



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9536		
Country/Region:	Papua New Guinea		
Project Title:	Sustainable Financing of Papua New Guinea's Protected Area Network		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5507 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$11,314,679
Co-financing:	\$49,540,000	Total Project Cost:	\$61,154,679
PIF Approval:	September 28, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	October 03, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Cyrille Barnerias	Agency Contact Person:	Lisa Farroway,

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>July 11th 2016 Yes it is aligned with "improving Financial Sustainability and Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure". The project is intended to address Aichi targets 11 and 12, but Aichi PNG SMART targets are not provided. Please provide the PNG SMART targets in the PIF.</p> <p>August 25th 2016</p>	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		We expect delivery by the end of PPG. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	July 11th 2016 Yes it is consistent with the NBSAP and the PAP. Please provide the detailed financing strategy to support protected areas that was supposed to be developed within 12 months following the approval of the PAP? This could help the current financial baselines to be determined (programmed for the PPG phase (p1)). August 25th 2016 Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	July 11th 2016 Main drivers are identified: deforestation to farming and industrial logging and mining. August 25th 2016 Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	July 11th 2016 Yes. To compensate a low level of financial resources, it proposes to build a Trust fund for financing protected areas management.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the	July 11th 2016 No, please address the following:	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	GEBs?	<p>- For GEF to contribute to the Trust Fund (TF), the TF has to be an independent entity outside the government along the model of FUNBIO (GEF PMIS 126) with Government, GEF and other donors being part of the Steering Committee. This has been discussed with Government in GEF 4&5 and a GEF sponsored a Gvt staff to attend the LAC Trust Funds meeting which included close consultations with FUNBIO. Please provide the administrative set-up of the Fund. It also has to be funded by other donors. Please also consult with Joseph D'Cruz who was the former PNG UNDP contact person and who is fully aware of this requirement.</p> <p>- What will be the Government contribution to the Fund be?</p> <p>- Regarding the increase of the CEPA's budget, is the numbered commitment of the ministry of Finance available? What are the milestones?</p> <p>- Please connect with a maximum donors for the funding of the Fund including bilateral (including Norway, Australia, Japan, USAID),</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>private sector (Exxon, Barrioks, etc) and NGOs (see the Pacific and Carribean Milenium Challenges model).</p> <p>-Component 3 is aiming at improving the management of 6 New PAs (p 15 and Annex 2) but 10 (under the average METT score) are reflected on page3: please confirm what is effectively planned.</p> <p>-In the project outcomes, please add intermediate results (capacity assessment scorecards by CEPA) to support the MTR and help the project management.</p> <p>-on p11, please confirm if the ExxonMobil BD offset financial support corresponds to the co-financing or whether it is something else related to the baseline.</p> <p>-please make sure that no CITES App I species are planned to be included in an exportation plan (Ornithoptera alexandrae is on CITES I).</p> <p>-using hunting in order to regulate IAS can be a good idea, but please make sure it is included into a general plan to maintain an objective of eradication or at least general</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>limitation and to avoid biases in the IAS fighting due to artificial economic interest or to hunters natural limitations (non-native hunters limited action range can reduce the effective impact of the hunting method to reduce IAS population)</p> <p>August 25th 2016</p> <p>Thank you for confirming that the foreseen fund will be independent. As you know, the Mama Graun TF, originally initiated through a \$15M GEF & \$15 M IDA grant implemented by the World Bank in 1998, did not materialize because of a controversy with the Forestry Conservation project. However, around 2006 the structure came to life with small donations from NGOs and Foundations (including Packard & Exxon) and became a small grant TF for communities. Hence, whereas Mama Graun might play a role in the project for issuance of small grants to communities, the project needs to focus on the bigger picture in the light of the global importance of PNG forests and marine resources, including coral reefs. Hence, it is recommended that you ensure that a seasoned CTF expert participate in the whole cycle of the project design</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>starting with the PPG phase. Please consult with the GEF database. PNG can not miss this opportunity.</p> <p>In order to make sure the fund will be as attractive as possible to other donors, we recommend that the independent fund will have a variety of independent partners including private sector and NGOs.</p> <p>It is encouraged to focus on a sink fund versus an endowment fund which promote fast implementation activities and opportunities to generate additional funding.</p> <p>September 22 2016 Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>July 11th 2016 Yes. Regarding Gender a full assessment will be conducted during the PPG. (p19-20) Indigenous people through customary landowners and CSOs are identified as stakeholders in the project. Could you be more affirmative as to the fact that Indigenous Landowners will be asked to be on the board of the Trust Fund? (p19)</p> <p>August 25th 2016 Cleared</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	Yes Why haven't you proposed to use the rest of the STAR allocation for this project? September 22 2016 Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	July 11th 2016. Please address the issues identified in the above comments. August 25th 2016. Please address the remaining comments. September 22 2016 Cleared	
Review Date	Review	July 18, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 25, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 23, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.