▪ gender and generational effects on production; ▪ under-harvesting; ▪ income diversification; ▪ land tenure issues; ▪ food security; ▪ HIV/AIDS. <p>Establishment of a network of 'barefoot research assistants' in each project area (to foster participatory research and to provide a feedback mechanism to check that OPRA research is meeting the needs and priorities of growers).</p> <p>Greater smallholder (and OPIC) representation at OPRA SAC meetings (or SAC research seminars repackaged for smallholder growers in each project area)</p>
<p>Grower associations</p>	<p>Increased skills and capacity to improve delivery of services to growers.</p> <p>Enhanced capacity to represent the interests of female smallholders.</p> <p>Increased range of services to address the social and economic problems confronting growers (i.e., to enhance the quality of life of growers and their families).</p> <p>Increased smallholder confidence in the capacity of associations to meet their needs.</p>	<p>Risk that the benefits of training and capacity building may be lost because of the high turnover of grower representatives and administrative staff.</p>	<p>OPIC to implement an induction/training program for all newly elected grower representatives and newly appointed administrative staff. Program should aim to enhance capacity in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ project planning, design, management and monitoring; ▪ financial planning and budgeting; ▪ administrative and technical skills; ▪ governance and transparency; ▪ community needs analysis. <p>Facilitate collaboration with OPIC, local NGOs, church organisations, banks, government institutions, etc. to provide growers with training workshop on a range of important issues such as household budgeting, health issues, family planning, youth and gender issues, law and order, bookkeeping, small business development, etc.</p> <p>Identify female leaseholders or VOP blockholders to stand for election to the growers' association in each project area.</p>

6 Beneficiaries Participation Framework

Tables 6.1–6.3 present Beneficiaries Participation Frameworks for the three major Project components. The frameworks are designed to encourage the sustained involvement of beneficiaries through strategies to enhance beneficiary participation in Project implementation and management and during the monitoring and evaluation stages of SADP.

In each Beneficiaries Participation Framework strong emphasis has been given to:

- strategies that promote the dissemination of information to, and consultation with, all stakeholder and beneficiary groups;
- ensuring equitable access to Project benefits for less powerful groups such as women, youth and blockholders with insecure land tenure; and
- devolving decision-making to local and community level to promote a sense of ownership over Project activities amongst potential beneficiaries.

Table 6.1. Beneficiaries Participation Framework for **Component 1: Smallholder Productivity Enhancement (replanting, infill and road upgrading).**

BENEFICIARY GROUP	PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT	PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION.	MEASURES TO ENSURE BENEFITS AND TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS
<p>LSS, LTC and VOP smallholders</p>	<p>Establish Smallholder Steering Committee (SSC) in each project area to play an advisory and decision-making role in project implementation and management. SSC members to consult with growers on project implementation and on issues such as the introduction of a replanting levy, road levy, voluntary savings and loans schemes and initiatives to raise smallholder harvesting rates. The committee should have representatives from the grower associations, and reflect the diversity of smallholders in terms of age, gender and type of grower (VOP, LSS, CPBs LTC, caretaker). The Chair of SSC should be a senior OPIC Divisional Manager or a consultant and report to SADP management and the LPC committee.</p> <p>OPIC radio programs to inform smallholders of the objectives and program of the SADP, and how to become involved in the Project. These radio programs could include occasional input from the grower associations and the SCC (see above).</p> <p>OPIC to hold regular community meetings in VOP areas to consult and collaborate with local customary landowners and non-landowning blockholders to determine the suitability and level of support for introducing Customary Land Tenancy Agreements and other potential strategies for enhancing tenure security of blockholders while recognising the continuity of customary landowner rights (see Recommendation 2.7 of the SA Report).</p> <p>In Popondetta a special land forum be established for</p>	<p>A consultant to take the lead role in coordinating monitoring and evaluation through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ working with smallholder groups (VOP, LSS, CPBs, LTC, women, youth, elderly) to develop monitoring and evaluation indicators that reflect the community's needs; ▪ training OPRA's 'barefoot research assistants' recruited from amongst the smallholder population in each project area to carry out household baseline surveys and repeated participatory monitoring activities related to replanting, infill, and road upgrading (see Recommendation 4.9 of the SA Report); ▪ conducting quarterly focus group meetings with smallholders, grower associations and OPIC divisional managers in all project areas to monitor and evaluate SADP activities. The meetings to be advertised on OPIC radio programs to ensure good representation of women and youth; ▪ conduct bi-annual meetings with the various landowning groups in infill areas to monitor community perspectives on allocation of infill blocks and locations of access roads; ▪ conduct bi-annual meetings of OPIC, 	<p><u>Replanting</u> To reduce financial stresses of replanting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ encourage income diversification (cultivation of local market crops in newly poisoned oil palm stands, small business development, harvesting contracts on other blocks for labour from heavily populated blocks – Mobile Card contracts); ▪ implement strategies to raise harvesting rates (Mama Loose Fruit Scheme and Mobile Card labour); reduce loan repayment rates from 50% to 30% of gross income; ▪ in longer-term move to a replanting levy on production that will obviate need for replanting credit. <p>Update leasehold titles on LSSs as soon as possible to ensure block management decisions (e.g., regarding replanting) are less likely to be disputed.</p> <p>Develop strategies to improve tenure security of Popondetta LSS growers (set up special land forum for LSS growers and customary landowners with assistance of Lands Department to resolve disputed LSS leases).</p> <p>Ensure LSS growers, especially women, have sufficient access to land for food gardening (food security).</p> <p><u>Infill on VOPs</u> Adopt strategies that strengthen the tenure rights of growers on non-clan land (includes CPBs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ introduce Customary Land Tenancy Agreement (CLTA) which incorporates a land rental fee and a royalty based on production to be paid to landowners;

	<p>LSS growers and customary landowners to resolve disputed LSS leases (involvement of Lands Department will be necessary).</p> <p>In VOP areas identified for infill, community meetings should be held during planning stage to discuss and decide optimum locations for feeder roads (to reflect distribution of clan landholdings) and to plan for the future needs of youth from landowning clans for access to land for oil palm. Community meetings to be facilitated by respected community leaders. Village facilitator to maintain close collaboration with OPIC.</p> <p>Female extension officers to visit LSS and VOP subdivisions to hold meetings with female smallholders to provide them with information on oil palm production (loose fruit collection, maintaining palm circles and paths, etc), the mama card, opening bank accounts and the importance of access to land for food security.</p> <p>Grower associations involved in disseminating project-related information to growers and in providing regular feedback on SADP activities to SADP management directly and through the LPC and SSC.</p> <p>Grower associations to facilitate collaboration with OPIC, local NGOs, church organisations, banks, government institutions, women's organisations, etc., to provide growers with training workshops on a range of important issues such as household budgeting, health issues, family planning, youth and gender issues, law and order, bookkeeping, small business development, etc (see OPIC above).</p>	<p>grower associations and various collaborating partners (e.g., CBOs, NGOs, church organisations, etc) to monitor progress of workshops for growers.</p> <p>Smallholder Steering Committee (SSC) and growers' association in each project area to provide input on monitoring and evaluation program to maximise the participation of different types of smallholders.</p> <p>Popondetta land forum made up on LSS growers and customary landowners to monitor progress on land issues.</p> <p>LPC Meetings to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ monitor introduction and expansion of extension initiatives such as the Mama Loose fruit Scheme and the Mobile Card; ▪ monitor extent of employment of local labour for road upgrading. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ design Statutory Declaration Form which sets out rights of VOP grower to transfer the user-rights to named children in the event of death of blockholder before expiry of CLTA. <p>When deciding locations of infill blocks, feeder and linking roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ position roads to maximise numbers of landowning clans with a feeder road into their own land; ▪ ensure that sufficient land suitable for food cultivation remains accessible (women must be involved in these discussions). <p>Introduce a voluntary savings and loans scheme based on a revolving fund to ensure that income gains from replanting, infill and road upgrading can be transformed into long-term improvements in material quality of life (e.g., improved water supply and housing).</p> <p>Each replant or infill block should participate in the Mama Loose Fruit Scheme. Where possible, loose fruit income should be paid directly into the bank accounts of women. Depending on loose fruit production track record, women should be able to access credit for their own wheelbarrows, particularly women on LSS blocks.</p> <p>Ensure women's views on infill are taken into account in infill planting to ensure that they are not disadvantaged in terms of accessing land suitable for food production.</p> <p>Make youth a focus of strategies to raise harvesting rates on VOP and LSS blocks (e.g., individual youth employed as Mobile Card contract workers on LSSs; and groups (youth/church/sports) employed as Mobile Card workers on VOP subdivisions).</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Grower associations to encourage female leaseholders or VOP blockholders to stand for election to the association in each project area.</p> <p>Consultations with Milling Companies for the introduction of the Mobile Card for use by youth seeking to work as hired labourers on smallholder blocks and to remunerate irregularly paid or underpaid caretakers.</p> <p>Involvement of local labour in road maintenance and upgrading (particularly important if road levy is introduced).</p>		<p>Examine possibilities for recruiting youth from CPBs to work as contract labour (Mobile Card) on low producing VOP blocks.</p> <p>Ensure that the future needs of youth from landowning clan for access to land for oil palm are provided for in infill plans (e.g., CLTA arrangements (see LSS, LTC and VOP above).</p> <p>Encourage adoption of contracts between blockholders and caretakers that specify contract period and payment arrangements (payments to caretakers to be handled by milling company).</p> <p>Encourage deployment of contract labour on blocks of elderly growers (e.g., Mobile Card). Promote as a "retirement income" strategy where a proportion of the income from the block is paid directly into the elderly blockholder's bank account.</p> <p>Strengthen Lands Section of OPIC in each of the project areas.</p>
--	--	--	--

Table 6.2. Beneficiaries Participation Framework for **Component 2: Local Governance and Community Participation.**

BENEFICIARY GROUP	PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT	PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION.	MEASURES TO ENSURE BENEFITS AND TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS
<p>Local Level Governments and Ward Development Committees.</p> <p>Church groups</p> <p>NGOs</p> <p>CBOs</p>	<p>Consultant to conduct a training needs analysis of LLGs, community groups and NGOs to develop priority training areas for capacity building. The training needs analysis to be conducted in a participatory forum such as focus groups.</p> <p>Contract a Community Development Consultant/NGO to work closely with potential beneficiaries to co-ordinate the community development component of the SADP. The consultant/NGO will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct community workshops to allow community members to identify and prioritise community needs and to foster a sense of 'ownership' among the community. • Disseminate information about SADP activities to communities in written and verbal form (e.g. newsletters, meetings, radio announcements, etc.). • Establish transparent and participatory processes within the LLGs for the management of community development funds. • Foster partnerships between LLGs and church and community groups through consultative community meetings. <p>Contract a Community Development Consultant/NGO to select and train local motivators from each census district (motivators to</p>	<p>A Community Development Consultant/NGO to take the lead role in coordinating monitoring and evaluation through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working with each of the local NGOs, community groups, church organisations, and LLGs, to develop a monitoring and evaluation system for each group to assess the performance, transparency and accountability of funded activities and the degree to which each project meets the community's needs. ▪ Training local motivators/village leaders to produce and carry out village baseline surveys and repeated participatory monitoring and evaluation activities to assess improvements in infrastructure, service delivery and living conditions. ▪ Working with each of the NGOs, community groups, church organisations and LLGs to develop monitoring and evaluation indicators for assessing capacity building in each organisation. ▪ Training and providing staff/representatives from NGOs, community groups, church organisations and LLGs with the necessary skills and tools to monitor and assess their own progress in capacity building. ▪ Conducting quarterly focus group meetings with the various NGOs, community groups, church organisations and LLGs to monitor SADP activities. ▪ Conducting quarterly focus group meetings 	<p>Careful monitoring of finances required if project funding channelled through LLGs rather than church organisations and NGOs.</p> <p>Heavy emphasis on building skills capacity before the funding for community development projects is devolved to LLGs. Because LLGs lack capacity to manage projects, primary responsibility for project management should be vested in NGOs or church organisations, with the NGO or church group acting as a mentor to the LLG. LLG staff would develop capacity as the junior partner without risking project failure. Initially, it might also be necessary for funding to be channelled through church organisations.</p> <p>Ensure clear accountability mechanisms are in place and understood by LLG/Ward Development Committee staff.</p> <p>Careful assessment of the capacity of CBOs and village-based groups to take on additional activities. Capacity not only relates to skills, but to time availability to take on additional work.</p> <p>Careful attention must be given to the composition of village-based groups/CBOs to ensure project benefits are shared equitably. This may require the establishment of more than one village group/CBO in a community.</p>

	<p>be chosen by the community) and ward councillors. The local motivators will act to facilitate local participation (especially to ensure project benefits are not 'captured' by groups/elites in the community) and planning and implementation.</p> <p>Community Development Steering Committee (CDSC) to be established in each LLG or ward area, which is made up of LLG/ward representatives, respected community leaders (from both private and public sector, village leaders including youth and women leaders) and representation from local organisations. The CDSC to be headed by the Community Development consultant or LLG or ward representative. The committee will rank and prioritise projects for funding and address any conflicts which may arise during project implementation.</p> <p>LLGs to disseminate information on community development grants through radio announcements and through printed material distributed to community and church groups.</p>	<p>with communities affected by the Project and local motivators to monitor SADP activities. The meetings should be advertised on OPIC radio programs.</p> <p>Community Development Steering Committee together with local motivators to monitor the planning, progress and financial management of funded community projects. The CDSC to be involved in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual audits of LLG budgets (together with an external auditor). ▪ Annual assessments of progress reports from implementing organisations. ▪ Annual assessment of the equitable distribution of funded activities to disadvantaged or 'at-risk' groups within the community or remote communities. 	<p>There should be some financial or labour commitment to community development projects to prevent a handout mentality developing. It is critically important that the village group/CBO have primary responsibility for implementing projects and maintaining them afterwards (e.g., maintenance of aid posts).</p> <p>Only village-based groups that have some prospect of lasting for the life of a proposed project should be recruited.</p>
--	---	--	---

Table 6.3. Beneficiaries Participation Framework for **Component 3: Project Management and Institutional Support.**

BENEFICIARY GROUP	PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT	PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION.	MEASURES TO ENSURE BENEFITS AND TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS
<p>OPIC</p> <p>OPRA</p> <p>Grower associations</p>	<p>OPIC to hold regular community meetings in VOP areas to consult and collaborate with local customary landowners and non-landowning blockholders to determine the suitability and level of support for introducing Customary Land Tenancy Agreements and other potential strategies for enhancing tenure security of blockholders while recognising the continuity of customary landowner rights (see Recommendation 2.7 of SA Report).</p> <p>OPIC to increase frequency of field days, and broaden scope of activities to include strategies that improve household income and general quality of life (e.g., income diversification strategies, savings and loans initiatives, small business development, food security issues, HIV/AIDS). This might entail a designated OPIC officer working with external agencies and grower associations to deliver these services at field days.</p> <p>OPRA to conduct consultative meetings with smallholders and LPC committees to identify research priority areas in the expansion of the smallholder livelihood studies section of the organisation.</p> <p>OPRA to establish a network of part-time 'barefoot research assistants' in each project area at a ratio of around one research assistant to 300 blocks.</p>	<p>A Consultant to take the lead role in coordinating monitoring and evaluation through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ working with OPIC, OPRA and grower associations to develop a monitoring and evaluation system for each organisation to judge capacity strengthening of the organisation. ▪ training OPRA's barefoot researchers to undertake surveys for monitoring and to assess uptake of new initiatives developed by OPRA research. ▪ training and providing staff from OPIC and OPRA with the necessary skills and tools to monitor and assess their own progress in capacity strengthening. ▪ conducting quarterly meetings with OPIC, OPRA and grower associations, to monitor SADP activities. 	<p>Any new tasks and roles for OPIC to be adequately resourced, and not simply added to extension officers' existing duties.</p> <p>Training needs analysis of OPIC to identify training requirements of extension staff (e.g., one likely area for training is in the use of livelihoods approaches to assessing the situation of smallholder growers and identifying constraints on production).</p> <p>Develop or strengthen particular areas of OPIC to address some of the emerging needs of growers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ recruit an officer to initiate and coordinate collaborative programs with community and external organisations (e.g., education/ awareness programs on budgeting, savings and loans initiatives, HIV/AIDS, etc.). ▪ strengthen lands section to hasten updating of LSS lease and VOP records, as well as smallholder wills program (might involve secondment of staff to OPIC from the Lands Department). ▪ recruit female extension officer at Bialla and reserve position for female representatives on LPC at Bialla and Popondetta. <p>OPRA to recruit a Smallholder Research Officer trained to at least Masters level and with some training in social science research methods.</p>

			<p>OPRA's smallholder research programme to adopt a livelihoods approach to smallholder production issues. This would encompass:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ social factors determining production strategies; ▪ population growth; ▪ gender and generational effects on production; ▪ under-harvesting; ▪ income diversification; ▪ land tenure issues; ▪ food security; ▪ HIV/AIDS. <p>Establishment of an OPRA network of 'barefoot research assistants' in each project area (to foster participatory research and to provide a feedback mechanism to check that OPRA research is meeting the needs and priorities of growers).</p> <p>Greater smallholder (and OPIC) representation at OPRA SAC meetings (or SAC research seminars repackaged for smallholder growers in each project area).</p>
--	--	--	--

References

- Banks, C. 1993. *Women in Transition: Social Control in Papua New Guinea*. Australian studies in law, crime, and justice, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Curry, G.N. & Koczberski, G. 2004. *Mobilising Smallholder Labour in Oil Palm Production: Results of the Mobile Card Trial, Hoskins, West New Britain, Papua New Guinea*. Research Unit for the Study of Societies in Change, Curtin University, Western Australia, Perth. Available at: <http://espace.lis.curtin.edu.au/archive/00000236/>
- Curry, G.N. & Koczberski, G. 2007. *The Resettlement Policy Framework Report for the Smallholder Agriculture Development Project, Papua New Guinea*. Draft Report to the Oil Palm Industry Corporation.
- Curry, G.N. & Koczberski, G. 2007. *Social Assessment Report for the Smallholder Agriculture Development Project, Papua New Guinea*. Draft Report to the Oil Palm Industry Corporation.
- Koczberski, G. & Curry, G.N. 2003. *Sustaining production and livelihoods among Biella oil palm smallholders: A socio-economic study of the smallholder sector*. Perth: Research Unit for the Study of Societies in Change, Curtin University of Technology. Available at: <http://espace.lis.curtin.edu.au/archive/00000233/>
- Koczberski, G., Curry, G.N. & Gibson, K. 2001. *Improving productivity of the smallholder oil palm sector in Papua New Guinea: A socio-economic study of the Hoskins and Popondetta schemes*. Canberra: The Australian National University. Available at: <http://espace.lis.curtin.edu.au/archive/00000235/>
- Koczberski, G., Curry, G.N., Warku, J. & Kwam, C. (2006). *Village-Based Marine Resource Use and Rural Livelihoods: Kimbe Bay, West New Britain, Papua New Guinea*. TNC Pacific Island Countries Report No. 5/06, The Nature Conservancy, Indo-Pacific Resource Centre, Brisbane, Queensland. Available at: <http://espace.lis.curtin.edu.au/archive/00001105/>
- Waddell, E. & Krinks, P. 1968. *The organisation of production and distribution among the Orokaiva*. New Guinea Research Bulletin, Number 24. New Guinea Research Unit, Australian National University, Canberra.
- William, F.E. 1930. *Orokaiva Society*. Claredon Press, Oxford.