

Name of Protected Area: Paga Hill Scenic Reserve
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> | Ann Peterson, SPREP/Protected Area Solutions, 283 Madill Road, Tandur, Q4570, Australia, a.peterson@uq.edu.au, 0414300955 |
| <i>Person 2: Name, Organisation, Address, Email, Phone</i> | |
| Today's Date | 21/6/2016 |
| Name (or names) of protected area | Paga Hill Scenic Reserve |
| Size of protected area (ha) | 13.1195 |
| PNG Code or number | |
| World Database of Protected Areas site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/) | 19716 |
| What level or kind of protected area is it? (National Park, Wildlife Management Area, Sanctuary, Reserve, Locally Managed Marine Area etc) | Scenic Reserve |
| IUCN Category | |
| International protected area? e.g. World Heritage or Ramsar? | |
| Country | Papua New Guinea |
| Province/s | National Capital District |
| District/s | |
| Local level governments | Motu-Koitabu |
| Ward/s | |
| Nearest big town | Port Moresby City |
| Location of protected area (brief description) | The Scenic Reserve is located at the entrance to Fairfax Harbour in Port Moresby on the eastern side of the headland. It is an important site for visitors to the city and provides panoramic views of the city and its surrounds. The former access road is now closed. |
| Map references | 9°28'S,147°8E |
| When was the protected area gazetted or formally established? | 10/9/1987 |
| Reference for gazettal or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) | |
| Who owns the protected area? please enter Government Private Community/ customary landowners, private, Other (name) and include Clan name(s) | State land. (For customary landowners – Motu-Koitabuan) |
| Number of households living in the protected area | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Population size within the protected area | |
| Who manages the protected area?(e.g. please enter government, customary landowners [add clan names] management committee [how many and what gender]) | Director of CEPA. Management Committee – CEPA in partnership with the National Capital District Commission. |
| Total number of staff (this means anyone working on the protected area in paid jobs –whether NGOs, community, rangers or customary landowners | 0 |
| <i>Temporary paid workers</i> | 0 |
| <i>Permanent paid workers</i> | 0 |
| Annual budget (US\$) – excluding staff salary costs | 0 |
| Operational (recurrent) funds | 0 |
| Project or special funds | 0 |
| Reason for park establishment | Scenic/panoramic views of Fairfax Harbour |
| What are the main values for which the area is designated (Fill this out after data sheet 2) | Scenic. Historic (WWII relics, gun emplacement, bunkers and underground tunnels). |
| List the primary protected area management objectives (add lines if needed after the most important objectives): <i>Management objective 1</i> | Preservation of landscape and historical features. |
| <i>Management objective 2</i> | |
| <i>Management objective 3</i> | |
| Number of people involved in answering the assessment questions | 4 |
| Name/organisation/contact details of people participating the assessment (Please do not insert return/enter or dot points) | David Kau, CEPA, PO Box 6601, Boroko, dkau@dec.gov.pg, 3014500; Beside Thomas, CEPA (as above), bthomass@gmail.com, 3104500; Andrew Yaga, CEPA, Ranger (at Moitaka), (as above), 3014500; James Sabi, CEPA (as above). |
| 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 | |
| Please note if assessment was carried out in association with a particular project, on behalf of an organisation or donor. | SPREP through the PNG Protected Area Assessment Project, which is a component of the GEF Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management Project in PNG. |

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

Paga Hill was reported to contain at least 20 items of historical significance (e.g. bunkers, gun battery sites and emplacements, tunnels, ground level undetermined concrete structures, observation posts, concrete steps and gun positions) (Archaeological and Heritage Management Solutions 2013). However, recent development (e.g. reclamation at the base of the site and removal of most of the seaward portion of the site for commercial development) has significantly impacted on the historical significance of the site through the removal of several relics. There has been little or no government investment into the area and currently the site is under development. It is a highly modified environment. The PNG *War Surplus Material Act, 1952* was enacted to establish ownership of materials relating to wars in which Australia had been involved from 3 September 1939 until October 1952. Under the Act: any building, fitting or structure, or the materials comprising any building, fitting or structure or any aircraft, ship, vehicle, machinery, equipment or chattel acquired or used by any government or by the armed forces of any government in, or in connection with, the prosecution of the recent war is deemed, until proven to the contrary, to be the absolute property of the State (PNG).

Table 2. Key values of the protected area

| No. | Key values | Brief description | Note if endangered species or ecosystem (IUCN) |
|-----|-----------------|---|--|
| 1 | Historical site | Some WWII relics remain e.g. some gun emplacements, but many of the structures have been destroyed as part of the construction of a commercial building on the site. Without access to the site, it is difficult to know what has been removed. It is thought that the tunnel has been destroyed. | |
| 2 | Scenic | Panoramic view of the harbour (Simpson Harbour) and city (Ella Beach) | |
| 3 | Tourism | Although the site is currently unable to be accessed, it has historical values of interest to tourism; and the site provides a lookout with lines of sight to the harbour and city. | |
| 4 | Communication | Telecom Tower infrastructure. | |

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 | 0 | |
| 2. Presence of rare, threatened, or endangered species (plants and animals) | 0 | |
| 3. Ecosystems (e.g. wetlands, grasslands, coral reefs etc) that are rare because they have been cleared or destroyed in other areas | 0 | |
| 4. Protecting clean, fresh water | 0 | |
| 5. Sustaining important species in big enough numbers that they are able to survive here | 0 | |
| 6. Providing a source of employment for local communities now | 0 | |
| 7. Providing resources for local subsistence (food, building materials, medicines etc.) | 0 | |
| 8. Providing community development opportunities through sustainable resource use | 0 | |
| 9. Religious or spiritual significance (e.g. tambu places) | 0 | |
| 10. Plant species of high social, cultural, or economic importance | 0 | |
| 11. Animal species of high social, cultural, or economic importance | 0 | |
| 12. Attractive scenery | 2 | Views to the harbour from the top of the hill. |
| 13. Tourism now | 1 | The site is being re-developed and access is limited. |
| 14. Potential value for tourism in the future | 2 | It has value due to its inner city location, panoramic views and WWII war relics. |
| 15. Educational and/or scientific value | 1 | |
| 16. Maintaining culture and tradition on customary land and passing this on to future generations | 0 | |

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 | |
| 1.1a Population increase in the protected area community | 0 | |
| 1.2 Commercial and industrial areas | H | The site is currently under construction for commercial purposes and much of the original site and the war relics have been destroyed. |
| 1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure | 0 | |
| 2.1 Customary land owner and community gardens and small crops | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | |
| 4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals) | H | A new road has been constructed on the reclaimed land at the base of the site and the access road to the site has been closed. |
| 4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines) | 0 | |
| 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) | 0 | |
| 5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber) | 0 | |
| 5.3a Logging and wood harvesting for local/customary use | 0 | |
| 5.3b Logging and wood harvesting – commercial logging | 0 | |
| 5.4a Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources for local/customary use | 0 | |
| 5.4b Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources for commercial use | 0 | |
| 6.1 Recreational activities and tourism | 0 | |
| 6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises | 0 | |
| 6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas | 0 | |
| 6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use) | 0 | |

| Threat type | Score (H,M,L,0) | Notes |
|--|--------------------|---|
| 6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors | H | The site has been destroyed as a result of earthworks for the construction of commercial buildings. |
| 7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson) | 0 | |
| 7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use | 0 | |
| 7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area | 0 | |
| 7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation) | 0 | |
| 7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values | H | Encroachment of commercial buildings and a new road at the base of the hill. |
| 7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc.) | 0 | |
| 8.1 Pest plants | 0 | |
| 8.1a Pest animals | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | |
| 9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | |
| 10.4 Erosion and siltation/deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes) | 0 | |
| 11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration | 0 | |
| 11.2 Droughts | 0 | |
| 11.3 Temperature extremes | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | |
| 12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values | 0 | |
| 12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc. | H | Destruction of important WWII relics e.g. bunkers, gun emplacements and tunnels. |
| 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 | Destruction of a historical heritage site due to commercial development | 12.3 | Top down decisions have resulted in severe impacts on the values of the area. The issue has been taken to court under the <i>War Surplus Material Act 1952</i> . CEPA provided advice on the site's historic and other values, for consideration in the decision making process, but this was not successful. There needs to be effective enforcement of the existing laws –this is important for the country. We need to be seen to be enforcing our legislation. Those responsible for the administration of the War Surplus Material Act (i.e. the National Museum), were engaged too late in the development decision making process and as a consequence the development has proceeded and many of the site's values have been lost. |

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 | Legally gazetted. | |
| 1b. Legal status | | | |
| 2a. Protected area regulations | 2 | Regulations in relation to the historic relics lie with the National Museum under their legislation – re taking of war relics (not CEPA). | |
| 2b. Protected area regulations | | | |
| 3. Law enforcement | 0 | In the past yes, but now through decentralisation and downsizing of the public service there has been no management of the area since the 1990s. | |
| 4. Protected area objectives | 0 | We currently don't know what the objectives for the protected area are. | |
| 5. Protected area design | 3 | The size captures the relics from WWII and the only other main value is as a viewing point. | |
| 6. Protected area boundaries | 3 | Boundaries are known and mapped. | |
| 7. Management plan | 0 | | |
| 7a. Planning process | 0 | | |
| 7b. Planning process | 0 | | |
| 7c. Planning process | 0 | | |
| 8. Regular work plan | 0 | | |
| 9. Resource inventory | 3 | There is a recent report on the historic values on the site. | |
| 10. Protection systems | 0 | | |

| Issue | Score (0,1,2,3 NA) | Comment | Next steps |
|---|-----------------------|--|------------|
| 11. Research and monitoring | 1 | Some research has been done under the Kokoda Initiative – Paga Hill was one of three sites examined (by Archaeological and Heritage Management Solutions). About 20 important historical relics were identified. | |
| 12. Resource management | 0 | | |
| 13a. Staff numbers | 0 | | |
| 13b. Other people working on the protected area | 0 | | |
| 14. Training and skills | 0 | There is no on-ground presence in the protected area. | |
| 15. Current budget | 0 | | |
| 16. Security of budget | 0 | | |
| 17. Management of budget | NA | | |
| 18. Equipment | 0 | | |
| 19. Maintenance of equipment | NA | | |
| 20. Education and awareness | 0 | | |
| 21. Planning for land use or marine activities | 0 | Planning decisions have resulted in the destruction of many of the site's values. | |
| 22. State and commercial neighbours | 0 | | |
| 23. Indigenous people/ Customary landowners | 0 | | |
| 24a. Impact on communities | 0 | | |
| 24b. Impact on communities | 0 | | |
| 24c. Impact on communities | 0 | | |
| 25. Economic benefit | 0 | | |
| 26. Monitoring and evaluation | 0 | | |
| 27. Visitor facilities | 0 | | |
| 28. Commercial tourism operators | 0 | | |
| 29. Fees | NA | | |
| 30. Condition of values | 0 | | |
| 30a. Condition of values | 1 | The evidence from an on-site visit indicated that the values are disappearing and that development continues, with little or no protection of the site's remaining historic relics. | |
| 30b. Condition of values | 0 | | |
| 30c. Condition of values | 0 | | |

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 |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Historical site | P | D | While many important relics have been lost, it is important to protect what remains. |
| Scenic | VG | S | The importance of the site as a scenic viewpoint needs to be retained. |
| Tourism | p | S | Potential value – no current access. |
| Communication | VG | S | |

Table 8. Recommendations and ways forward

| 1. | 2. | 3. |
|---|---|--|
| Work to protect the remaining historic values and to protect the scenic lookout values. | No further building construction in the area. Maintain the view lines from the top of the mountain. The site has educational value in relation to WWII history. | Transfer caretaking responsibilities from CEPA to another organisation e.g. National Museum. |

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

| | Strengths | Challenges |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Very important as a site of historical significance, but only some WWII relics remain on the site | To prevent the further loss of the remaining relics. |
| 2 | Provides an important viewpoint for the people of the city and visitors | |
| 3 | Central location with easy access by the public (although no access at the time of the assessment) | |
| 4 | Headland and gateway to Fairfax Harbour. | |