



GEF 6 Sustainable Financing of PNG Protected Area Network Project

LPAC MEETING MINUTES

22-23 February 2019

Venue: Wewak Boutique Hotel Conference Room, Wewak, East Sepik Province
Time: 1000 -1630 & 0930-1145

Chairpersons: Ms Kay Kalim, Conservation & Environment Protection Authority (CEPA), Director, Sustainable Environment Program Division; Patricia Kila, GEF 5 Project Manager.
Presenters: UNDP Environment & Energy Programme staff: Ms Emily Fajardo, UNDP GEF CTA & Patricia Kila, GEF 5 Project Manager.

Meeting Participants:

Ms Kay Kalim, Director SEP, CEPA; Mr Michael Bongro, Director Special Projects, CEPA; Mr Bense Thomas, Terrestrial PAs Manager, CEPA; Mr Bernard Suruman, Marine PA Manager, CEPA; Mr Kale Simai, Advisor Planning & Monitoring, Simbu Provincial Administration; Mr James Sabi, Terrestrial Ecosystems Manager, CEPA; Mr Brian Kunai, Policy Officer, Department of National Planning; Mr Derek Warakai, Director Climate Change, East Sepik Provincial Administration (ESPA); Mr Pius Num-Atai, Provincial DAL Food Security, ESPA; Frederick Kaukudi, Technical Manager DAL, ESPA; Daryll Worimo, Cocoa Coordinator, Cocoa Board Wewak; Tom Fandim, Provincial Planner, ESPA; Moses Wally, Disaster & Climate Change, ESPA; Solange Kanbibel, Disaster & Climate Change, ESPA; Elsie Simeon, Project Assistant, UNDP GEF 4; Emily Fajardo, CTA UNDP GEF Programme; Patricia Kila, GEF 5 Project Manager.

Absent invited participants: Mr Desmond Vaghello, Environment Officer, West New Britain Provincial Administration.

Preparatory aspects: Prior to the meeting, the participants had been provided soft and hard copies of the ProDoc for their review, in preparation for feedback. CEPA as the Implementing Partner were provided hard copies in October 2018, and other provincial counterparts provided a soft copy 2 weeks in advance.

Meeting Minutes:

1. The opening prayer was made by Mr Kale Simai
2. Opening remarks were made by Patricia Kila who thanked all participants for making time to attend the meeting. This was followed by the Introductions and the objectives of the meeting which were outlined as follows:
 - For CEPA/UNDP to present the Project Document;
 - To facilitate dialogue and collect feedback on the project
 - For the presentation of UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment
 - For the endorsement of Project Document

Welcome remarks on behalf of the East Sepik Provincial Administration were made by the Provincial Planner, Mr Tom Fandim and he apologised that he was not able to stay for the meeting as he had to leave for an urgent family obligation.

3. The purpose of the meeting was to inform all relevant parties of the Project Document, the quality assurance assessment process and the next steps. The minutes of this meeting was crucial in progressing the Project from design to implementation phase and would be submitted to the UNDP Regional Office to facilitate for the Delegation of Authority (DOA) which will enable the inception workshop to take place as part of the implementation phase. The concept of this Project commenced in 2016 and the design phase took place in 2017 where field visits to proposed Project sites was taken, with the exception of the Mt Wilhelm site. There were several iterations of the Project Document towards the current version. CEPA is the Implementation Partner and has been fully involved from conception to design phase and actively used the selection criteria for selecting project sites.
4. Power-point presentations were prepared and provided by Ms Emily Fajardo and there was time for discussion during the presentation to allow for participants to raise queries. The Project objective, strategy and overview of the Project components were presented, and discussions entailed. Some key points are highlighted:
 - Concern about funding for other protected areas other than the proposed sites under Component 3 and how this is being addressed. UNDP relayed that Component 2, the establishment of the Biodiversity Trust Fund would be a mechanism to address funding for other protected areas, with relevant administrative processes. Kay also added for noting, that the CEPA had submitted a funding proposal for the 2019 Capital Investment Program, part of the Development Budget, for 7 priority protected areas sites in other parts of PNG;
 - Kay also commented on the life of the Project and noted lessons learnt from the GEF 4 Project, of 5 years, where there was a no-cost extension made. In PNG, the Project requires more than 12 months for community and provincial stakeholder consultations to take place. Experiences from GEF 5 on consultation timeframes informed GEF 6 so that the GEF 6 Project duration was 7 years, to allow for consultations at sub-national level. GEF 6 would have to accommodate for participating provincial administrations to look at staffing resources to complement the partnership for better effectiveness and ease of work. There is much expected of GEF 6, given experiences from the current GEF 4 & GEF 5 Programs;
 - Simbu Provincial administration was not consulted during the design of the Project and encouraged that the Administration was invited. The Simbu Provincial representative, Mr Kale Simai, commented that the Administration would need to raise the profile of Mt Wilhelm, in terms of conservation/livelihood activities such as eco-tourism, as a result of this initiative. Mr Simai added that the Administration have a number of livelihood officers under their HR structure but that their functions would need to extend to looking after the Protected Areas. Mr Brian Kunai commented that the CEPA could look at devolving regulatory powers at the sub-national level as Protected Areas was a key priority as part of the current government strategy and the current Medium Term Development Program 3 (MTDP 3). Ms Fajardo mentioned that CEPA had formulated the Protected Areas Policy Implementation Plan (PAPIP) that was considered a development sector plan and there was funding allocated in the 2019 National Budget and that this was a major initiative by CEPA;

Project Component 2: Ms Emily Fajardo directed emphasis to Figure 7 on page 37 on the Biodiversity Trust Fund (BTF) to summarise this important Component. There was only one query raised as follows:

- The number of agencies on the Steering Committee. The response was a minimum of 3 representatives from Government, including Provincial administration.

Theory of Change (pages 18-20), Results Framework (pages 66-70), & Budget Notes (90-94) and Work Plan (pages 87-94) were used as a format to go through details of the Project Components. The following were key discussion outcomes as a result of the presentation and focussed mainly on Component 3 of the Prodoc:

- CEPA is counting on the GEF Projects to facilitate for capacity building, effect sustainability at the national level and also at the sub-national level. Further commendation was given to the East Sepik Provincial Administration for including the Cocoa Board team, as the Province focus was on agribusiness;
- CEPA commended feedback from the provincial counterparts on the Prodoc;
- There was a discussion between CEPA and provincial counterparts on sustainability of initiatives borne from Projects such as the GEF Program and that Districts were key to sustainability in the Provinces as they had access to direct funding from the respective members of parliament. The issue of sustainability also involved good management, staffing and financial resources. Mr Derek Warakai added that staffing resources were a real issue in the Province to cater for national initiatives such as this Project to complement efforts by CEPA. He suggested that the CEPA/UNDP consider GEF 4 lessons learnt by the East and West New Britain Provinces that would better inform how the ESP and Simbu Provinces can accommodate the Project, as the focus at the provincial level is mostly on climate change rather than protected areas/environment/biodiversity. CEPA/UNDP relayed GEF 4 experiences from the New Britain Island in terms of restructuring of the provincial administration and having a MoA arrangement to guide the Project and also created the opportunity for the respective provincial administrations and even the Pomio District to allocate and fund and resource activities reflected in the MoA, consistent with GEF 4 Prodoc Outcomes. Furthermore, there was mention that a key Industry (New Britain Oil Palm) have also been actively engaged in the West New Britain and a Tourism businessman is currently the Chairman of the East New Britain Environment Committee. The Committee was revived under the GEF 4 Project;
- The Cocoa Board Team mentioned that there every Project has to be sustainable and that the Team had a good communications network in the Province for their work and added that the Team had 3,800 processing facilities throughout the Province and 800 fermenters in the lower Sepik area. The cocoa networks were useful for noting;
- The East Sepik Provincial Administration raised queries on the risk to the Project of the proposed Frieda River Copper Mine development. The CEPA/UNDP Secretariat Team responded that the proposed mine's environment permitting schedule had already been considered as part of the Project risks and that the Risk was moderate;
- Mr Pius Num-Atai, Technical Manager for DAL, mentioned that the Mainland Holdings company does not engage the Ambunti-Drekirkir District Administration (one of the Project pilot sites), on the crocodile Project and the Provincial administration were not happy about this.(refer page 45 of Prodoc);
- CEPA (Bernard Suruman) mentioned a CSIRO study – resource validation study that could assist with the Kimbe Bay site;
- There was a question on whether any changes could be made to the Prodoc at this stage and CEPA (James Sabi) responded that changes could be raised at the Inception Workshop and that any changes can only be made to the output indicators;
- Indicator 11 discussions – Ms Kay Kalim stated it is possible to exceed the target set. Emily Fajardo gave an example of the GEF 5 Responsible Partner YUS reflecting in their reports that household incomes had been exceeded. Ms Kay Kalim encouraged the East Sepik Provincial Admin to support crocodile farming communities to

negotiate prices of crocodile eggs, skins with Mainland Holdings and that the targets are not impossible to exceed;

5. Quality Assurance Assessment Session. The Assessment is a means to ensure that the Project is still in line with Project objectives and used as part of the UNDP monitoring process. The reference document used for this Assessment is the Design & Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report (*refer Attachment 1*). Ms Patricia Kila led this session and went through each question for the LPAC to vet. The LPAC **endorsed** the Assessment. Some feedback in relation to some questions were noted as follows:

Question 4: There was a query on consistency with government planning frameworks.

Question 6: Clarification on the south-south cooperation was that there are tours to other developed or developing countries that may include academic institutions. For example, the GEF 4 Project facilitated for a tour of the Philippines in collaboration with UNDP Philippines. GEF 5 has provisions for a similar type cooperation as well.

Question 7: A query was raised of CEPA on the status of the Protected Areas Bill. CEPA advised that the Minister for Environment & Climate Change, is targeting the May Parliament Session.

Question 11: Mr Brian Kunai commented on the M&E and that the Department of National Planning & Monitoring (DNPM) is collecting data on development statistics and asked if CEPA had any plans to provide statistics to the DNPM. CEPA responded that the Authority via the PAPIP has a M&E Framework and that the PAPIP is a Sectoral Plan already and statistics could be provided by way of funding & M&E reports to the DNPM. CEPA also advised of their publicly accessed data portal that featured environment publications/information.

Question 12: Mr Kale Simai mentioned that the project management structure should include all provinces that are part of the Project. CEPA advised that with the GEF 4 & GEF 5 Projects, the provincial administration representatives are part of the Project Board.

Question 14: Does the Project use the government procurement process or another? CEPA responded stating that the UNDP procurement process is being used.

Question 15: Is there consistency with the PNG Medium Term Development Plan. CEPA responded that the Project is consistent with current government strategy and the Project is part of the implementation of the PNG Protected Areas Policy, Pillar 5 *Sustainable financing of Protected Areas*.

Question 20: There was a comment that the question was not worded properly.

Question 25: *Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.) to the extent possible?* Additional comments: Throughout the Project we will look at the government processes. The Trust Fund will not deviate from government approval mechanisms. A query was raised on capacity building. Ms Emily Fajardo responded on lessons learnt at the District/LLG level on the use of drones for land use planning.

Question 26: *Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation strategy)?*

Resolution: That the Prodoc was endorsed by the LPAC with some of the following comments for consideration at the Inception workshop.

1. That the Simbu Provincial Administration be consulted on the pilot site as this was not part of the design phase;
2. Emphasis on establishment of small grant facility as a funding resource for protected areas.

NEXT STEPS:

1. Minutes of the LPAC to be circulated to stakeholders in the next 2 weeks;
2. GEF Secretariat to notify UNDP of approval status of Prodoc;
3. Inception workshop to be formalised – estimated timeframe is June 2019;
4. Annex I to be inserted into the ProDoc;
5. Project Management Team to be established and consultations to commence;
6. Get ready for capacity building opportunities.

Annex A. LPAC Meeting Actual Agenda

Day One: Friday 22nd February 2019 Chairperson – Ms Kay Kalim		
Time		Lead
1030-1130	Opening Prayer	Mr Kale Simai
	Welcome and Introductions	CEPA & East Sepik Provincial Administration – Kay Kalim & Tom Fandim, Provincial Planner
	Appraisal Purpose & Project Background, including LPAC Overview	UNDP/GEF Project Technical Specialist - Emily Fajardo
	Project Component 1- Enabling conditions for improving the sustainability of the protected area system	E. Fajardo with CEPA support
1130-1145	Morning Tea	
1145-1400	Project Component 1 continues	E. Fajardo with CEPA support
1400-1500	Lunch Break	
1500-1600	Project Component 2- Establishment, operationalisation and mobilization of funding for a Biodiversity Fund	E. Fajardo with CEPA support
	Project Component 3 -Enhanced management capacity and financial sustainability of individual protected areas	E. Fajardo with CEPA support
1600-1615	Afternoon Tea Break	
1615-1700	Project Component 3 -Enhanced management capacity and financial sustainability of individual protected areas	E. Fajardo with CEPA support
	Project Management Arrangements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation Modality ▪ Project Management Unit 	E. Fajardo with CEPA support
Day Two: Saturday 23rd February 2019 Co-Chair: Patricia Kila		
0930-1030	QA Assessment – Questions 1-25	UNDP/GEF Project Manager Patricia Kila with CEPA support
1030-1040	Tea Break	
1040-1145	QA Assessment continues; next steps and close up of meeting	P. Kila with CEPA support
1200-1300	Lunch	

Annex B. Design & Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating: Highly Satisfactory
Decision: Approve: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
Project Number: 00100181
Project Title: The project aims to demonstrate increase in sustainable financing of biodiversity conservation across the protected area system as well as increase in species conservation in and outside PAs.
Project Date: 01-Jan-2017
Strategic Quality Rating: Exemplary

1. Does the project's Theory of Change specify how it will contribute to higher level change? (Select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project) (Refer page 18)

- 3: The project has a theory of change with explicit assumptions and clear change pathway describing how the project will contribute to outcome level change as specified in the programme/CPD, backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context. The project document clearly describes why the project's strategy is the best approach at this point in time.
- 2: The project has a theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project intends to contribute to outcome-level change and why the project strategy is the best approach at this point in time, but is backed by limited evidence.
- 1: The project does not have a theory of change, but the project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without specifying the key assumptions. It does not make an explicit link to the programme/CPD's theory of change.

Evidence

Management Response

The project has a theory of change in the project document.

2. Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan; it addresses at least one of the proposed new and emerging areas; an issues-based analysis has been incorporated into the project design; and the project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: While the project may respond to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan, it is based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. This answer is also selected if the project does not respond to any of the three areas of development work in the Strategic Plan.

Evidence

The Project Results Framework is linked with indicators of the UNDP Strategic Plan, particularly on sustainable natural resource management and gender response measures.

Relevant

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

3. Does the project have strategies to effectively identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of targeted groups/geographic areas with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project) (Refer pages 42,76, 118,126,134,138)

3: The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised. Beneficiaries will be identified through a rigorous process based on evidence (if applicable.)The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of specified target groups/geographic areas throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (such as representation on the project board) (all must be true to select this option)

2: The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised. The project document states how beneficiaries will be identified, engaged and how meaningful participation will be ensured throughout the project. (both must be true to select this option)

1: The target groups/geographic areas are not specified, or do not prioritize excluded and/or marginalised populations. The project does not have a written strategy to identify or engage or ensure the meaningful participation of the target groups/geographic areas throughout the project.

Not Applicable

Evidence

Management Response

Target beneficiaries are specified in the project document, of which 65% are women and youth. They would be represented in the project board (See Section 8, page 76 on governance and management arrangements).

4. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: Knowledge and lessons learned (gained e.g. through peer assist sessions) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to develop the project's theory of change and justify the approach used by the project over alternatives.

2: The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources, which inform the project's theory of change but have not been used/are not sufficient to justify the approach selected over alternatives.

1: There is only scant or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references that are made are not backed by evidence.

Evidence

Management Response

Limited knowledge on the feasibility of sustainable livelihood options in each pilot sites to be pursued.

5. Does the project use gender analysis in the project design and does the project respond to this gender analysis with concrete measures to address gender inequities and empower women? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project) Refer to Annex K, page 138

3: A participatory gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men, and it is fully integrated into the project document. The project establishes concrete priorities to address gender inequalities in its strategy. The results framework includes outputs and activities that specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality. (all must be true to select this option)

2: A gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men. Gender concerns are integrated in the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework includes outputs and activities that specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality. (all must be true to select this option)

1: The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project's development situation on gender relations, women and men, but the constraints have not been clearly identified and interventions have not been considered.

Evidence

Management Response

The Project Document contain Annex K on Gender analysis and Action Plan.

6. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national partners, other development partners, and other actors? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project. It is clear how results achieved by relevant partners will contribute to outcome level change complementing the project's intended results. If relevant, options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. (all must be true to select this option)

2: Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation may not have not been fully developed during project design, even if relevant opportunities have been identified.

1: No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners' interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.

Evidence

Management Response

UNDP selected by government as first partner of choice with relevant South-South and Triangular Cooperation to establish the Biodiversity Fund.

Social & Environmental Standards

Quality Rating: Exemplary

7. Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights based approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: Credible evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights, upholding the relevant international and national laws and standards in the area of the project. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option)

2: Some evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget.

1: No evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.

Evidence

Management Response

SESP is Annex I of the Project Document.

8. Did the project consider potential environmental opportunities and adverse impacts, applying a precautionary approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: Credible evidence that opportunities to enhance environmental sustainability and integrate poverty-environment linkages were fully considered as relevant, and integrated in project strategy and design. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option).
- 2: No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, if relevant, and appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget.
- 1: No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts were adequately considered.

Evidence

Management Response

Risks are identified and reported on a quarterly basis.

9. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? [If yes, upload the completed checklist as evidence. If SESP is not required, provide the reason(s) for the exemption in the evidence section. Exemptions include the following:

Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication materials
Organization of an event, workshop, training
Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences
Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks
Global/regional projects with no country level activities (e.g. knowledge management, inter-governmental processes)
UNDP acting as Administrative Agent

- Yes
- No
- SESP not required

Evidence

A draft Environmental and Social Management Framework was circulated to the general public for feedback.

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

10. Does the project have a strong results framework? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level and relate in a clear way to the project's theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure all of the key expected changes identified in the theory of change, each with credible data sources, and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (all must be true to select this option)

2: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level, but may not cover all aspects of the project's theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. (all must be true to select this option)

1: The results framework does not meet all of the conditions specified in selection "2" above. This includes: the project's selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level and do not relate in a clear way to the project's theory of change; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change, and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators.

Evidence

Management Response

Project Results Framework is Section 6 of the Project Document.

11. Is there a comprehensive and costed M&E plan with specified data collection sources and methods to support evidence-based management, monitoring and evaluation of the project?

Yes

No

Evidence

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan or Section 7 of the Project Document.

12. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including planned composition of the project board? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: The project's governance mechanism is fully defined in the project document. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. (all must be true to select this option).

2: The project's governance mechanism is defined in the project document; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The prodoc lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. (all must be true to select this option)

1: The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.

Evidence

Management Response

Governance and management arrangement is Section 8 of the Project Document. Identified individuals have yet to agree to become a member of the project board.

13. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risks? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk. (both must be true to select this option)

2: Project risks related to the achievement of results identified in the initial project risk log with mitigation measures identified for each risk.

1: Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified and no initial risk log is included with the project document.

Evidence

Analysis and plans to manage and mitigate risks are reflected in several sections of the Project Document: Risk Management (Section 12), Risk Log (Annex M), SESP (Annex I), Stakeholder engagement plan (Annex J), Gender analysis and Action Plan (Annex K), Capacity assessment (Annex O), and a draft ESMF.

Management Response

Efficient

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include: i) using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available; ii) using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions; iii) through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners.

Yes

No

Evidence

The project will use a portfolio approach and cost-efficiency strategy as indicated in Section 5 of the Project Document.

15. Are explicit plans in place to ensure the project links up with other relevant on-going projects and initiatives, whether led by UNDP, national or other partners, to achieve more efficient results (including, for example, through sharing resources or coordinating delivery?)

Yes

No

Evidence

The project will strive for further cost effectiveness with the other GEF projects as well as other conservation programmes that are being implemented by UNDP (and even other organisations such as IUCN/CEPF, forthcoming USAID biodiversity project as well as other closely related programmes in other focal areas (e.g., climate change). Sharing of resources could be explored to include: rental facilities, utilities, vehicles and personnel that can be pooled.

16. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?

3: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget.

2: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates.

1: The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget.

Evidence

Total Budget and Work Plan is Section 10 of the Project Document.

17. Is the Country Office fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?

3: The budget fully covers all direct project costs that are directly attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.)

2: The budget covers significant direct project costs that are directly attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant.

1: The budget does not reimburse UNDP for direct project costs. UNDP is cross-subsidizing the project and the office should advocate for the inclusion of DPC in any project budget revisions.

Evidence

Management Response

UNDP services fully costed in the LOA to be signed by government.

Effective

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

18. Is the chosen implementation modality most appropriate? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted, and there is evidence that options for implementation modalities have been thoroughly considered. There is a strong justification for choosing the selected modality, based on the development context. (both must be true to select this option)

2: The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted and the implementation modality chosen is consistent with the results of the assessments.

1: The required assessments have not been conducted, but there may be evidence that options for implementation modalities have been considered.

Evidence

Management Response

Refer to Annexes N and O of the Project Document. Since there is no change in the financial management system in CEPA since 2014, HACT micro assessment to be conducted in the next cycle.

19. Have targeted groups, prioritizing marginalized and excluded populations that will be affected by the project, been engaged in the design of the project in a way that addresses any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination?

3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. Their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change which seeks to address any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination and the selection of project interventions.

2: Some evidence that key targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project, have been engaged in the design of the project. Some evidence that their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change and the selection of project interventions.

1: No evidence of engagement with marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project during project design. No evidence that the views, rights and constraints of populations have been incorporated into the project.

Not Applicable

Evidence

Stakeholders consulted are listed as Annex E.

20. Does the project conduct regular monitoring activities, have explicit plans for evaluation, and include other lesson learning (e.g. through After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops), timed to inform course corrections if needed during project implementation?

Yes

No

Evidence

M&E actions are reflected in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan or Section 7 of the Project Document.

21. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.

Yes

No

Evidence

Management Response

The Project rated with a gender marker 2 with outcome indicator#3 in the PRF wherein more than 65% of the direct project beneficiaries are women and youth.

22. Is there a realistic multi-year work plan and budget to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within allotted resources? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: The project has a realistic work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the activity level to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within the allotted resources.

2: The project has a work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the output level.

1: The project does not yet have a work plan & budget covering the duration of the project.

Evidence

Section 10 Total Budget and Work Plan reflects project activities and allocation for 7 years.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Exemplary

23. Have national partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?

3: National partners have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.

2: The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national partners.

1: The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners.

Not Applicable

Evidence

Implementing Partner directed the design of the project and led decisions, for example, in the selection of project sites (Annex G).

24. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific/comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted? (select from options 0-4 that best reflects this project):

- 3: The project has a comprehensive strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions based on a systematic and detailed capacity assessment that has been completed. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly.
- 2.5: A capacity assessment has been completed. The project document has identified activities that will be undertaken to strengthen capacity of national institutions, but these activities are not part of a comprehensive strategy to monitor and strengthen national capacities.
- 2: A capacity assessment is planned after the start of the project. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions based on the results of the capacity assessment.
- 1.5: There is mention in the project document of capacities of national institutions to be strengthened through the project, but no capacity assessments or specific strategy development are planned.
- 1: Capacity assessments have not been carried out and are not foreseen. There is no strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions.
- Not Applicable

Evidence

Financial and capacity scorecard are part of the Project Results Framework.

25. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.) to the extent possible?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

Evidence

The Project is founded on Pillar 5 of the Protected Area Policy endorsed by national government.

26. Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation strategy)?

- Yes
- No


Evidence


Implementing Partner will lead in mobilizing resources and manage the Biodiversity Fund, before the Project ends.

Quality Assurance Summary/PAC Comments

The Project is of sufficient quality to be approved in its current form and management actions for an updated HACT micro assessment should be addressed.

ENDORSEMENT or CLEARANCE FOR THE MEETING MINUTES

Signature:  Date: 01/05/2019
Ms. Kumaras Kalim
Meeting Chairperson & Director, SEP, CEPA

Signature:  Date: 01/05/2019
Ms. Dang Thi Hien
Operations Manager & OIC, UNDP Country Office