

Name of Protected Area: Mt Gahavisuka Provincial Park

Part 1: Basic information about the protected area

Table 1. Protected area information

Name, organisation and contact details for person(s) conducting the assessment <i>Person 1: Name, Organisation, Address, Email, Phone</i>	Beside Thomas, Conservation and Environment Protection Authority, PO Box 6601, Boroko, National Capital District, bensidethomas@gmail.com, +675 301 4500.
<i>Person 2: Name, Organisation, Address, Email, Phone</i>	Madline Ainie Lahari, Conservation and Environment Protection Authority, PO Box 6601, Boroko, National Capital District, mlahari@dec.gov.pg, +675 301 4500.
Today's Date	03/10/16
Name (or names) of protected area	Mt Gahavisuka Provincial Park
Size of protected area (ha)	77.4
PNG Code or number	
World Database of Protected Areas site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)	9714
What level or kind of protected area is it? (National Park, Wildlife Management Area, Sanctuary, Reserve, Locally Managed Marine Area etc)	Provincial Park
IUCN Category	Nil
International protected area? e.g. World Heritage or Ramsar?	No
Country	Papua New Guinea
Province/s	Eastern Highlands
District/s	Goroka
Local level governments	Gahuku
Ward/s	Gehamo Ward 8
Nearest big town	Goroka
Location of protected area (brief description)	The Provincial Park is approximately 11 km (30-40 minutes' drive) from Goroka township. It is located on a spur of Mt Otto in the Bismarck Ranges, mostly facing westwards. There are walking tracks to the summit of the mountain and the lookouts toward Madang and the Goroka township.
Map references	Portion 627 C Milinch of Goroka, Fourmil of Karimui Cat: No; 30/367; 1:100,000 Topo Goroka sheet 7985; in the foothills of Mount Otto, 145 20'E, 6 0'S.
When was the protected area gazetted or formally established?	27/07/1989 (as a national park); from 0/3/1983 there was a 49 year lease to the national government and the area was gazetted as reserved land. K15, 000 was paid ass a lump sum to the landowners with no conditions on the lease.
Reference for gazettal or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)	Gazette Number 49 (gazettal as a national park)

Who owns the protected area? please enter Government Private Community/ customary landowners, private, Other (name) and include Clan name(s)	Customary Landowners of Ganakoiha Anupazuha Clan. Nagamiza Village owned the land and leased it to the State in 1983 through a Land Lease Agreement for a period of 49 years.
Number of households living in the protected area	0
Population size within the protected area	0
Who manages the protected area? (e.g. please enter government, customary landowners [add clan names] management committee [how many and what gender])	Managed by the Provincial Government through the Natural Resources Division in collaboration with the Ganakoiha Anupazuha Clan of Nagamiza village. For some time now the park has been managed through a Board of Trustees established by the Provincial Government.
Total number of staff (this means anyone working on the protected area in paid jobs – whether NGOs, community, rangers or customary landowners	0 (previously rangers were employed by the National Government, through the Department of Environment and Conservation / National Parks Service).
<i>Temporary paid workers</i>	0 (there is some support through research organisations such as PNG Institute of Biological Research and the provincial administration).
<i>Permanent paid workers</i>	0
Annual budget (US\$) – excluding staff salary costs	0 (Provincial Government funding of about K10, 000.00 per year ceased in 2002).
Operational (recurrent) funds	0
Project or special funds	0 (Funds were allocated by the Provincial Government through a Board of Trustees to supported rehabilitation of the Park).
Reason for park establishment	It was established as a National Park for the conservation of the montane forest ecosystem including species of mountain orchids and rhododendrons in their natural habitat and to protect general wildlife species including tree kangaroos, cuscus, cassowaries, double eyed snake and orchids. The park has cultural sites and provides eco-tourism activities such as trekking and scenic areas for visitors from Goroka town and other areas. The CEPA register states the purpose as “primarily to maintain scenic and recreational values and because of the presence of a botanic garden”. However, the park has been deteriorating due to lack of management funds.
What are the main values for which the area is designated (Fill this out after data sheet 2)	Wild animals (e.g. tree kangaroos, cuscus, cassowaries and double eyed snake); forest ecosystems (montane forest with mountain orchids and rhododendrons); Pandanus (karuka) forest; ecotourism (tracks and lookouts); caves and cultural sites; and research and education.
List the primary protected area management objectives (add lines if needed after the most important objectives): <i>Management objective 1</i>	To protect the biodiversity including the conservation of montane forest species, mountain orchids and rhododendrons in their natural habitat.
<i>Management objective 2</i>	To protect caves and other culturally significant sites.
<i>Management objective 3</i>	To promote ecotourism activities.
Number of people involved in answering the assessment questions	5
Name/organisation/contact details of people participating the assessment (<i>Please do not insert return/enter or dot points</i>)	<i>Dr Joseph Apa</i> , PO Box 1519, Goroka, dr.josephapa@gmail.com; <i>Raymond Gahunu</i> , Nagamiza Village; <i>Amisere Gopave</i> , Nagamiza Village, PO Box 863, Goroka, ammigopave@gmail.com, 71206079; <i>Gahunu Mamaite</i> , Nagamiza

	Village, 72195856, <i>Anty Auwo</i> , Nagamiza Village, 73445367; <i>Apex Gahuno</i> , Nagamiza Village, 72620607.
Customary landowners/other community; CEPA, Other national government agency; Provincial govt; local level govt; Protected area staff (anyone working on the protected area in paid jobs; NGO; Donors; External experts; Others	Customary landowners of Ganakoiha Anupazuha Clan, Nagamiza village. The area is leased from the landowning community.
Please note if assessment was carried out in association with a particular project, on behalf of an organisation or donor.	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environmental Program through the Papua New Guinea Protected Area Assessment Project, which is a component of the Global Environmental Facility Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management Project in PNG.

Part 2: What makes this protected area special and important?

No statement recorded.

Table 2. Key values of the protected area

No.	Key values	Brief description	Note if endangered species or ecosystem (IUCN)
1	Animal species	The park has species such as tree kangaroos, double headed snakes, cuscus, cassowaries, birds of paradise (six spp have been recorded) and harpy eagles.	Birds of paradise, cassowary and orchids
2	Forest ecosystems (including rivers and streams)	The park contains montane forest species including mountain orchids (>1000 spp) and rhododendrons in their natural habitat and has special medicinal plants. Most of the area consists of mid-montane rainforest (<i>Saurauia</i> spp.) and some grassland.	
3	Pandanus (Karuka) (<i>Pandanus julianettii</i>)	Pandanus is a very important plant to the community. It is known locally as “Karuka” and has special uses. The leaves are used to make mats, headbands and thatch for roofs; the stem is used in building materials (wall, flooring, bridges and fencing); the fruit/nut is used for food and trade (traditional currency); and salt is produced from the shell of the nut. It is an important commodity for bride price payments.	
4	Ecotourism (tracks, lookouts)	There are walking tracks to the summit of Mt Gahavisuka, with several lookouts both within and outside the park area. There are views to Mt Michael, Mt Wilhelm and Mt Koriggoma and the surrounding ranges. Most trekking to the lookout is done early in the morning to catch a glimpse of the rising sun and surrounding scenic views towards Goroka and Madang (before being covered by clouds during the day). The park is easily accessible from Goroka.	
5	Caves and sites of traditional and cultural importance	Caves of cultural importance include “Nokondi Cave” and those that provide habitat for bats and other cave dwelling species; Nokondi, in the traditional belief is a half human figure and lives in the cave. There may be archaeological remains in the sediment deposited in some caves.	
6	Research and education	Tertiary institutions (such as University of Papua New Guinea, University of Technology and the University of Goroka), primary and elementary schools and NGOs use the park for educational studies and research. Several biodiversity inventories have been undertaken during training exercises.	

Table 3. Checklist of values/benefits

Not important 0; Important 1; Very important 2; Don't know DK

How important is the protected area for each of the listed values/benefits?	Score (0,1,2, DK)	Comment
1. Biodiversity – the presence of many different kinds of plants, animals and ecosystems	2	Plants include Karuka, orchids and rhododendrons; and animals include bird of paradise, cassowaries, harpy eagles and bats (refer above).
2. Presence of rare, threatened, or endangered species (plants and animals)	2	Birds of paradise, double headed snake, orchids (e.g. genus <i>Bulbophyllum</i>) and rhododendron.
3. Ecosystems (e.g. wetlands, grasslands, coral reefs etc) that are rare because they have been cleared or destroyed in other areas	2	The montane forest with its orchids is important.
4. Protecting clean, fresh water	2	Clean water is important for everyone that lives downstream. The park protects the water supply of adjoining landowners and for Goroka township.
5. Sustaining important species in big enough numbers that they are able to survive here	2	The park provides habitat for a diverse range of species (e.g. six species of bird of paradise).
6. Providing a source of employment for local communities now	2	There is no employment now, but this is important for the future.
7. Providing resources for local subsistence (food, building materials, medicines etc.)	2	Refer to Table 2 (e.g. pandanus and wild pigs).
8. Providing community development opportunities through sustainable resource use	2	This is important in the future.
9. Religious or spiritual significance (e.g. tambu places)	1	Caves of cultural and traditional uses, e.g. <i>Nokondi Cave</i> .
10. Plant species of high social, cultural, or economic importance	2	Karuka, <i>Castanopsis species</i> (used for housing and garden fences and the fruits are edible) and orchids.
11. Animal species of high social, cultural, or economic importance	2	A new species of frog has been identified. There are spiders and grasshoppers; cuscus; birds of paradise (plumes are used for traditional singsings).
12. Attractive scenery	2	There are lookouts (4) at the top of the mountains including Mt Gahavisuka that provide views to the surrounding landscape.
13. Tourism now	2	Trekking to the top of mountains (lookouts) and within the park occurs now. There are different types of orchids and rhododendrons and birds of paradise to observe.
14. Potential value for tourism in the future	2	This is a very significant site and location for continued tourism. The area needs to be protected and promoted to attract tourists.
15. Educational and/or scientific value	2	The park is used by tertiary institutions (University Papua New Guinea, University of Technology, Divine Word University, and University of Goroka) for training purposes; NGOs (Papua New Guinea Institute of Biological Research, Research and Conservation Foundation) use the park for species inventories and research; Institute of Medical Research uses the park for medical research; Other individual researchers and schools also use and visit the park.
16. Maintaining culture and tradition on customary land and passing this on to future generations	2	The park is important to help educate the young about medicinal, cultural and traditional uses of plants (housing materials) and animals (e.g. bird plumes and feathers for traditional events).

Part 3: What are the threats to the protected area?

Table 4: Threats to the protected area

- H** High significance threats are seriously degrading values. This means they are badly damaging some value –it might be a kind of animal or plant, or your traditional gardens
- M** Medium threats are having some negative impact – they are damaging values but not so badly
- L** Low threats are present but not seriously damaging values
- 0** N/A where the threat is not present in the protected area or where something is happening but is not threatening the values at all

Threat type	Score (H,M,L,0)	Notes
1.1 Housing and settlement	0	No houses are to be built by villagers. The only housing that is possible is for park management purposes.
1.1a Population increase in the protected area community	0	No communities live within the park.
1.2 Commercial and industrial areas	0	
1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure	0	There is no infrastructure currently, but there is an intention to build a lodge near the park area for tourists.
2.1 Customary land owner and community gardens and small crops	0	There are no gardens in the park. There is a buffer between the nearest community and the park.
2.1a Drug cultivation	0	
2.1b Commercial plantations	0	
2.2 Wood and pulp plantations	0	
2.3 Livestock farming and grazing	0	
2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture	0	
3.1 Oil and gas drilling	0	
3.2 Mining and quarrying	0	
3.3 Energy generation	L	A mini hydro-electric plant was used for park management (rangers) in the past. However, it is no longer operational. It may pose a threat if the park is rejuvenated.
4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)	0	The road to the park ends at the entrance to the park.
4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines)	L	The impact of cables is minimal as underground cables were used for the mini hydro-electric plant.
4.3 Shipping lanes	0	
4.4 Flight paths	0	
5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)	L	Hunting is not allowed within the park. The buffer between the village community and the park is used for hunting and this reduces pressures on the park.
5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)	0	Gathering of materials is not allowed within the park. However, the buffer between the village community and the park is used for such purposes.
5.3a Logging and wood harvesting for local/customary use	0	Wood harvesting is not allowed in the park. However, the buffer between the village community and the park is used for such purposes.
5.3b Logging and wood harvesting – commercial logging	0	
5.4a Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources for local/customary use	0	These activities are not allowed in the park.
5.4b Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources for commercial use	0	
6.1 Recreational activities and tourism	L	All recreational activities are guided by the park rangers or customary landowners.
6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises	0	

Threat type	Score (H,M,L,0)	Notes
6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas	L	People undertaking research or education activities are guided by the customary landowners and impacts are low.
6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use)	L	These activities are concentrated at the park entrance area only.
6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors	L	The old rangers' facilities were vandalised by neighbouring community households.
7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)	0	The park is not threatened due to the buffer zone surrounding the park area.
7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use	L	A mini-hydro-electric plant was constructed for park management use, but is no longer operational.
7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area	0	The park is intact with no disturbances.
7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation)	0	The park is intact with no disturbances.
7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values	0	The park is intact with no disturbances.
7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc.)	L	Unknown, due to lack of research/monitoring. This also depends on the movement of animals during the seasons (e.g. fruiting at different locations within the park or adjacent forest areas).
8.1 Pest plants	L	These were observed previously but not now.
8.1a Pest animals	L	
8.1b Diseases such as fungus or viruses that make native plants or animals sick	0	
8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)	0	
9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water	L	Pit toilets were used by park rangers (2), but they no longer live in the park.
9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities	L	Pit toilets are used for visitors and there could be some minor impact.
9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents	0	
9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)	0	
9.4 Garbage and solid waste	0	
9.5 Air-borne pollutants	0	
9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc.)	0	
10.1 Volcanoes	0	
10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis	0	
10.3 Avalanches/Landslides	L	
10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)	L	
11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration	L	There has been some displacement of species and more may occur in the future.
11.2 Droughts	0	
11.3 Temperature extremes	L	Temperatures are changing and now leeches are more common.
11.4 Storms and flooding	0	
11.5 Coral bleaching	0	
11.6 Intrusion by saltwater into gardens etc.	0	
11.7 Sea level rise	0	
Other (please explain)		
12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices	L	There is a threat based on a failure to pass on cultural practices to younger generations.

Threat type	Score (H,M,L,0)	Notes
12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values	L	Deterioration of cultural sites is not observed now, but it can occur at any time.
12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc.	0	
Other (please explain)		

Table 5. Worst threats and ways forward

Threat No.	Threat (Most significant first)	Threat number or name (copy no. from Table 4)	Nature of the threat, impact and how to reduce the impact.
1	Climate change and natural disasters	11.3	Change of temperature and occurrence of few things (leeches) that have not been there and displacement of species.
2	Introduction of invasive species	8.1,8.1a	Introduction of new species destroys the habitats of the park.
3	Increase in the number of visitors	6.1	An increase in the number of visitors may destroy the habitats, walking tracks and increase littering.

Part 4: What is the management like in the protected area?

Table 6. Management effectiveness scores, comments, next steps

Issue	Score (0,1,2,3, NA)	Comment	Next steps
1a. Legal status	3	The park is legally gazetted under the National Parks Act 1966.	Re-designate the park under the new Policy on Protected Areas and related legislation.
1b. Legal status			
2a. Protected area regulations	2	Communities are aware of the status of the park as a provincial park and also understand the park management requirements.	Need to urgently employ someone (with salary and appropriate resources) to manage the park.
2b. Protected area regulations			
3. Law enforcement	1	The community takes ownership in enforcing the law, although there are major deficiencies in human capacity (e.g. there are no longer any rangers working in the park).	Communities should be equipped (trained as rangers and provided with appropriate equipment) to enforce the laws of the park.
4. Protected area objectives	2	The park has agreed objectives and was managed to achieve these. However, currently there is no park management team and no day to day management.	Identify resources (financial and equipment and human) to manage the park activities and achieve effective outcomes.
5. Protected area design	2	The size is adequate to achieve the objectives but could do better if adequately resourced.	Investigate opportunities to extend the park area on customary land.

Issue	Score (0,1,2,3, NA)	Comment	Next steps
6. Protected area boundaries	3	The park boundary is known by the surrounding communities and there is an adjacent buffer zone.	An extension boundary has already been surveyed by EH Provincial Lands Division and needs to be negotiated further with the customary landowners.
7. Management plan	2	A Management Plan exists, but there is no ranger presence or financial resources to implement the plan and there is a lack of institutional support.	There is a need to do revise the Management Plan for the provincial park and set new directions for the park.
7a. Planning process	1	Customary landowners are involved in management processes.	There is a need for the Provincial Government to involve the landowners and other stakeholders in updating the Management Plan.
7b. Planning process	0	There has been no recent review or updating of the Management Plan. Communities are not really aware of the Plan.	The community needs to be fully involved to provide the support, security and trust for the park and the visitors.
7c. Planning process	1	There are quarterly meetings with stakeholders and partners.	There is a need to talk with and involve stakeholders who contribute or utilise the facility and this process needs to be made part of the planning process.
8. Regular work plan	1	There is a work plan in place, but is implemented voluntarily.	Establish and fund and effective work plan for the park.
9. Resource inventory	2	Information of the park's resources were collected by different institutions such as PNG Institute of Biological Research (PNGIBR), Research Conservation Foundation (RCF), National Museum and Arts Gallery (NM&AG), University of Goroka, University of Papua New Guinea, Institute of Medical Research, Papuan New Guinea University of Technology and Divine Word University.	Collate the information that has been gathered on the park and store it at one location (or online), so that it is accessible to all partners and stakeholders, including visitors and tourists. Posters of important species can be produced from the information.
10. Protection systems	1	No written systems are in place, but there is a common understanding in the community and by visitors to the park of the relevant rules.	Formal protection systems should be developed and promoted.
11. Research and monitoring	2	There is information at the provincial government and with other institutions, but this is not used to support the management of the park and it is also not accessible by the communities.	Information shall be made available for the management of the park and to the landowning communities.
12. Resource management	1	This was practiced when park rangers were employed and when the Board of Trustees was operation, but it is no longer undertaken today.	Need to urgently get/employ someone (with salary and appropriate resources) to manage the park.
13a. Staff numbers	0	There are no paid staff. All work is done on a voluntary basis by the customary landowners.	Need to urgently get/employ someone (with salary and appropriate resources) to manage the park.

Issue	Score (0,1,2,3, NA)	Comment	Next steps
13b. Other people working on the protected area	2	Customary landowners assist on a voluntary basis.	Members of the community should be identified, trained and resourced to manage the park.
14. Training and skills	2	There is a lack of specific skills such as tour guiding and curating for the park.	Members of the community should be identified, trained and resourced to manage the park.
15. Current budget	0	The responsible provincial government agency, Division of Natural Resource is not very supportive with a budget to manage the park.	Funding support is required from either the National or Provincial Government. This is necessary for the management of this important park.
16. Security of budget	NA		
17. Management of budget	NA		
18. Equipment	0	There is no equipment currently.	Equipment is needed to undertake management of the park.
19. Maintenance of equipment	NA		
20. Education and awareness	2	There used to be education and awareness programs in the past but this has been reduced due to limited funding and the absence of park rangers employed to manage the park.	Identify potential avenues to establish education and awareness raising e.g. undertaken by local NGOs such as RCF with adequate funding. RCF is currently involved in producing educational materials relating to biodiversity conservation.
21. Planning for land use or marine activities	3	There are no gardens, houses or settlements near the park due to a buffering forest area between communities and the park.	There is need for better management and land-use planning for the park and the community.
22. State and commercial neighbours	0	No surrounding commercial neighbours. However, generally the population of Goroka township area is aware of the status of this area.	
23. Indigenous people/ Customary landowners	2	Customary landowners were involved in the decision to protect this area under the land lease agreement with the government.	There is a plan to increase the area and boundary of the park. The proposed boundary has been surveyed already.
24a. Impact on communities	1	There is open communication between the landowners and other stakeholders such as CEPA.	
24b. Impact on communities	0	There are no programs being implement to improve the customary landowners' welfare. Previously community members were engaged through employment.	
24c. Impact on communities	1	Communities still support the protected area or park and are intending to increase the size.	
25. Economic benefit	1	Currently there is no economic benefit but there is potential.	Conduct studies to create economic incentives for the communities.
26. Monitoring and evaluation	0	Currently there is no monitoring or evaluation.	There is a great need for this to happen at the park level to understand the health and sustenance of the values

Issue	Score (0,1,2,3, NA)	Comment	Next steps
27. Visitor facilities	1	The visitor facilities (e.g. pit toilet and tracks and lookouts) are limited.	Identify, in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, the facilities needed in the park.
28. Commercial tourism operators	2	There is communication with the tour operators including hotels.	Engagement with tourism operators/hotels should be improved with the involvement of landowners / communities.
29. Fees	1	Some ad hoc payments are made to the local community for helping the tour operators. However, due to a lack of rangers, no fees are generally applied.	Fees should be collected and managed by an appropriate agency to support the management of the park.
30. Condition of values	3	The general condition of the values remains intact with minor disturbances along the tracks and lookouts.	Expand the awareness training to keep the values intact.
30a. Condition of values	1	The assessment is based on observations and some research information.	There is a need for scheduled monitoring and evaluation of the values to ensure effective outcomes.
30b. Condition of values	0	No management programs are in place now to address threats to the park.	Identify appropriate funding sources and other resources to implement effective threat abatement plans.
30c. Condition of values	0	There is no routine maintenance of key park values due to the absence of park management personnel.	Funding support is needed to rehabilitate the park infrastructure facilities, especially orchid gardens and facilities for visitors.

Part 5: Condition and trends of protected area values

Table 7. Values, condition and trend

Key value (from Table 2)	Condition Score (VG, G, F, P, DK)	Trend Score (I, S, D, DK)	Information source and justification for Assessment and HOW the condition can be IMPROVED
Animal species	VG	S	Due to the absence of park rangers, visitors and communities are not allowed to enter the park without informing the landowners. As a consequence there is no interference or impacts to the park environment and its resources.
Forest ecosystems, including rivers and streams	VG	S	As above.
Panndanus (Karuka) (<i>Pandanus julianettii</i>)	VG	S	As above.
Ecotourism values (tracks, lookouts)	VG	S	The condition of the lookouts is satisfactory. Tracks need to be maintained due to deterioration from runoff. There is a plan to undertake maintenance by the landowners, however, there is no funding support (a funding proposal is being developed for the rehabilitation of these facilities and tracks).
Caves and sites of traditional and cultural importance	VG	S	These sites remain undisturbed and help to protect traditional and cultural beliefs.
Research and education	VG	S	The park values remain relatively intact and provide an important resource for education and research.

Table 8. Recommendations and ways forward

1.	2.	3.
<p>Values: we need external assistance and resources to facilitate improvement of the values of the park.</p>	<p>Threats: The main threats are from climate change and natural disasters which requires risk management planning. This has been incorporated into our redevelopment plan which will also require the input of specific expertise.</p>	<p>Issues: The park has been neglected for 17 years and the landowners' plan is firstly to rehabilitate and redevelop the park and then to appoint a management team to manage it effectively. Therefore we need resources from external partners to effectively develop and manage the park.</p>

Table 9. Strengths and challenges (facilitator/recorder synthesis)

	Strengths	Challenges
1	Landowners remain interested in continuing their conservation efforts.	Obtaining political support to reinvigorate park management processes.
2	The area is a very good site for tourism including local and international visitors.	Obtain financial support for Infrastructure development and other uses (e.g. rangers, threat abatement, education, research)
3	The biodiversity values of the park remain relatively intact.	Implementing an effective park management approach that requires well trained and resourced park staff (including a park manager).