



EREPA - Ensuring Resilient Ecosystems and Representative Protected Areas in the Solomon Islands

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9846

Countries

Solomon Islands

Project Name

EREPA - Ensuring Resilient Ecosystems and Representative Protected Areas in the Solomon Islands

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

5/29/2019

Review completed by PM

3/25/2021

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2019

Yes. Some of the subcomponents have been reordered or combined, but there is a logic to the changes.

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/20/2019

Yes, thank you for the edits.

7/1/2019

No, while logically designed there are some issues that need to be addressed.

Component 1 -

1.5 - Unfortunately, environmental communications often do not achieve their desired effect for behavior change. How will communications strategies be tested and refined? How will their success be measured and lessons learned?

Component 2 -

2.1.1 - Who will manage and maintain this network including after project end? Oftentimes these types of networks can be valuable, but do require a small amount of resources including some staff time to work.

- It would also be good to clarify the relationship between the land use plans and the protected areas within the text. They seem disconnected. The project would benefit from a coherent and concise explanation of the sustainable development planning process and its implementation as envisioned by this project. It appears that this is where the project is going. It might help to switch components 2 and 3.

2.5 - Financing is key for PA success. How will the business plans seek to develop financing or other strategies to ensure the effective management of the areas? The description of financing a business plan is a bit confusing as a business plan is often about the financing options for the park. Therefore, the goal likely shouldn't be the full financing of one park. They should also include various financing options not simply government budget support.

Response to Secretariat comments

Component 1 -	
<p>1.5 - Unfortunately, environmental communications often do not achieve their desired effect for behavior change. How will communications strategies be tested and refined? How will their success be measured and lessons learned?</p>	<p>Added to Activity 1.5.1: In the design phase, pre-implementation baseline surveys of attitudes and perceptions will be carried out to provide a baseline of awareness and related behavioural choices. These awareness surveys will be conducted during initial consultations with communities (Activity 1.2.2). Awareness will be surveyed again during community consultations (e.g. Activity 1.3.2 and 2.4.1) to assess changes in awareness and to refine the communications strategy. These surveys will build on existing lessons in measuring the impact of educational activities, such as has successfully been implemented by the NGO Live and Learn in Rennell, in the context of their sustainable livelihoods programme, and by the University of Queensland with regards marine resource use in Ghizo.. (Page 54)</p> <p>Awareness measures have been included in results framework.</p>
Component 2 -	

<p>2.1.1 - Who will manage and maintain this network including after project end? Oftentimes these types of networks can be valuable, but do require a small amount of resources including some staff time to work.</p>	<p>Added to Output 2.1 text: The national network will be established within the MECDM. Provincial networks will be established under an appropriate provincial agency with guidance and coordination from MECDM. Page 53.</p>
<p>- It would also be good to clarify the relationship between the land use plans and the protected areas within the text. They seem disconnected. The project would benefit from a coherent and concise explanation of the sustainable development planning process and its implementation as envisioned by this project. It appears that this is where the project is going.</p> <p>It might help to switch components 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Added to Component 3 text: Component 3 will implement interventions for improving livelihoods in the targeted landscapes. This will be underpinned by community based land-use planning (Output 3.1), which involves supporting customary owners through an inclusive and participatory process to zone land-uses in a way that balances sustainable development and conservation. It will also identify local development priorities. This approach has proved very successful in the Melanesia region[1]¹. The outputs from the process will inform the designation of protected areas and implementation of livelihood development activities within this component. Under Output 3.2 the communities' priority sustainable development actions from the land-use plans can be supported through training and funding, and if the activity is an income generating action it can potentially be supported through the micro-loan system of Activity 3.2.2. This is an important step in creating the enabling conditions required for community-based conservation areas to succeed through reducing the direct reliance on natural resources. Lastly, restoration interventions and management activities for invasive species identified in the land-use management plans, including reforestation interventions, will be implemented under Output 3.3. Page 58.</p> <p>We recognize the value of putting the landscape-oriented Component 3 before the PA-oriented Component 2. However, because this is primarily a PA project, Component 2 was presented first. As the change will not make any substantive changes and create difficulties in rearranging the ProDoc, budget, workplans, etc, we request to keep the components oriented as originally presented.</p>

2.5 - Financing is key for PA success.

How will the business plans seek to develop financing or other strategies to ensure the effective management of the areas?

The description of financing a business plan is a bit confusing as a business plan is often about the financing options for the park.

Therefore, the goal likely shouldn't be the full financing of one park. They should also include various financing options not simply government budget support.

To reduce confusion, the term 'business plan' has been changed to 'operational plan' for individual PAs with explanation below. It is important to recognize how remote some of these places are without significant tourism potential yet or many government services. This reduces the potential for PES in Solomon Islands at this time.

Text added to Output 2.5: Output 2.5 Operational plans and funding opportunities for the implementation of the PA management plan in each targeted site developed.

Before being able to plan for the sustainable financing of a protected area, the scope of operations and the associated costs of the implementation of a PA management plan including *inter alia* the establishment and maintenance of a protected area and sustainable development within and outside the PA in the SIs will be assessed.

An operational plan will then be developed to form an annex or additional, easily-communicated and updated scheme for the effective implementation of management provisions agreed to with and by community members and designated protected area management agents. This operational plan will define the short-term and longer term needs for installation and recurrent staffing, infrastructure and related needs. Based on these operational plans, the project will help identify, as much as possible, the financial, infrastructure, equipment, and staffing requirements for effective operations in each of the protected areas and for the entire network.

Financing options will come from government, community activities, and Payment for Ecosystem Services options, and user fees where appropriate. The results of the operational plans will be specific to the Solomon Islands context and determined through the consultative processes proposed. As the operational plans will be developed to coincide with the establishment of the protected areas, these plans will be implemented by the Solomon Islands government, communities, and partners during the management phase of these protected areas.

?

Protected area management plans, operational plans, and business plans will be presented to local and provincial authorities to be considered during local, provincial and national budgeting processes. The financing requirements will be shared with the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology for inclusion in government budgeting processes, for developing future projects, and for informing the spending of the Solomon Islands Trust Fund. Where PES may be appropriate, such as for municipal water sources for Honiara on Guadalcanal, the plans will inform the discussions with other projects and Ministries. In sites that may have opportunities for financing from tourism, the plans will be shared with tourism operators and potential donors.

Page 59.

Activity 2.5.2 includes 'Funding sources to be considered in the business plan may include government funds (e.g. budget available for rural employment initiatives; the encouragement for provincial governments to contribute to funding PA within their jurisdiction); the PA Trust Fund

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/20/2019

Yes.

7/1/2019

No, it's surprising that the largest amount of resources is focused on component 1 which is the enabling environment and not component 2 or 3 which is the actual implementation of activities. This might make sense if there were substantial co-financing for those components that GEF financing was facilitating. Please explain.

Response to Secretariat comments

Component 1 is for an enabling environment in the Solomon Islands. It is important to note that Solomon Island has only one formal protected area and is lacking in much of the necessary knowledge and capacity to develop additional formal protected areas. Of the \$1,780,200 budget for Component 1, \$751,300 is allocated to baseline social and biodiversity surveys in the 4 sites to fill those basic knowledge gaps (Activity 1.2.2). When this is considered, the remaining budget for Component 1 is less than or equal to Component 2 (\$1,769,019) or Component 3 (\$1,130,100).

Again, it is important to note that the studies are not just for academic interest. These surveys include socioeconomic baseline establishment, the beginning of the FPIC process, and identifying biodiversity baselines for the establishment of PAs. They will form the foundation of the management plans and M&E plans in the future.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2019

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/12/2020

Yes, thank you for the efforts. We encourage you to continue to seek out and document other sources of cofinancing even if small from CSOs, private sector, etc. co-financing is a topic that our Council watches very closely.

11/26/2019

Yes. However, we ask that the project seek out additional cofinancing from UN, multilateral, and bilateral donors that seem to be missing from the cofinancing list.

7/1/2019

Yes. However, it's disappointing to see a lack of diverse sources of co-financing. Are there no initiatives from NGOs or other bilateral or multilateral donors that are part of this effort?

Response to Secretariat comments

The IUCN-led CEPF project is operating in Solomon Islands with over \$1,000,000 in grants in the past 3-4 years but as this is based on GEF funds, it cannot be used as co-financing.

Additional projects are detailed in ProDoc sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2. Pages 38-42.

The project will include representatives from other Ministries on the steering committee. These will include representatives from Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and Ministry of Lands who are working with SI government funds continue a UNDP project to map potential agricultural lands with communities.

03/24/2020

Noted. We will continue to engage with stakeholders and co-financiers during project implementation

02/17/2020 ? IUCN

We have had discussions with UNDP, UNEP, FAO, GIZ, WWF, and WCS. UNDP and UNEP have projects in Solomons on water supply and energy (most of which are GEF funded). FAO is implementing a GEF5 forests and protected areas project. WWF?s

focus is mostly on coastal fisheries and community engagement (but not in the provinces that the project will be working in). WCS has some terrestrial protected area work, but it is funded by CEPF (and hence GEF). GIZ and WCS have IKI and Blue Action Fund monies but they are more about marine/coastal management and require donor letters from BMUB and are they not interested to go through that process. So, there are projects but they are not willing to go through the process to issue a formal co-financing letter.

April 6, 2020

Thank you for this. We will continue to look for possible cofinancing from various sources.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/5/2020

Yes. The start date of core indicator 6.1 will need to be updated to 2021, but this can be done at midterm.

11/13/2020

No, - The calculation on the GHG benefits is over 18 years instead of 20 as per our GEF guidelines.

- On the high-level of GHG results, the comments 1, 2, 3 and 4 are addressed.

There are still some important issues that need to be clarified:

1- The Prodoc says 100 ha of forest restoration while the table F of the CEO ER, and the Ex-ACT tool, say the restoration is on 100 ha of agriculture lands. This is not consistent.

2- The EX-Act tool considers the 35,000 ha of forest are being restored (I understand naturally, thanks to the protection) as their degradation level decreases. Nevertheless the Prodoc and the table F of CEO ER only considers 100 ha of restoration. In the project description, the Agency should clearly described what kind of restoration will be implemented, on what kind of land and on how many hectares of land, and the information provided should be consistent throughout all the documents (CEO ER, Prodoc and Ex-ACT tool).

4/24/2020

No, carbon figured need to be in the core indicators of the Portal. Also, there are still some issues with the completion of the ExACT tool. We can discuss directly with the project team on this if need be.

- Please calculate the results over a 20-years period (6 years for the project duration + 14 years of capitalization phase) as per our guidelines.

- The result appears relatively high regarding the investment (especially as all the co-financing is in-kind? not sure how much it will be incremental from a baseline scenario). We would encourage the proponent to:

1. be more conservative in the Ex-ACT tool in terms of the expected degradation level with the project (changing from 'very low' to 'low');
2. check the area of intervention: Why the 35,000 ha in Ex-ACT while in table F they claim 50,000 ha of improved management for biodiversity and 10,000 ha of SLM in production systems. This looks inconsistent unless it is somewhere explained (maybe the 35,000 ha are part of the 50,000 ha and they chose this number for some reason);
3. check the type of forest: is it tropical rain forest as they say in the Ex-Act tool or tropical moist deciduous or tropical dry forest? We don't know, but this is important as it affects much the result;
4. report the CO2 benefits in table F.

3/11/2020

No, the project still has not completed the indicator 1 information correctly. We need names and WDPA IDs for the PAs as they will need an improved METT score to count.

The carbon calculations are also done incorrectly. We encourage the project to use ExACT to do the carbon calculations so that they follow established GEF standards. Please contact the GEF Secretariat if there are questions.

11/20/2019

No. Thanks for the revisions.

However, for the core indicators on Protected Areas we need a list of protected areas to be under improved management. If these are new protected areas (which is what is in the project results framework), then they should be listed as new rather than improved.

Please note that hectares of improved management require an improved METT score to count.

It's unclear how the GHG numbers were calculated and they seem quite high. Can you please include the figures or other calculations?

Please revise the Rio Markers in the GEF Portal.

7/1/2019

No.

Core Indicators - The project should include the predicted number of beneficiaries disaggregated by gender. It would also be good to include if possible the GHG emissions benefits as significant areas are being brought under protection.

Rio Markers -it seems that mitigation would be a 1 and adaptation a 0. There will be significant mitigation benefits from the protected areas but the work isn't being undertaken for adaptation purposes or with specific adaptation goals in mind. Please revise or explain.

Taxonomy - Please only select the higher level choices (i.e. "Focal Areas" should not be selected). Please include relevant habitat types and the relevant activities under biodiversity.

Response to Secretariat comments

Completed. Derived from Solomon Islands national census 2009 and 2019 population predictions.

M: 21,427

F: 21,237

Data source: Solomon Islands National Statistics Office.
2009_Census_Population_by_Wards.xls
(<https://www.statistics.gov.sb/statistics/demographic-statistics/census>) and Projected Population by Province 2010-2025 (<https://www.statistics.gov.sb/statistics/social-statistics/population>). Accessed 12 July 2019.

CEO Endorsement Letter: Page 5 and Page 35 of ProDoc.

12,230,000 metric tons ? added to CEO Endorsement letter, Page 5.

Greenhouse Gass Emissions Mitigated derived from Solomon Islands National Forest Reference Level, Submission for the UNFCCC Technical Assessment 2019, Solomon Islands Government December 2018, Prepared by: REDD+ Implementation Unit Ministry of Forestry and Research. Table 5.3.3. EF forest degradation = 244.6 t CO₂ / ha. (https://redd.unfccc.int/files/2019_submission_frel_solomon_islands.pdf)

Rio Markers: We have removed some of the climate adaptation areas in the taxonomy, however it is anticipated that some of the protected areas will be located in coastal and low-lying areas, including East Rennell. The National Adaptation Plan (2008) includes ?protect and where relevant rehabilitate coral reefs and mangroves in build-up [sic] coastal areas.? Additionally, the Solomon Island Climate Change Policy 2012-2017 includes a focus on restoration of degraded land with forest/horticultural based projects which will directly benefit climate change adaptation responses, especially when they are scaled up nationally. Thus, we have kept adaptation with ?ecosystem-based adaptation.? Upon advice we have included

02/17/2020 ? IUCN

Noted. We have corrected the Total area under improved management (Hectares) from 50,0150 to 150 ha. We had incorrectly added all of the cells above that line rather than just the cells for ?improved ha.?

April 6, 2020

This mistake has been corrected in the portal. The 50,000 ha are all newly created protected areas.

Thank you for the suggestion to use ExAct. This has been calculated and added to the CEO endorsement letter and the portal as an attachment.

04 May 2020

Thank you for these. We have revised based on comments.

We were unable to find guidelines that referred to calculating for 6-year projects. We are calculating for 4 years for project duration and 14 years capitalization as suggested.

Noted and agree.

1. Noted. This has been changed in the '5. Management' tab.
2. We made a comment in our previous submission but there is no space in the portal for this comment. It is also in the comments tab of the Ex-Act spreadsheet. The project will establish 50,000 ha of protected areas distributed across 4 provinces. On Rennell, there is a large FW lake 'Lake Tegano' which is 15,000 ha. This 15,000 ha has been removed from the calculation as it will not serve a GHG role that can be measured.

According to the WWF/National Geographic Terrestrial Ecoregions of the World, all Solomon Islands forests are tropical moist forests or mangrove.

IUCN 24 Nov 2020

The timeframe of the Ex-Act tool has been changed to 20 years.

1. We have corrected the CEO ER to show for reforestation rather than agriculture in Table F. In the ExAct Tool, the 100 ha are on Tab 2 (LUC) and in the Afforestation/Reforestation table. I am confused about where this should go other than where it is.

2. Activities related to restoration are described in output 3.3 (page 52) and activity 3.3.1. This is in line with the targets included in the core indicators table. We have not considered the designation of Protected Areas as 'restoration.' The restoration of 100 ha will be done in addition to the PA designation in areas identified during the land-use planning exercises.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2019

Yes. It would be good to look at other projects for lessons learned on sustainable livelihoods and community-based natural resource management.

Response to Secretariat comments

The MECDM is the central point for natural resource management projects in Solomon Islands. We will work with them to look at other projects. This includes the experiences of WWF Solomon Islands and their small-grants program. IUCN, through the GEF-funded, CEPF programme has supported more than 30 small and large grants in Solomon Islands with a value of more than \$2,000,000. Lessons from these, and other projects, will be built upon.

Additional projects are detailed in ProDoc sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2. Pages 38-42.

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/20/2019

Yes. However, at inception we encourage examining indicators that address quality of implementation as well as the straight forward output. For example, a new data platform could also be assessed by the number of users in the past 3 months.

We will note that the proposed Inclusive Conservation Initiative (CI/IUCN) will be looking to develop a revised METT or guidance for using the METT in ICCAs. This project could be part of the piloting of this work.

7/1/2019

No, at this point the indicators and targets for this project are very much focused on outputs and not outcomes. The project should add some outcome indicators for the activities and their quality of implementation (such as revenue generated from a sustainable development activity or number of loans given out by the microfinance system by project end or number of participants in the learning network).

It could also be good to coordinate with the UNDP GEF-6 project on protected areas in PNG that will be looking at a revised METT for community protected areas that might be appropriate for these PAs as well.

Response to Secretariat comments

Outcome indicators and targets have been added to the results framework. These include:

Output 1.1: Number of people attending landuse forums
Land-use forum participants are satisfied with the forum
process and outcomes

Output 1.2: Number of local scientists engaged in studies

Output 1.3: Number of local community members attending
consultations
Community members are satisfied that their views and
concerns are heard and addressed

Output 1.5: Increase in awareness among community members
Capacity of trained individuals increased

Output 2.1: Number of members of PAN

Outcome 3: Number of sustainable micro or small enterprises
created/strengthened because of microloans

Output 3.1: Community members feel that their inputs into land-
use management plans are taken seriously

Output 3.2: Number of participants in peer-to-peer capacity
building sessions
Number of participants in peer-to-peer capacity
building sessions reporting new knowledge or skills

These additions can be found in the revised CEO Endorsement Letter Annex A and on
ProDoc pages 8-10.

The IUCN Oceania Regional Office Protected Area programme, under the BIOPAMA
project, has already attended several meetings in PNG on the METT and this will be
incorporated with this project in Solomon Islands. The BIOPAMA programme is in
close coordination with Protected Areas Solution that developed the PNG METT.

[02/17/2020 ? IUCN](#)

Noted.

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
11/20/2019

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

7/1/2019

No, given that the scaling up opportunities for this project rest in the roll out of similar activities in other parts of the country and sharing experiences more widely, a robust knowledge management plan is needed. How will the project document the activities and lessons learned throughout the life of the project? Component 4 might add some activities in this area.

Response to Secretariat comments

Added to Project Results Framework Component 4 (ProDoc and CEO Endorsement letter) and text added to ProDoc Section 4.10. Knowledge management will be strongly linked to the project monitoring and evaluation to ensure that all collected M&E data are processed into knowledge and shared with the project staff through the most appropriate communication tools. The objectives of this internal knowledge management process are twofold (i) delivering the preliminary knowledge generated by the project to the main stakeholders; and (ii) improving this knowledge with individual know-how. This enriched operational knowledge through internal processes will serve as inputs to the external processes of knowledge management. External knowledge management will be geared towards outreaching the project achievements and lessons to external partners at local, national, regional and international levels.? Page 70.

Added to CEO Endorsement Letter. Page 26

Added to ProDoc Page 107.

02/17/2020 ? IUCN

Noted.

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2019

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/1/2019

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
11/11/2020

Yes, thank you for providing specific responses.

4/24/2020

No, please also provide responses to the comments from Germany.

3/13/2020

No, there is still no response to comments from the GEF Council.

11/26/2019

No, please include responses to comments from GEF Council members in Annex B.

7/1/2019

No, please include responses to comments from GEF Council members.

Response to Secretariat comments

April 6, 2020 - IUCN

Apologies for the oversight. Responses to comments from Japan now in Annex B in the portal.

25 September 2020 - IUCN

The comments from Germany have been addressed now in Annex B in the portal.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/4/2021

No, please include maps in the main portal project page (actually cut and pasted in) not as an attachment.

3/25/2021

No, please address these remaining issues:

3- Please include maps in the Portal.

4- Budget: in absence of co-financing resources allocated to PMC, the National Project Coordinator and the Provincial Project Coordinators (4) are charged throughout the different components of the project. However, in consistency with what is requested in paragraph 3 ? page 48 of the Guidelines, the TORs should reflect the technical contributions (unique outputs) to the components ? in this case, the specific duties for these positions do not reflect such contributions ? instead, these are ?coordination activities?. We couldn't find the TOR?s of the Chief Technical Advisor (also charged to the components). Please amend.

1/5/2020

Not at this time. Please address the following.

1. On Co-financing: In the "Name of Co-Financier" field, please provide the name of the entity that provides the co-financing, rather than the name of the project with which it is associated.

2. M&E Budget: Audits need to be charged to PMC

3. No maps have been included in the Portal ? please ask the Agency to

include maps as appropriate.

4. The budget does not provide detailed information on what some costs include. As an example please see below. We have the global amount of the procurement office equipment but no information on what that entails. PPO cannot assess the budget as it is: we need to understand what type of costs are charged to which part of the budget, including PMC, M&E and the Project's components (especially if project's staff is charged to the project's components, in which case TORs are required). Once re-submitted, we will review the budget accordingly.

11/13/2020

No, there are still inconsistencies in the indicators and ExACT. We hope this can be fixed quickly.

4/24/2020

No, please address the two remaining small issues on Ex-ACT and the comments from Germany.

3/13/2020

No, there are still issues with indicators and responding to Council comments.

11/26/2019

Not at this time. Thank you for the revisions, but a few issues remain.

7/1/2019

Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit.

Response to Secretariat comments

IUCN 04 May 2021

Q3 ? The maps have been uploaded to the portal with filename: Key Maps for EREPA 04052021.docx. They have also been pasted into the CEO Endorsement Request on the portal into Part II: Project Justification. 1. Project Description, as there was no other place on the portal to insert maps.

Q4 ? The specific duties of the National Project Coordinator and the Provincial Project Coordinators have been incorporated into the TORs.

National Project Coordinator EREPA 28042021_Final.docx

Provincial Project Coordinators EREPA 28042021_final.docx

The TOR for the CTA has been uploaded with filename: CTA EREPA 28042021_Final.docx

Response to 1/5/2020

Q1 - We have amended this to the GEF Agency (IUCN) with reference to the project and originating donor

Q2 ? This is included in the budget in App7-2_Detailed Budget ? line 399. Activity 4.2.1. The budget file is EREPA_BUDGET_19012021.xls

Q3 ? Maps ? uploaded with file name Key Maps for EREPA 28042021.docx

Q4 ? The budget SUMMARY has been pasted into the portal. For details, please refer to the Excel sheet. This has been amended. Procurement for office equipment is included in the ?Equipment? section of the Procurement Plan of the budget workbook. This includes:

Desktop computer
Laptop computer
Power stabilizer
Printer
Projector
Portable Hard drive / USB memory stick
Field - phone and internet for provincial coordinators
Local server and external harddrives (data compilation platform)
Software
GPS

-

IUCN 24 November 2020

The inconsistencies are addressed. See responses to comment 6 above.

IUCN 8 Feb 2021

1. Replaced 'Biopama' with 'European Union' and 'PEBAAC' with 'German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB)?
2. Addressed
3. Maps are uploaded
4. the detailed budget is in spreadsheet App 7-2 of the overall budget file. In this spreadsheet the detail for the procurement of office equipment is provided in activity 4.1.2

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/1/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/13/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/28/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/13/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/11/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations