



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas			
Country(ies):	Papua New Guinea	GEF Project ID: ¹	5510
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5261
Other Executing Partner(s):	Conservation and Environment Protection Authority, Ministry of Environment and Conservation Woodlands Park Zoo, and Tenkile Conservation Alliance	Submission Date:	1 st Submission: May 1, 2015 2 nd Submission: May 26, 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods	Agency Fee (\$):	983,642

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	<u>Outcome 1.1:</u> Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas	Output 1.1. New protected areas (1), and coverage of terrestrial protected area from 77,054 hectares to 332,054 hectares (an increase of 255,000 hectares)	GEFTF	10,107,870	37,662,000
LD 2	<u>Outcome 2.3</u> Sustainable flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands	Output 2.3. Suitable SFM interventions (reforestation) to increase natural forest cover by 1,000 hectares	GEFTF	258,356	2,147,200
LD 3	<u>Outcome 3.2:</u> Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities	Output 3.1. Integrated land management plans (3) developed and implemented	GEFTF	563,132	4,600,000
Total project costs				10,929,358	44,409,200

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

Project Objective: To strengthen national and local capacities to effectively manage the national system of protected areas, and address threats to biodiversity and ecosystem functions in these areas						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Management capabilities of the PNG State to support and oversee Protected Area Management	INV	<p>1.1 Institutional capacity of Conservation and Environment Protection Authority and relevant Provincial Government counterparts for PA system planning and management improved, as indicated by a minimum 35% increase in relevant scores on the Capacity Development Scorecard</p> <p>1.2 Oversight and coordination of the national PA system is strengthened through standardized and scientifically-based monitoring of status and pressures, agreed national standards and guidelines for PA management and minimum technical standards for PA management and staff.</p> <p>1.3 Effective management of National Parks demonstrated through increased management effectiveness at Varirata National Park and better integration of the Park into the broader Sogeri Plateau landscape to reduce erosion and sedimentation levels in the Laloki River, measured by: <i>(i) Increase in METT scores for VNP: baseline: 27%, End of project target: 50%; (ii) Sedimentation levels in the Laloki River as measured at relevant downriver site (and compared to levels in the Sirinumu dam) reduced by 5% against baseline to</i></p>	<p><i>1.1: Policies & Legislation relating to PA Management and Biodiversity Conservation strengthened:</i> (i) A medium-term <u>strategic plan</u> to operationalize and implement the PAP; and (ii) a set of <u>policies and legislation</u> for protected area management and biodiversity conservation in PNG. Specifically (a) An enabling policy that establishes an effective national system to license and regulate development impacts on biodiversity, within the functional mandate of the Conservation and Environmental Protection Authority (CEPA), (b) An administrative regulation or similar issuance describing the process by which funds and revenues for PA management will be earmarked within the overall CEPA financial structure.</p> <p><i>1.2: Capacity of CEPA emplaced for effective management of the National PA System:</i> (i) Dedicated and Functioning PA Management and Oversight Unit in CEPA [includes the development of incentive mechanisms for increasing motivation of technical staff], (ii) Development of a Set of Standards and Guidelines for PA Management in PNG, (iii) Establishment and Institutionalization of PA data/Information and Knowledge Management System, and (iv) Facilitate Participation in Regional Coordination on Ridge to Reef Approaches.</p> <p><i>1.3: Training Programmes targeting PA managers institutionalized.</i> Preparation of accredited training curriculum. Individually tailored training modules developed and implemented with UPNP or other suitable academic institutions for mid-level managers (training-the-trainer). At least 100 PA field staff (primarily Community Rangers) trained and certified in SMART enforcement, patrolling and biological monitoring of key ecosystems and threatened species. Feasibility of establishing a “Centre of Excellence for Conservation Area Capacity and Development” assessed and planned.</p> <p><i>1.4: Effective management of Varirata National Park and its integration into the broader Sogeri Plains Landscape:</i> (i) Establishment of a functional National Park Management System for Varirata NP, with effective management, infrastructure and</p>	GEF	5,109,176 <i>(BD: 4,659,176)</i> <i>(LD: 450,000)</i>	20,350,000

		<i>be established in Year 1.</i>	facilities, to allow the Park to function as a showcase for the PNG national park system; (ii) Designation of a designated Conservation Zone within the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan, encompassing the existing Varirata National Park (1,060 ha) and at least 7,000 ha of adjacent forest landscape, and Improve Watershed Management through the development and implementation of measures within the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan, and Integration of national standards and regulations (from CEPA) into the development and implementation of the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan (includes reduced soil erosion from farming activities in the Sirinumu Dam catchment through establishment of buffer zones and reforestation of degraded hill slopes).			
Component 2: Strengthening the Capacity of the State and Local Communities to Cooperatively Manage Protected Area Sites	INV	<p>2.1 Effective management of PAs covering an area of 331,000 hectares, evidenced by:</p> <p>(i) Increase in METT scores: YUS: baseline: 57%, end of project target: 75%; Torricelli: baseline: 57%, end of project target: 72%</p> <p>(ii) Stable or increased populations of threatened species – YUS: Matschie's Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>) (Endangered), Population Estimate: 250; TMR: Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>) (Critically Endangered) Population estimate 300+; Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>) Population estimate 500+</p> <p>2.2 Traditional systems and models for management and conservation of biodiversity strengthened across at least 331,000 ha of priority landscape consisting of: (a) the expanded YUS Community Conservation Area (151,000 ha) and (b) the Torricelli Mountain Range Community Conservation Area (180,000 ha):</p>	<p>2.1. Expansion to the landscape level and effective management of the YUS Conservation Area</p> <p>a) Formal gazettal and CA governance; b) Improving effectiveness of YUS CCA Management.</p> <p>2.2. Community livelihood assistance in the YUS landscape:</p> <p>(i) developing leadership in support of conservation and sustainable livelihoods, and (ii) supporting improved productivity of organic coffee and cocoa from existing agricultural zones within the YUS landscape</p> <p>2.3. Formal gazettal and effective management of the Torricelli Mountain Range (TMR) Community Conservation Area (CCA):</p> <p>(i) Formal gazettal and CCA registration; (ii) Support TMR CCA governance; (iii) Effective TMR CCA Management.</p> <p>2.4: Community livelihood assistance in the TMR landscape proposed CCA: Alternative protein</p> <p>(i) Implement Conservation Area Agreements (CAAs), (ii) Support alternative protein projects.</p>	GEF	5,320,182 (BD: 5,026,145) (LD: 294,037)	23,809,200

		<i>(i) Formal agreements in place between communities in participating conservation areas and central and/or Provincial Government/ project IAs, to provide financial and in-kind (service provision) support to participating communities, resulting in at least PGK 400 (approximately USD 150) in additional resources per household per year provided to the communities concerned.</i>			
			Subtotal		10,429,358 44,159,200
			Project management Cost (PMC)	GEF	500,000 250,000
			Total project costs		10,929,358 44,409,200

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Budget Amount
Government	CEPA	Grant	30,000,000
Government	CEPA	In-kind	8,000,000
CSO	TKCP	Grant	500,000
CSO	TKCP	In-kind	250,000
CSO	Woodlands Park Zoo	Grant	1,650,000
CSO	Woodlands Park Zoo	In-kind	65,000
CSO	TCA	In-kind	1,400,000
CSO	TCA	Grant	894,200
Beneficiaries	YUS Conservation Organization	In-kind	1,000,000
Beneficiaries	YUS Conservation Organization	Grant	50,000
Donor Agency	UNDP	Grant	600,000
Total Co-financing			44,409,200

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Papua New Guinea	10,107,870	909,708	11,017,578
UNDP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Papua New Guinea	821,488	73,934	895,422
Total Grant Resources				10,929,358	983,642	11,913,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	1,100,000	250,000	1,350,000
National/Local Consultants	590,000	0	590,000
Total	1,690,000	250,000	1,940,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF³

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

Refer to PRODOC, Section I –PART II: Project consistency with national priorities/plans, as well as in Section I –PART I: Institutional and policy review.

The project continues to be aligned with the Pacific R2R program, based on its consistency and contribution to key national strategies and plans. Since PIF stage two landmark pieces of legislation and policy guidance have been adopted in PNG, and the project is carefully designed to assist the Government of PNG as well as civil society actors to implement these eminent national priorities.

Firstly, the Ministry of Environment and Conservation (MEC) is the overall responsible Government Ministry for PAs and environmental management. It is responsible for biodiversity conservation, protected areas, and marine management. In **May 2014 the CEPA Act** was enacted, formally establishing the Conservation and Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA) and dismantling the former Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC). The Agency will largely be managed as a parastatal institution, which will be allowed to, and responsible for raising its own funding. All PA management functions are delegated to CEPA. The transformation process is currently underway with CEPA formally established as of January 2015. *For this reason, this project document focuses on CEPA and does not retain the terminology of DEC.* The project is designed specifically to support the Government of PNG to implement the CEPA Act and help the institutional transition from DEC to CEPA.

Secondly, the newly drafted **PNG Protected Areas Policy (PAP)**, which has been crafted and consulted on over a two-year period, was approved in **December 2014**. The PAP sets out an entirely new governance structure for PAs including classification of National and Regional Protected Areas. Two independent, but interlinked governance systems for these two types of PAs are set out in the policy. National Protected Areas will be managed at the national level under CEPA whilst Regional Protected Areas will be managed at the provincial level, with CEPA keeping an advisory and oversight role. The PAP brings together and supersedes a large set of old policies and law pertaining to PA management in PNG. The most significant policy documents that have impacted PA designations and management in the past are: the National Parks Act 1982, the Organic Law on Provincial and Local Level Government 1995, Fauna (Protection and Control) Act 1966, the Conservation Area Act of 1978, the Environmental Act of 2000, and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of 2007. The project specifically supports the implementation and operationalization of the PAP. By supporting the transformation to CEPA and especially the setting up of a well capacitated PA Unit, critical

³ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

systemic, institutional and individual capacities will be built, supporting the effective implementation of the PAP. A set of guidelines and standards will be developed that will allow more specific follow-up on the directives and provide critical management tools to CEPA's PA unit. Furthermore, the project supports the hands-on implementation of the PAP in three pilot PAs, developing much needed practical tools and experiences for establishing, gazettal, registering and managing PAs in various categories.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

This is described in detail in the PRODOC, Part I, Section II – Strategy. A summary is provided in Part I, Table A of this document.

Whilst during PIF stage, the Land Degradation (LD) component of this project was programmed fully under LD 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities, a split arrangement with certain activities in the Sogeri Plateau/ Sirinumu Dam areas around the Varirata National Park have been programmed under LD-2.3: Generate sustainable flow of forest ecosystem services in arid, semi-arid and sub-humid zones including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people (see output 1.4).

It is asserted that intensive forest rehabilitation is required in the catchment of the Laloki River, to ensure that currently high sedimentation rates in the catchment will be reduced. Although PNG is not considered an arid ecosystem, the human-made transformation of habitat in this specific project target area just outside the capital, Port Moresby, has led to a significant ecosystem degradation, which will have to be reverted. A dual strategy investing into the development of an ILUP, setting up a participatory planning platform, but also investing into visible restoration/reforestation is pursued by the project.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

N/A (No changes since PIF approval.)

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The UNDP PRODOC provides a country-specific analysis of the underlying root causes and drivers of the weak PA management system in PNG. The analysis at PIF stage has been deepened by specific reviews of the current institutional situation of PA management, especially the weak performance of DEC. Opportunities with the establishment of the CEPA Act (May 2014) and the drafting of a new PNG PAP (December 20014) have been identified in detail. Although the design of the project at outcome and output level has not been majorly affected by this updated situation of the baseline project, some detailed analyses were undertaken during the PPG phase to provide a good alignment with the updated policy framework.

See PRODOC, Section I – PART I Institutional context and Section I – PART I Policy and legislative context, as well as Annex 1. : Table of Roles and Functions of National PA Governance Framework in PNG PPA; Annex 3.: Draft Capacity Development Profiles for selected target groups for PA training and Annex 4.: PA registration processes for National and Regional PAs under new PAP.

Additionally, the list of baseline projects was further updated during the PPG phase. Especially in support of the LD/ Sustainable Land Management (SLM) component of this project, a number of Government and private sector investments have been identified. With the focus on work on organic coffee and cocoa production as a livelihood alternative and a strategy to intensify economic returns of agricultural production in existing agricultural use zones in YUS CA, some critical baseline projects were added to support the technical know-how, market development to scale, amongst other. The Government National Agriculture Development Plan (NADP)⁴ for the period 2007-2016, a large investment by the WB/IDA of over \$ 51 million into the PNG's Productive Partnerships in Agriculture Project (PPAP),

⁴ <http://aci-ar.gov.au/files/node/2406/Volume2-Implementation%20Plan%20part1.pdf>

as well as smaller investments by NARI, the Coffee Industry Corporation (CIC) and the Cocoa Board, provide important baseline activities supporting work under project output 2.2.

Baseline investments made by the National Agriculture Research Institute (NARI), i.e. in terms of research and extension support, are similarly critical for the livelihoods component of TMR CA, which focuses on introducing alternative protein sources to reduce pressure on natural resources in the CA.

See PRODOC, Section I - PART I, Baseline Analysis, for more details.

The baseline analysis has been further reflected on in the Incremental Cost Analysis and Matrix.

Under the baseline scenario, PNG authorities and partners including local and district authorities will continue to function, independently with little or no collaboration between national, district and local actors, without adequate investments necessary to create a robust system of protected areas that is backed with standards, monitoring tools and management effectiveness comparators to address the key threats to ecosystem services and associated benefits.

Although a new PA policy and governance framework have been developed in PNG over the past years, under the baseline scenario the implementation of the Policy will be slow and largely ineffective. Low capacities, especially at the provincial government level, but also by CEPA, will negatively affect local level conservation efforts.

Globally important biodiversity is likely to continue to be degraded and at worst, risk extinction. Under the baseline scenario, the national PA system will continue to be an ineffective mechanism to conserve PNG's globally-significant biodiversity and critical ecosystem services. In the absence of GEF funding, the creation and management of Conservation Areas will continue to be ad-hoc processes initiated by external actors with limited long-term sustainability and unclear national benefits.

See PRODOC, Section I – PART II, Incremental reasoning and expected global, national and local benefits and next section (A.5).

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The project will support the paradigm shift to put the national PA system on a more secure institutional framework, both at the national level and, through partnerships, at the local level. At the local level the project will demonstrate the effective operationalization of the Conservation Areas model, providing a platform for local landowners, central, provincial and local governments and conservation actors to collaborate on the protection and sustainable use of important biodiversity resources and ecosystems.

Under the alternative scenario, additional investments by the GEF, Government of PNG and local partners will strengthen the national PA system and ensure the sustainability of investments in Conservation Areas on the ground. The objective of the project is —*To strengthen national and local capacities to effectively manage the national system of protected areas, and address threats to biodiversity and ecosystem functions in these areas.* This objective will be achieved through two major components.

The first component focuses on the strategic support to the implementation of the new PNG PAP (December 2014) and the CEPA Act (May 2014) contributing to the establishment of a comprehensive and capable national system to oversee and support National and Regional PAs.

The second component focuses on strengthening support to Community Conservation Areas (CCA), to ensure that these areas are effectively managed and sustained within a supportive national framework, including through the provision of stable and predictable financial support through various Government channels. An expansion of the existing gazetted PAs will supported, as well as effective PA management by local stakeholders. Targeted livelihood support will be

provided as governed by locally established Conservation Area Agreements (CAAs), and specifically identified priorities on organic coffee and cocoa in YUS and alternative protein in TMR.

See PRODOC, Section I – PART II, Incremental reasoning and expected global, national and local benefits for the full rational. The Incremental Cost Matrix is reproduced below for ease of reference.

Incremental Cost Matrix

BENEFITS	Baseline (A)	Alternative (B)	Increment (A-B)
Global benefits	Without the GEF investment, the 'business-as-usual' baseline scenario, PNG authorities and partners including local and district authorities will continue to function independently with little or no collaboration between national, district and local actors without adequate investments necessary to create a robust system of protected areas that is backed with standards, monitoring tools and management effectiveness comparators to address the key threats to ecosystem services and associated benefits. Although a new PA policy and governance framework have been developed in PNG over the past years, under the baseline scenario the implementation of the Policy will be slow and largely ineffective. Low capacities, especially at the provincial government level, but also by CEPA, will negatively affect local conservation efforts. Globally important biodiversity is likely	The project will support the paradigm shift to put the national PA system on a more secure institutional framework, both at the national level and through partnerships at the local level. At the local level, the project will demonstrate the effective operationalization of the CA model, providing a platform for local landowners, central, provincial and local governments and conservation actors to collaborate on the protection and sustainable use of important biodiversity resources and ecosystems. The land use plan and capacity for landowners will provide tools for strategic decision making on land use, ensuring that agriculture outside of the protected areas incorporates ecosystems and biodiversity friendly practices, thereby securing livelihoods and economic development while simultaneously restoring ecosystems integrity. Under the alternative scenario, additional investments by the GEF, GoPNG and local partners will strengthen the national PA system and ensure the sustainability of investments in Conservation Areas on the ground. The objective of the project is <i>—To strengthen national and local capacities to effectively manage the national system of protected areas, and address threats to biodiversity and ecosystem functions in these areas.</i> This objective will be achieved through two major components. The first component focuses on the strategic support to the implementation of the new PNG Protected Areas Policy (PAP, December 2014) and the CEPA Act (May 2014) contributing to the establishment of a comprehensive and capable national system to oversee and support National and Regional PAs. The second component focuses on strengthening support to Community Conservation Areas (CCAs) to ensure that these areas are effectively managed and sustained within a supportive national framework.	With the dedicated co-financing that has been leveraged from the Government of PNG through CEPA for component 1, foundation for the establishment of the Authority is laid. Basic staff costs and office costs are being covered and the institutional transition from DEC to CEPA can take place. This form a critical investment in support of the effective implementation of the new PA Policy of PNG. Other co-financing investments by international donor and local partners are being made for the effective implementation and management of three CAs in PNG – which will be a critical ingredient to establish and maintain the few functional PAs in PNG. The incremental GEF funding will support the paradigm shift to put the national PA system on a more secure institutional framework both at the national level and through partnerships at the local level. By implementing the above-mentioned components, the GEF investment will significantly contribute to effective management of PA's covering an area of 331,000 ha. Further it will facilitate the formal gazettal of large CCAs ⁵ in each site- in the case of YUS this being the expansion to the landscape level of the CA from 76,000ha to up to 151,000ha; and the TM R being ~180,000ha. The exact enlargement in the Sogeri Plateau is expected to be 7,000 ha. Populations of threatened species will be stabilised. Further the sedimentation of the Laloki river (Varirata NP) will be reduced. Species such as the endemic and endangered Matschie's tree kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>), Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>) (Critically Endangered) and Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>) will be conserved, and other threatened species such as the Endangered long-beaked echidna (<i>Zaglossus bruijni</i>), the Papuan Harpy Eagle (<i>Harpyopsis novaeguineae</i>) the Vulturine Parrot (<i>Pyrilia vulturina</i>). Other rich variety of plant and animals will be protected, including birdlife and especially the only known poisonous bird, the Hooded Pitohui (<i>Pitohu dichrous</i>).

⁵ The newly approved PNG PAP foresees the transition of CAs to CCAs. In the case of YUS the implications of this will have to be scoped as part of the project design.

	to continue to be degraded and at worst, risk extinction. Under the baseline scenario, the national PA system will continue to be an ineffective mechanism to conserve PNG's globally-significant biodiversity and critical ecosystem services. In the absence of GEF funding, the creation and management of Conservation Areas will continue to be ad-hoc processes initiated by external actors with limited long-term sustainability and unclear national benefits.	including through the provision of stable and predictable financial support through various Government channels. An expansion of the existing gazetted PAs will be supported, as well as effective PA management by local stakeholders. Targeted livelihood support will be provided as governed by locally established Conservation Area Agreements (CAAs) and specifically identified priorities on conservation grown coffee and cocoa in YUS and alternative protein in TMR.									
National and local benefits	<i>Without the GEF investment</i> , the 'business-as-usual' baseline at the local level, especially the three PAs targeted by this project will solicit some baseline investments. At YUS CA and TMR proposed CA, some baseline investments are being made by the local NGOs actively supporting the CAs, but capacities are very limited and meaningful and sustained conservation action depend on outside donors. The creation and management of Conservation Areas will continue to be ad-hoc processes initiated by external actors with limited long-term sustainability and unclear national benefits.	The project will support three PAs (including one NP, one existing CA and one emerging CA) to ensure that these areas are effectively managed and sustained within a supportive national framework, including through the provision of stable and predictable financial support through various Government channels. The GEF Alternative will deliver sustainable environmental and socioeconomic benefits at the local level. This strategy will reduce pressure on the PAs and endangered and threatened biodiversity, enhance cost-efficiency of PA management, and more generally trigger the improved conservation of biodiversity in the target areas, which will then be replicated across PNG.	An expansion of the existing gazetted PAs will be supported as well as effective PA management by local stakeholders. Targeted livelihood support will be provided as governed by locally established CAAs, and specifically identified priorities on organic coffee and cocoa in YUS and alternative protein in TMR, providing tangible local benefits. From these activities, household incomes will be supplemented by > US\$ 150 p.a. – which for the local communities is an important income injection. By project end, the management effectiveness of the three PAs will have increased, as follows: <table border="1" data-bbox="1052 1314 1503 1457"> <thead> <tr> <th>Current METT Score %</th> <th>Targeted METT Score %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Varirata NP: 27%</td> <td>Varirata NP: 50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>YUS: 57%</td> <td>YUS: 75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Torricelli: 57%</td> <td>Torricelli: 72%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Current METT Score %	Targeted METT Score %	Varirata NP: 27%	Varirata NP: 50%	YUS: 57%	YUS: 75%	Torricelli: 57%	Torricelli: 72%
Current METT Score %	Targeted METT Score %										
Varirata NP: 27%	Varirata NP: 50%										
YUS: 57%	YUS: 75%										
Torricelli: 57%	Torricelli: 72%										
COSTS			GEF + mobilised co-financing beyond the baseline								
Component 1: Management Capabilities	Baseline: USD 43,200,000	Alternative: USD 68,659,176	Increment: USD 25,459,176 GEF 5,109,176								

of the PNG State to oversee Protected Area Management	Sources: GoPNG, District and Provincial Governments (Morobe, West and East Sepic), GEF – BD, the Nature Conservancy, WCS		Co-financing (CEPA, UNDP) TOTAL	20,350,000 25,459,176
Component 2: Strengthening the Capacity of the State and Local Communities to Cooperatively	Baseline: USD 58,000,000 Sources: UNDP, TCA, TKCP, YUS CO, Department of Land and Physical Planning, District and Provincial Governments (Morobe, West and East Sepic), GEF – BD & SLM, WB/IDA.	Alternative: USD 87,129,383	Increment: USD 29,129,383	GEF 5,320,183 Co-financing (CEPA, TKCP, YUS, WPZ, TCA, UNDP): TOTAL 29,129,383
Project Management	n/a	Alternative: USD 750,000	Increment: USD 750,000	GEF 500,000 Co-financing (UNDP) 250,000 TOTAL 750,000
TOTAL	Baseline: USD 101,200,000	Alternative: USD 156,538,559	TOTAL Increment: USD 55,338,559	GEF 10,929,359 Co-financing 44,409,200 TOTAL 55,338,559

CEPA's co-financing has increase from US\$ 15 million to US\$ 30 million. The cash co-financing is part of the overall CEPA's effort to improve protected areas management in PNG. The breakdown of co-financing is as follows:

1. Establishing and maintenance of an Integrated Environmental Information Management System (IEMS) – this IEMS will compile all data on PNG biodiversity and environmental status that are scattered in institutions domestically and internationally. Currently, CEPA's Species Information Management System is outdated. The estimated costs to design the IEMS is at US\$ 2.5 million and annual maintenance for the duration of the project is US\$ 7.5 million which brings the total to US\$ 10 million.
2. National Protected Areas Management – CEPA in recognizing government's renewed commitment to will commit US\$ 2 million annually with the support at ministerial level for five national parks including YUS and Torricelli. The total is US\$ 10 million for 5 years of project duration.
3. Recurrent Management Costs including contribution for capacity development at national and subnational level is US\$ 5 million.
4. Support for CEPA's Institutional Change Management that will be implemented for the duration of the CEPA will likely costs around US\$ 5million.

The outputs necessary to achieve both Components/ Outcomes/ are thoroughly described in the PRODOC, Section I - Part II, – Strategy, chapter Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities.

Notably, one output was added to the project design, namely output 1.3 Training Programs targeting PA managers institutionalized. Initially envisaged at an activity level, consultations during the PPG phase suggested that the activity should be uplifted to an output level.

Other changes to the design include that all activities related to the Laloki river, Sogeri Plateau complex and adjacent areas in the vicinity of the Varirata National Park were moved under outcome 1, synthesized into one dedicated Output 1.4: Effective management of Varirata NP and its integration into the broader Sogeri Plains Landscape.

SEE PRODOC, Section II – Strategic Results Framework and Table B – Project Framework, above.

In terms of project indicators, several changes were made during the PPG phase, to provide a more robust M&E framework for the project and linking more closely to the project intensions. Certain baseline information of indicators, e.g. the METTs, were revised as well.

Most notably the following indicators underpin the overall project objective and the two project components:

Project objective indicators:

- (1) Aggregated Average Capacity Development indicator score for CEPA, Madang, Morobe and East and West Sepik Provincial Government, TCA and TKCP
35.3% - >62.3%
- (2) Total area expansion of the National Protected Area in the Varirata-Sogeri Plateau, YUS and Torricelli Mountains Landscapes
0 ha – 255,000 ha
- (3) Conducive policy environment for CEPA to operate within
No policy regulating development impacts on biodiversity – an enabling policy that established an effective national system to license and regulate development impacts on biodiversity
No clear direction on how funds and revenues will be earmarked within the overall CEPA financial structure -
An administrative regulation or similar issuance describing the process by which funds and revenues for PA management will be earmarked within the overall CEPA financial structure.
- (4) Number of villages directly benefitting from community-based livelihood activity that contribute to the reducing the extent and intensity of threats to the YUS and Torricelli CAs
CAAs: 0 ->60
- (5) IRRF Sub-Indicator 1.1.3.A.1.1: Extent to which institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and/or access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems.
Baseline and targets to be defined at project start.

Component 1: Management capabilities of the PNG State to support and oversee Protected Area Management
Evidenced by:

- (1) Capacity of CEPA
Development indicator score for CEPA: 38% - 72%
PNG PA Policy in place and implemented through a formulated Strategic Plan
Standards and Guidelines for PA Management in PNG approved
>30 professional staff of CEPA (esp. the PA Unit) completing specialised, targeted short-course training in PA oversight and coordination
- (2) METT Scores of Varirata NP – 27% - 50%
- (3) Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan approved and being implemented
- (4) Sedimentation levels in the Laloki River as measured at relevant downriver sites and compared to levels in the Sirinumu dam reduced by 5%

Component 2: Strengthening the Capacity of the State and Local Communities to Cooperatively Manage Protected Area Sites
Evidenced by:

- (1) Capacity Development indicator score for Madang (23% - > 55%), Morobe (27% - > 50%), West Sepik (21% - > 56%) and East Sepik (23% - > 58%) Provincial Government and TCA (53% - > 70%) and TKCP (62% - > 75%)

- (2) METT scores of YUS Conservation Area and Torricelli Mountain Range Conservation Area – YUS: 57% -> 75%; Torricelli: 57% -> 72%
- (3) Extent of area under different National PA Categories: YUS CA: 76,000 ha -> 151,000 ha; Torricelli CA: 0 ha Protected Area -> 180,000 ha
- (4) Stable or increased populations of threatened species – YUS: Matschie’s Tree Kangaroo (*Dendrolagus matschiei*) (Endangered) 250+ -> 250+
- (5) Stable or increased populations of threatened species – TMR: Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (*Dendrolagus scottae*) (Critically Endangered) Population estimate 300+ -> 300+; Weimag Tree Kangaroo (*D. pulcherrimus*) Population estimate 500+ -> 500+
- (6) Productivity of organic coffee and cocoa in existing agricultural zones in YUS: *Coffee* = 2.5 tons p.a. -> 30 tons p.a.; *Cocoa* = 38.6 tons p.a -> 103 tons p.a
- (7) Formal agreements in place between communities in participating conservation areas and central and/or Provincial Government/ project IAs, to provide financial and in-kind (service provision) support to participating communities, resulting in at least PGK 400 (approximately USD 150) in additional resources per household per year provided to the communities concerned. *YUS* – US\$ 50 p. HH (coffee and cocoa producers) -> US\$ 150 p. HH (coffee and cocoa producers); *TCA* = US\$ 0 -> US\$ 150 p. HH (Alternative Proteins beneficiaries)

The most significant changes revolve around

- a. The removal of measuring the sedimentation levels of the Uruwa river in YUS CA. Although the organic coffee, cocoa and associated conservation agriculture activities in already existing agricultural zones will contribute to a reduction of sedimentation levels, it was found that the project intervention sites for the related activities are scattered across the landscape and it will be difficult to measure the specific impacts on sedimentation.
- b. Resetting of METT baseline values during PPG phase for all three project target PAs.
- c. Further integration of indicators which measure livelihoods impacts.
- d. A reconceptualization of component/outcome 1 indicator # 7 on “Formal agreements in place between communities ...” The impacts on household income will include those that are generated through this specific project. A methodology on how to “monetarise” e.g. the contributions of the alternative protein activities at TMR will be developed during the project implementation.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The thorough risk analysis included in the PIF has been updated. The detailed risk matrix is included in the PRODOC, Section I, Part II – Project Risks. It is reproduced herein. Refer to PRODOC Annex 3 for the Project Risk Assessment Guiding Matrix.

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
Weak absorptive capacity in CEPA	Medium	Very likely	High	Although existing capacities are weak, a comprehensive review and strengthening process including dedicated change management support will be provided by the project to CEPA. The current Government has demonstrated its commitment to a strengthened conservation and environment protection function through the rapid approval for the establishment of CEPA, and the priority accorded to its operationalization. The project will take a systematic, medium-term approach to strengthening capacities, including through better partnerships with other conservation stakeholders such as conservation NGOs and academic institutions. Specific investments into a dedicated change process will aid staff to come fully on board the new institution, and realign the staff complement with relevant knowledge, skills and competencies. The project will emphasise the importance of having a fully functional PA Management Unit within CEPA to Government decision makers and over time build the staff complement of the

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
				<p>Unit to meet the desired number. This will be determined and supported through the development of an organisation design of the unit, including defining its core business, organisational structure, a staffing organogram and medium-term expenditure framework. A change management consortium or company with specialist skills in <i>inter alia</i> institutional reform, organisational development, human resource management system will be contracted for the preparation and implementation of the transition plan (as described in outcome 1.1).</p> <p>The possible creation of a “National Centre of Excellence for Conservation Area capacity development” or similar strategy (as described in Outcome 1.3) would help to mitigate some of this risk. It will also strengthen conservation management capacities across a broad spectrum of actors, including NGOs, local and provincial governments and local communities. The integration of support to CAs into Provincial and local-level Government systems and plans will also ensure that there is a broader base of institutional capacity through which to support the establishment and operation of CAs.</p>
Slow implementation of draft Protected Areas Policy	Medium	Very likely	High	<p>The GoPNG has demonstrated strong leadership in developing a new and concerted effort to establish a unified and strategic framework for PA Management in PNG. The new PAP foresees major changes in the manner PA management is conducted in PNG, and CEPA has the key responsibility for its implementation. The PA governance framework set out in the policy is novel but also complex. A suite of new institutions ought to be set up or operationalized, and most notably the Provincial Government will have a much stronger role to play than in the past. It is anticipated that the implementation of the policy will take some time, however, this project specifically programs support activities that will assist the relevant institutions in PNG to set up a fully operational system within the five-year project period. All outcomes under Component 1 of this project specifically focus on capacity support to the implementation of the new policy, whilst Component 2 is providing important practical lesson learnt from the (Community) Conservation Area (CCA) level. The two proposed Regional PAs TCA and TKCP will help develop practical guidance for replication of the registration as well as successful management of CCAs for newly emerging ones, amongst other. It is suggested to schedule a review of the Policy at the end of this project to ensure that critical lessons learnt from this dedicated implementation effort can be readily absorbed into a yet improved policy version.</p>
Interventions are not sustained post-project or scaled up to other conservation areas.	Medium	Likely	Medium	<p>Past GEF experience in PNG has indicated a clear risk that stand-alone project interventions will not be sustained post-project. The intervention approach for this project has taken this risk into account by designing the project as part of a modular, medium-term program strategy for on-going support to conservation in PNG. Just as this project will build upon the progress made and capacities developed under the previous GEF-4 project (GEF PIMS 3954), the GoPNG expects subsequent program interventions supported by the GEF, UNDP and other partners to sustain and build upon the systems and capacities being developed here. The Government’s commitment to sustaining the project’s interventions is also demonstrated through the decision to program significant cash co-financing through the pending Government PIP funding proposal that has been submitted by CEPA with the endorsement of the MEC. It is noted that CEPA will establish a project management unit, which will likely provide longer term institutional memory on individual projects.</p> <p>Scale-up and replication to other CA sites will be dependent on the availability of suitable partners and communities willing to support the creation of CAs on their lands. There have already been indications of such demand through requests for support to CEPA for the establishment of a CA in the Managalas Plateau, and requests from various stakeholders to support the conversion of existing WMAs to CCAs. Based on this documented demand it is reasonable to</p>

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
				expect that a successful model developed through this project can be replicated in a number of other locations over the coming years.
Financial sustainability – flow of financial resources to support PAs is insufficient or interrupted	Medium	Likely	Medium	The project is part of a modular approach to strengthening the national system, where initial needs and feasibility analysis will be undertaken through this project and a full-fledged biodiversity financing initiative is being developed by the Government as part of module 3. The CEPA structure explicitly includes provision to generate revenues through licences, fees and offset payments and hence a viable revenue stream can be instituted. UNDP supports a parallel GEF 6 project that focuses on the establishment of the Conservation Trust Fund (CTF), as a long-term, sustainable financing mechanism for PNG. In terms of this specific project lifetime, the project has been designed independent enough that all project activities can be implemented without long-term financing for PA management. The project will also support an administrative regulation or similar issuance describing the process by which funds and revenues for PA Management will be earmarked within the overall CEPA financial structure, resulting in government funding flowing towards protected areas. In Varirata National Park, a financial plan will be developed that will look at the long-term financial sustainability of the area. In YUS CCA and Torricelli Mountain Range CCA the project will be working with the two NGOs, TKCP and TCA. These two NGOs have proven their donor funds mobilization capacity and through employing such strategies the sources of funding are further diversified and the safety net of funding sources widened.
Unclear mandates and division of roles and responsibilities leads to delays in project implementation	Medium	Likely	Medium	This risk mostly pertains to component 1, as component 2 is fully delegated to the two Regional PAs. Most notably, this risk pertains to the interventions planned in support of the Varirata-Sogeri Plateau complex. CEPA (still operating under DEC), has drafted a MoU with NCDC for the management of VNP. At the same time this project and JICA are planning support interventions to VNP and the larger surrounding landscape. A management committee must be set up as a matter of priority for the VNP.
Social conflict in the community	Medium	Likely	Medium	The selected CCAs sites already have completed social mapping and extensive community consultations, with strong systems in place to avoid and manage conflict. At Varirata the project will work with the resource users (local customary land owners, provincial, district and local level government, PNG Power and Eda Ramu) under the leadership of CEPA, to ensure that existing social mapping and community engagement systems are strengthened to ensure consensus around the proposed catchment land use plan. During the PPG phase, initial consultations took place and general commitment to the project objectives was secured. The project acknowledges that the social dynamics in the Varirata-Sogeri Complex are difficult and that progress on the set project objective may be impacted by disagreements. This is something that the team will pay special attention to and seek to manage by working with all stakeholders. The project will also keep a degree of independence from the PA planning and management vis-à-vis the larger complex for that reason.
Balancing community needs vs. livelihoods	Medium	Likely	Medium	The (Community) Conservation Area approach at both YUS and Torricelli already has a strong focus on livelihoods, including in particular the provision of alternative protein sources to reduce hunting pressure and the trialling development of cash generation activities to support community development needs. These approaches will be continued and strengthened through the project.
The effects of Climate Change will make is difficult to plan/implement activities	Medium	Likely	Medium	All three sites have altitudinal transects which will aid in adapting to climate change impacts. The project will also support actions to address climate vulnerability issues. For instance, the project will assist addressing issues that create increased risks in the face of climate change, such as the use of fire for land clearance in situations of increased drought incidence. Further, the resilience of ecosystems to resist or adapt to climate change will be

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
				enhanced/strengthened. This will be achieved in various ways by the project in particular through the expansion of PAs, PA management planning, threat assessments, restoration/rehabilitation plans, capacity needs assessment, research and monitoring, and participation and benefits to local communities.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The project is programmed under the GEF regional parent program “Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods”.

Notably, the project implementation and management arrangements are designed to ensure that all GEF financed projects in the sector are well coordinated. A specific (GEF) project coordination mechanism/ unit will be established at CEPA, and this project commits a 50% position to the International Technical Coordinator leading this unit. It is asserted that the investment into such a coordination unit will be worthwhile, ensuring not only that projects are well coordinated, and drawing on lessons learnt from other GEF projects, but also help reduce project administrative costs and efforts.

See PRODOC, Section I – PART III, Management Arrangements.

A specific review of previous GEF support to biodiversity conservation in PNG furthering the analysis at PIF stage was undertaken during the PPG phase. The review includes three projects implemented by UNDP; the *Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management Programme* (GEF PIMS 347, 1991-1998), the *Community-Based Coastal and Marine Conservation in Milne Bay Province Project* (GEF PIMS 1261, 2002-2006) and the *PAS: Community-Based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in PNG Project* (GEF PIMS 3954, 2011-ongoing). These projects have provided a number of important lessons which have informed the design of this project, including the importance of community involvement and community support for conservation efforts. The need for strong community support for conservation initiatives is a common thread running through all past conservation initiatives in PNG. The country’s community-based resource management system coupled with local communities’ strong dependence on their local environment for basic needs and livelihoods, requires that any new resource management regime (including conservation areas or protected areas) be carefully negotiated while respecting the needs and aspirations of participating communities. The lack of strong community-buy-in hampered PA establishment attempts at Bismark Ramu and Lak in GEF PIMS 347, and inadequate attention to local needs and priorities also undermined the implementation of GEF PIMS 1261. The on-going GEF PIMS 3954 project is strongly aware of this requirement, and is undertaking careful and extended community engagement and community entry processes at its target sites. The intricacies of the traditional land tenure system in PNG and the respective trade-offs by landowners for logging or other natural resource projects over conservation has previously been a barrier to GEF projects (especially in Lak) and is one that is not overlooked in the design of the current project. Targeted capacity building and investment in community education and awareness raising activities under Component 2 will complement existing programs undertaken by the project partners (TKCP and TCA) at respective CCA sites.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Since PIF stage, extensive stakeholder consultations were undertaken during the PPG phase. Over a 12 months period, workshops, field consultations, face-to-face meetings with CEPA staff etc. were conducted to collect background information, generate buy-in and develop a project design that reflects the needs of the project partners.

Stakeholder engagement and consultations during PPG were broad based and included civil society representatives at all times. By working with TKCP and TCA, two national CSOs, and the land owners in the two associated CAs, a strong engagement of civil society and indigenous people was mobilized. At Varirata-Sogeri Plateau, the stakeholder engagement has only just started during the PPG phase and it is well understood that further partnership building and generating buy-in and interest amongst the local land owners and communities to engage in conservation activities needs to be strengthened during project implementation – a priority that has been firmly built into the project design.

A detailed stakeholder involvement plan for the project implementation is included in the project document, as well as an overview of key consultations is provided as an Annex.

See PRODOC Section IV – Additional Information, PART III: Stakeholder Involvement Plan and Annex 8: Overview of PA Stakeholder Workshops/Consultations during PPG.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):

There are several socio-economic benefits that the project seeks to generate – mostly as part of the strategy to reduce pressure on threatened species and habitats in PAs in PNG. Dedicated project indicators, especially under component 2 of the project, focus on increasing financial returns from organic coffee and cocoa production in already existing agricultural zones in YUS CA, as well as through the provision of alternative protein through a number of interventions at TMR proposed CA.

Notably the two below component 2 indicators

- (6) Productivity of organic coffee and cocoa in existing agricultural zones in YUS: *Coffee = 2.5 tons p.a. -> 30 tons p.a.; Cocoa = 38.6 tons p.a -> 103 tons p.a*
- (7) Formal agreements in place between communities in participating conservation areas and central and/or Provincial Government/ project IAs, to provide financial and in-kind (service provision) support to participating communities, resulting in at least PGK 400 (approximately USD 150) in additional resources per household per year provided to the communities concerned. *YUS – US\$ 50 p. HH (coffee and cocoa producers) -> US\$ 150 p. HH (coffee and cocoa producers); TCA = US\$ 0 -> US\$ 150 p. HH (Alternative Proteins beneficiaries)*

allow for measuring such impacts, even though indicator #6 has not been displayed here in household economic terms.

Overall work in the two CAs focuses on exploring and setting up socio-economic benefits for local communities, so that the opportunity costs of giving land away for other uses such as mining, exploitation and logging could be a disincentive.

The project design, especially, but not only, of component 2, considers gender needs, and a formal gender strategy will be developed both for YUS and TMR CAs. Relevant trainings for gender screening and implementing engendered approaches will be part of all project outputs under component 2, and relevant budgetary allocations have been made.

Considering component 1 work, other than under output 1.4, which follows a similar rationale to gender considerations under component 2, the official governance structures of both Conservation Organisations (COs) already have gender considerations engrained in their formal constitutions.

A project risk focusing on “Gendered based conflicts over the roles of men and women in natural resource management” is included in the Risk Log. During the PPG phase a national consultant undertook a gender analysis and recommendations have been included in the project document.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

See PRODOC Section II, PART I: Cost effectiveness.

The project will seek to achieve a catalytic investment in improving the management effectiveness of the national system of protected areas in PNG, through focusing (i) on targeted support to CEPA, and to support the effective implementation of the CEPA Act (May 2014) and the PNG PAP. It will further focus (ii) on strengthening support to Community Conservation Areas (CCA), to ensure that these areas are effectively managed and sustained within a supportive national framework, including through the provision of stable and predictable financial support through various Government channels.

Costs incurred in project implementation will focus only on those additional actions required to provide key incremental assistance to the government, CEPA, private landowners and NGOs in undertaking strategically critical interventions to improve the representivity, governance, planning and operations of protected areas. To accomplish this, the project will use demonstrations for a National PA (Varirata) managed by CEPA and two Regional PAs (YUS and TMR (C)CAs) managed by local NGOs/CSOs, with strong baseline investments already in place. The new governance framework for PAs as set out in the draft PNG PPA will be supported, by identifying best practices and making these available as learning tools for replication. A dedicated Capacity Development mechanisms will be set up. Wherever possible, the project will use the competencies and logistical skills within the mandated government institutions and parastatals especially CEPA and the existing NGOs/CSOs to implement project activities. Through Letter of Agreements (LoA)/ MoUs project resources will be deployed to TKCP and TCA as implementing partners.

The project is considered cost-effective for the following primary reasons:

- (i) Strong baseline investments are dedicated by national government and CEPA for component 1, however, critical catalytic support through the GEF investment will generate more sustainable impacts. The incremental support will likely generate exponential benefits.
- (ii) For Varirata some strong co-financing is being mobilized from Government's side. An investment of US\$ 30 Mio has been dedicated to the upgrading of the access road to the park, and NCDC is planning to commit funding for the upgrading and operationalization of park infrastructure, including housing, and information Centre and other. JICA is committing a significant amount of financing to the establishment of a Man-and Biosphere type PA in the larger Sogeri Plateau Area, dovetailed with the ILUP approach suggested in the GEF project. The GEF support within Varirata will focus on biodiversity related management and will strengthen CEPA to fulfil its mandate in this regard. As Varirata will serve as a key learning demonstration for CEPA on how to successfully manage a National PA, this investment will pay off for replication elsewhere later. Details on this work will be elaborated once the full project commitment from JICA is finally agreed to by the Government of PNG and JICA.
- (iii) Supporting the already established YUS CA and the proposed TMR CA, conserves a significant baseline investment, which is under threat due to critical financing gaps. Project funding for improving the capacity of selected NGOs is expected to improve their cost-effectiveness and sustainability.

Alternative approaches could include setting up new PAs, either or both at the national and regional level. However, the required investments would go well beyond the GEF resources available, as well as the leveraged co-financing contributions. It is considered, based on lessons learnt from previous GEF projects, that the targeted approach to strengthening existing work will likely be more sustainable than setting out to establish new efforts. At this point a focused approach on improved PA management seems opportune as the Government has started to initiate a quite dramatic change in the policy and legal framework supporting PA management. Rather than diluting this effort, focused support for its success under the rationale for success including cost-effectiveness.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project's M&E Plan is thoroughly described in the UNDP PRODOC. For more detail, refer to Section I, PART IV: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget. The table below provides a summary.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TC ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: 20,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP GEF RTA/TC will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by TC ▪ Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TC and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TC and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TC and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 50,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TC and team, ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : 50,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TC and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ TC and team 	Indicative cost per year: 5,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>		US\$ 145,000	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Gunther Joku	Acting Secretary	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION	04/02/2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP- GEF Executive Coordinator.		May 26, 2015	Johan Robinson Regional Technical Advisor – EBD, UNDP	+66- 22802700	johan.robinson @undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Project Objective: To strengthen national and local capacities to effectively manage the national system of protected areas, and address threats to biodiversity and ecosystem functions in these areas</p>	Aggregated Average Capacity Development indicator score for CEPA, Madang, Morobe, West Sepik and East Sepik Provincial Government, TCA and TKCP	35.3%	62.3%	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEPA develops and implements its organisational structure to effectively meet its mandate for administering the protected area system • Government continues to view protected areas as a key investment strategy for meeting biodiversity conservation (and selected socio-economic development) targets. • Local NGOs and CBOs continue to support the implementation of CCAs and have the capacity to do so <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacities at different levels of government increase at a slower pace than required by the needs of the PA system • Local NGOs and CBOs do not get long-term financial support to allow them to continue operations
	Total area expansion of the National Protected Area in the Varirata-Sogeri Plateau, YUS and Torricelli Mountains Landscapes	0 ha	255,000 ha	CEPA Records	
	Conducive policy environment for CEPA to operate within	<p>No policy regulating development impacts on biodiversity</p> <p>No clear direction on how funds and revenues will be earmarked within the overall CEPA financial structure</p>	<p>An enabling policy that established an effective national system to license and regulate development impacts on biodiversity</p> <p>An administrative regulation or similar issuance describing the process by which funds and revenues for PA management will be earmarked within the overall CEPA financial structure</p>	Issuance of policy and administrative regulation or similar issuance	
	Number of villages directly benefitting from community-based livelihood activity that contribute to the reducing the extent and intensity of threats to the YUS and Torricelli CAs	0	>60	Project record of technical support and sub-grant funding agreements	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	IRRF Sub-indicator 1.1.3.A.1.1: Extent to which institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and/or access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems	To be defined at project start	To be defined at project start	Project reports	
Component 1 Management capabilities of the PNG state to support and oversee Protected Area Management	Outputs: 1.1 Policies relating to PA Management and Biodiversity Conservation Strengthened. 1.2 Capacity of CEPA emplaced for effective management of the National PA System. 1.3 Training Programs targeting PA managers institutionalized. 1.4 Effective management of Varirata NP and its integration into the broader Sogeri Plains Landscape.				
	Capacity of CEPA	Development indicator score for CEPA: 38% New PA Policy Standards and guidelines: None Zero of CEPA's PA Unit staff completed specialised, targeted short-course training in PA oversight and coordination	Development indicator score for CEPA: 72% PNG PA Policy in place and implemented through a formulated Strategic Plan Standards and Guidelines for PA Management in PNG approved >30 of CEPA's PA Unit professional staff completed specialised, targeted short-course training in PA oversight and coordination	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard Strategic plan included M&E plan Record of approval and adoption of standards and guidelines Staff training records Staff training certification Project reports	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEPA transition achieved in timely manner • Approval of draft PNG PPA and implementation of proposed governance framework • Sogeri Plateau – good work collaboration with JICA component; Careful partnership building with local land owners creates sufficient buy-in and commitment for establishment of CCA Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacities at different levels of government increase at a slower pace than required by the needs of the PA system • Land ownership disputes on Sogeri Plateau, which would hamper the implementation of output 1.4
	METT Scores of Varirata NP	Varirata NP: 27%	Varirata NP: 50%	Project review of METT Scorecards at mid-term and end of project	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan approved and being implemented	No Plan in place	Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan approved covering a landscape area of > 7000 ha	Record of approval of ILUP	
	Sedimentation levels in the Laloki River as measured at relevant downriver site (and compared to levels in the Sirinumu dam)	To be determined in Year 1 of the project	5% less than the baseline	Technical studies, assessments and project reports	
Component 2: Strengthening the Capacity of the State and Local Communities to Cooperatively Manage Protected Area Sites	Outputs: 2.1 Expansion to the landscape level and effective management of the YUS Conservation Area 2.2 Community livelihood assistance in the YUS landscape 2.3 Formal gazetted and effective management of the Torricelli Mountain Range (TMR) 2.4 Community livelihood assistance in the TMR landscape proposed CA: Alternative protein				
	Capacity Development indicator score for Madang, Morobe, West Sepik and East Sepik Provincial Government, TCA and TKCP	Morobe Provincial Government: 27% Madang Provincial Government: 23% East Sepik Provincial Government: 23% West Sepik Provincial Government: 21% TCA: 53% TKCP: 62%	Morobe Provincial Government: 50% Madang Provincial Government: 55% East Sepik Provincial Government: 58% West Sepik Provincial Government: 56% TCA: 70% TKCP: 75%	Project review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	Assumptions: – TCA and TKCP are available as IPs – Local land owners committed to continue their conservation efforts – CEPA and provincial government capacitated to coordinate regional PA work Risks: • Local NGOs and CBOs do not get long-term financial support to allow them to continue operations Climate change may exacerbate habitat fragmentation in the designated CCAs
	METT Scores of YUS Conservation Area and Torricelli Mountain Range Conservation Area	YUS: 57% Torricelli: 57%	YUS: 75% Torricelli: 72%	Project review of METT Scorecards at mid-term and end of project	
	Extent of area under different National PA Categories and covered by Integrated Land Use Plans to direct management	YUS: Conservation Area: 76,000 ha Torricelli: 0 ha Protected Area	YUS: Community Conservation Area: 151,000 ha Torricelli: Community Conservation Area: 180,000 ha	CEPA Records	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Stable or increased populations of threatened species - YUS	<i>YUS: Baseline:</i> Matschie's Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>) (Endangered) 250+	YUS. Stable or increased population: Matschie's Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>)\ 250+	METT at Mid-term and End of Project Conservation Status and Biodiversity Monitoring reports at site level Annual YUS reports GEF PIRs	
	Stable or increased populations of threatened species - TMR	Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>) (Critically Endangered) Population estimate 300+; Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>) Population estimate 500+	Stable or Increased Populations: Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>), target 300+ Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>), 500+	METT at Mid-term and End of Project Conservation Status and Biodiversity Monitoring reports at site level Annual TCA reports GEF PIRs	
	Productivity of organic coffee and cocoa in existing agricultural zones in YUS	Coffee = 2.5 tons per year from 22,650 ha. Cocoa = 38.6 tons per year from 6,091 ha.	Coffee > 30 tons per year from 22,650 ha Cocoa > 103 tons per year from 6,091 ha	APRs/PIRs	
	Formal agreements in place between communities in participating conservation areas and central and/or Provincial Government/ project IAs, to provide financial and in-kind (service provision) support to participating communities, resulting in at least PGK 400 (approximately USD 150) in additional resources per	YUS – US\$ 50 per Household (coffee and cocoa producers) TCA = US\$ 0	YUS – US\$ 200 per household (coffee and cocoa producers) TCA = US\$ 150 ⁶ per household (Alternative Proteins beneficiaries)	APRs/PIRs	

⁶ A methodology will have to be developed during project implementation to measure this as “in-kind” or “subsistence” value for the alternative protein activities in TMR CA.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND COMPONENTS	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	household per year provided to the communities concerned.				

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
GEF SECRETARIAT:		
STRATEGIC ALLIGNMENT: 4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>		
Please provide SMART indicators that will be used to track progress towards achieving the Aichi targets at CEO Endorsement	<p>The project will directly support PNG towards achieving several Aichi Targets and especially targets under Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use and Strategic Goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity.</p> <p>Integrated into SRF (see Prodoc Section of CEO Endorsement), especially applying the GEF METT, LD TT and UNDP Score Cards for Capacity Development:</p> <p>Aichi Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced. Indicator: METT scores and individual measures</p> <p>Aichi Target 8: By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity . Indicator: Sedimentation levels in the Laloki River as measured at relevant downriver sites (and compared to levels in the Sirinumu dam) reduced by 5%</p> <p>Aichi Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes. Indicator: Increase in the METT scores: Total Ha of the YUS and TMR Conservation Areas, and Varirata National Park (possibly incl. Varirata-Sirinumu Complex)</p> <p>Aichi Target 12: By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.</p>	See ProDoc, SECTION II – Strategic Results Framework and CEO Endorsement Request, Annex 1

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
	<p>Indicator: Stable or increased populations of threatened species</p> <p>(1) Stable or increased populations of threatened species – YUS: Matschie’s Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>) (Endangered) 250+ -> 250+</p> <p>(2) Stable or increased populations of threatened species – TMR: Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>) (Critically Endangered) Population estimate 300+ -> 300+; Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>) Population estimate 500+ -> 500+</p>	
COUNCIL MEMBER GERMANY		
<p>Given that the core of the project proposal is to improve governance of the PA system while strengthening PA management, it is suggested to conduct a governance assessment and development of action plan during the PPG-phase (e.g. using IUCN Best Practice Guidelines No. 20, 2013). The full proposal shall as a consequence strengthen the governance-related outcomes and outputs (such as improved legal frameworks for community management of CAs, strengthened capacities of CA management committees, etc.).</p>	<p>The CEPA Act was passed in May 2014. Since then the Government of PNG has engaged a transformation consultant, specifically working on the restructuring of the DEC into CEPA. At this point, the Government is taking a quite covered approach to the restructuring, although certain projections on staff numbers incl. indicatively for a PA Management Unit are given. The PPG phase facilitated several DEC staff meetings focusing on jointly identifying capacity needs for a PA Management Unit at CEPA, to inject a more participatory approach. The IUCN guidelines were used as foundation for these meetings. At this point, the project design foresees more specific engagement through identification of a change management specialist/firm in the early project implementation phase.</p> <p>Notably, the new PNG Policy on PAs is still under preparation, and should be submitted to the NEC for approval in October 2014. The new policy sets out a new PA Governance framework, including much stronger responsibility of Provincial Governments. The CEPA functions with regards to PA Management will be re-defined by the new Policy as well. Component 1 of the project has been designed to take on board the new Governance Framework and to strengthen CEPA to support the key players at all levels. As such CEPA will be positioned to coordinate the “Centre of Excellence” for PA management capacity development, with trainings to be executed by a number of partners. A dedicated output supporting the Regional PAs, for which Provincial Government will be responsible, has been introduced. Overall the project design has shifted slightly to facilitate the implementation of the new overall Governance Framework, while specifically strengthening the CEPA transformation, in line with the comments by Germany.</p>	<p>SEE PRODOC SECTION I, PART I – Institutional context and SEE SECTION I, PART I – Policy and Legislative Context.</p> <p>Also see Annexes: <u>Annex 1.</u> : Table of Roles and Functions of National PA Governance Framework in PNG PPA; <u>Annex 3.:</u> Draft Capacity Development Profiles for selected target groups for PA training; and <u>Annex 4.:</u> PA registration processes for National and Regional PAs under new PAP.</p>
<p>Particularly with regard to the showcase Varirata NP the full proposal shall be more explicit as to whether a separate management plan (in addition to the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan) will be developed which shall include a business plan and feasibility study of a potential PES arrangement</p>	<p>It is indeed proposed to develop a stand-alone Varirata management plan at this point. As new management arrangements are piloted in Varirata with a number of investment and co-financing partners coming around the table (e.g. JICA, National Capital District Commission NCDC) the VNP will have to focus on internal management before integrating fully into the Varirata-Sogery Plateau Complex ILUP. Consultations with a wider range of stakeholders in the Varirata-Sogery Plateau Complex have confirmed that the engagement in the ILUP process will possibly follow a different timeline than the VNP work. To avoid that the VNP management is held back by the ILUP process it</p>	<p>SEE SECTION I, PART II - Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes And Outputs/Activities.</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>with the water/city authorities. The role of the private sector and parastatal agencies shall be defined more clearly in the full proposal.</p>	<p>is recommended to introduce two planning processes and develop two plans – which, however must be integrated. A financial plan (business plan) will be an integral part of the management plan and will in its development stages involve a pre-selection and analysis of viable financial mechanisms (including a feasibility study of a potential PES arrangement with the water/city authorities).</p> <p>CEPA has engaged with NCDC as an investment partner for VNP more formally, while specific investments by JICA are still under preparation. No specific co-financing commitment could be leveraged from neither NCDC nor JICA during the PPG phase.</p> <p>CEPA identified the four areas of support in VNP by this project, outlined under output 1.4. This integrates well with the overall support to CEPA and the new PA governance framework, set out under component 1, providing relevant case examples and demonstrations.</p>	
STAP REVIEW COMMENTS		
<p>1. Biodiversity conservation is a high priority for Papua New Guinea which has received a succession of GEF-supported projects, with varying results. STAP has reviewed the outcomes and likely impact of previous GEF projects (e.g. GEF IDs 347, 1261) in the portfolio, which addressed biodiversity conservation and protected area designation and management, revealing a disappointing set of results. From a scientific and technical perspective the predecessor projects had merit, but clearly the main vulnerability noted in evaluations was the underestimated need to invest in community buy-in and follow-up over extended periods to build and maintain trust. An equally important vulnerability has been the failure to invest adequate effort in legislative support for protected area (PA) designation, funding and management. For these reasons, STAP has very significant concerns regarding this project. However, given that the majority of STAP's concerns are not</p>	<p>The project undertook a thorough risk assessment during the development of the project and have appropriate mitigation strategies have been developed. During the project development, a large amount of effort was invested in ensuring community buy-in. The two NGOs, TCA and TKCP have for years built up a strong relationship with the local communities and the management of the areas is very much community driven. The proposed project also recognizes the importance of community buy-in and therefore the dual emphasis on conservation and livelihood support. Regarding the vulnerability in regards to failure to invest in legislative support, PNG has recently passed both the CEPA Act and Protected Areas Policy. The proposed project will invest further in these legislative changes by developing a Strategic Plan to ensure its implementation. Additional policy and legislative changes to strengthen biodiversity conservation and empowering CEPA is also planned under the proposed project</p>	<p>SEE summaries in SECTION 1 – PART I. Baseline analysis and PART II. Strategy.</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>explicitly of a scientific or technical nature - but rather concerning the assessment of project risk in other areas - STAP has proposed minor revisions with regard to this project.</p>		
<p>2. The present project proposal, of five years duration, enters (in the STAP Panel's view) yet another risky project environment, in partnership with a new government department in the process of formation (CEPA), a governance background that appears to need considerable extra baseline research to arrive at workable local vs. national balance of customary rights and national laws. The past disconnect between under-equipped national institutions and distant communities would appear to remain a very significant risk which appears to dwarf any scientific and technical concerns that STAP has about the project concept. Nevertheless, and from a scientific and technical perspective, STAP recommends Major Revision for this concept and requests that the full project brief tracks the proponent's responses to STAP's concerns and responds to the following suggestions for improvements to the design.</p>	<p>The Government of PNG has invested into the drafting and passing of a new Protected Area Policy (PAP) (December 2014) and has enacted the CEPA Act of May 2014 – which foresees the institutional transformation of the DEC to CEPA. The PAP is an attempt to bring together and supersede a large set of old policies and law pertaining to PA management in PNG. PAP is built on 5 pillars namely (i) PA types governance, (ii) Sustainable livelihoods for communities; (iii) Effective and adaptive management; (iv) Network expansion and resilience; (v) Sustainable and equitable resourcing. The project has incorporated the comment by placing an emphasis on the development of a strategic plan to implement the PAP. The Strategic Plan will provide national guidance for improved cross-jurisdictional coordination and will support collaborative action by the PA managers and key stakeholders to enhance the PA system. A further sub-output “Dedicated and Functioning PA Management and Oversight Unit in CEPA” was also incorporated to ensure that national institutions move away from labelled as “under-equipped” – a major capacity development program will also be implemented to increase capacity. This program will include Provincial Governments, bringing the management of PAs closer to the local communities. There is some significant traction in PNG to strengthen the PA system through innovation and newly set out institutional arrangements. Although it is clear that the plans are quite ambitious it is the view of UNDP that it is critical to support PNG at this point for a pro-conservation and PA management drive. If the CEPA and PNG PAP do fail, it will be many years to come before a more practical and positive effort will be launched by the national government. This is clearly an opportunity which cannot be missed. Even if the risks and obstacles are obvious.</p>	<p>Addressed throughout project design. Specific risks included in risk log, including mitigation strategies.</p> <p>SEE SECTION I – PART II: Risks and assumptions.</p>
<p>3. The PIF describes in some detail the situation with regard to PAs and the wide range of actors that initiate and invest in PAs. This is commendable and it is clear that as the PIF describes, the project will be just one module with a wider framework of support to PNG. What the PIF fails to do is to review the baseline situation of</p>	<p>The overall existing planning framework was reviewed during the PPG phase, and opportunities were identified in consultation with multi-institutional stakeholders. Notably, the new draft PNG Policy for PAs, which is expected to be approved by NEC during October 2014, sets out a new PA management framework especially at the regional level, which will more closely bring together institutions such as the Provincial, District and Local level Government, as well as relevant line Ministries and institutions to engage in PA governance, i.e. through the establishment of Regional PA Round Tables (RPART). At this moment, the ILUP process set out by the Department of Lands and Physical Planning, and the planning under the PNG Policy on PAs are not yet well</p>	<p>SEE SECTION I – PART I: Baseline analysis</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>the PAs described within the broader PNG land and water planning framework, particularly that supported by the Department of Lands and Physical Planning; this gap should be addressed. A recent conference organized by the Department ("Refocusing and Enabling Sustainability of the physical planning system in PNG and beyond 2020."), would appear to have been highly relevant to the context within a Ridge to Reef project was formulated. However, the PIF contains no mention of this or of arrangements to apply relevant methods such as Integrated Landscape Management Plans (ILMPs, e.g. see GEF ID 5517), IWRM, ICM etc. within the family of spatial planning and management approaches and to build inter-Departmental capacity to share necessary expertise and to agree inter-Ministerial policy support for ILMP or equivalent.</p>	<p>harmonized, may pose conflicts and particularly pose a huge burden on local communities, including in CAs to engage in very complex processes. Additionally requirements for planning under the Organic Law add more complexity. The project design has been refined to specifically support the multi-institutional platforms under the new PNG Policy on PAs, to give them a strong start and leadership to position PA Management strategically at the provincial level. It is asserted that if the delivery on the roles and functions of the Provincial Governments and the RPARTs can be facilitated by CEPA, the PA management aspects that should be part of ILUP can be positively positioned. Output 1.1.2 specifically addresses the refinement of the planning, and will be underpinned by practical learning from the three demonstration sites. The baseline review has been updated to include relevant information.</p>	
<p>Component 1: 4. The statement in the PIF to the effect that "The project will ensure that support for Conservation Areas and other community-managed conservation areas is integrated into relevant national, provincial and local land-use and sectoral planning processes", is welcome, but needs to be more explicitly formulated in a full project brief that also details how the Ridge to Reef Program will support development of necessary inter-Departmental working arrangements, relevant expert capacities, on-going training and regional peer review. Particularly important will be the proposed pilot</p>	<p>ON ILUP – see above. The R2R:GEF parent programme mostly provides a regional training and experience sharing context for this project. Output 1.2 includes specific activities and budget allocations for such a linkage.</p>	<p>SEE SECTION I – PART I: Baseline analysis, as well as SECTION I – PART II: Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes And Outputs/Activities, Output 1.2.</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>Integrated Land Use Plan for the Sogeri Dam catchment area as a practical focus for the national to local cooperation required.</p>		
<p>Component 2: 5. While the actions proposed under this Component appear to be well described and focused on two sites, nevertheless STAP is concerned that the ambitious plans to designate and manage increased PA areas may compromise the pressing need to consolidate existing PAs and existing community livelihood concerns. STAP requests an explanation, i.e. why this trade-off has been proposed, which may distract from the core need to demonstrate increased management effectiveness of the current portfolio of PA area, within a well-planned R2R framework</p>	<p>There has been no ‘trade offs’ and the project is not expanding in the sense of establishing protected areas and management from scratch but rather formalizing existing management areas under protected area categories and developing existing management structures’ capacity. The Varirata NP is an existing protected area and the project is focusing on improving its management and integrating it into the wider landscape, for sustainability reasons. YUS: the focus is on consolidation, adding conservation zonation into the overall landscape boundary – which will not be broadened. The focus of the intervention is on improved management effectiveness and demonstrating PA management models that can address the pressing needs, rather than focusing on areas where little sustainability can be worked into the solution, because the baseline investments on site are too low. Experiences in the past have been that WMA’s managed by communities, were underfunded and eventually only resulted in paper parks, with very limited actions on the ground. TMR: the CA has already been identified, but needs formal gazettal. It is considered that the GEF support will strengthen one of the most functional CAs in PNG. As reflected in the cost effectiveness section of the prodoc and elsewhere, the PAs were chosen based on the fact that they have NGOs that are, in PNG terms, quite well established and funded, to assist in the management of the protected areas. The project uses these cases as a model for protected area management in PNG; that would directly implement and operationalize the new PAP.</p>	<p>Throughout project design, and SEE SECTION 1 – PART II – Cost Effectiveness.</p>
<p>Landscapes, ecosystem functions and local livelihoods 6. Cross-cutting both components but primarily concentrated in Component 2 is the objective of improving ecosystem functions and establishing secure livelihoods for local communities who will be expected to be the primary guardians of the PA system. STAP is concerned that this wider aspect features only briefly in the project framework and not at all in the textual commentary on activities to be accomplished in the project; yet as noted elsewhere in this screening of the PIF, addressing both immediately local</p>	<p>Livelihood rational and linkage made more explicit – but mostly in a conservation and PA management context. Although the project proponents clearly can see the linkages to ecosystem functioning, the project has been more precisely hinged into a conservation and PA management argument. The local partners have already established their work foci and interactions with local communities in this regard, at least at YUS and TMR. For the greater Sogeri Plateau more intense community consultations will have to be conducted over the lifetime of the project – however, it is clear that a water provisioning service and related ecosystem functions are a key to this specific site. At YUS CA, output 2.2 focuses on enhancing productivity from organic coffee and cocoa production in existing agricultural zones, including through the application of conservation agriculture practices. It is asserted that such investments will - across a R2R context – help protect and where necessary restore ecosystem functions. At In the Sogeri Plateau area (leading partially into the Sirinumu dam and encompassing catchment areas of the Laloki river), the siltation issue clearly persists and stakeholders agree that curbing the problem is a priority. Whilst much of the project design focuses</p>	<p>SEE esp. SECTION I – PART II: Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes And Outputs/Activities. Output 1.4 and Output 2.2.</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>issues as well as attention to the whole landscape (from ridge to reef) will be essential in developing any hope of sustainable outcomes. An issue that will need to be urgently considered is how "conservation farming" will be promoted and indeed, what the proponents mean by the term. If this should be some form of conversion of swidden agriculture to permanent occupation with the use of composts, then there will need to be a substantial drawing of lessons from other projects that have attempted agricultural change and intensification but with conspicuous lack of success. In addition, a target of 5 percent sediment yield reduction is mentioned in at least two places but without any information as to how this will be achieved and whether this is either a realistic or insufficient level. STAP is unconvinced about the whole reasoning and linkages to ecosystem functions and local livelihoods that the project promises consequent upon the investments in the PA system.</p>	<p>on establishing a solid and fully participatory ILUUP process during project implementation, investments have been dedicated to restoring forest vegetation in the upper catchment towards the VNP. Due to the sighting of the key project area, siltation/ sedimentation rates will be established along the Laloki river, rather than on the Sirinumu Dam intake.</p>	
<p>Regional considerations 7. The project design has relatively weak links to the regional Program as described, and there are significant opportunities to share lessons and ongoing experience at regional level regarding PA community-based management and financing. The PIF mentions that "the Government of PNG is also initiating work on biodiversity financing (module 3), including offset systems to mitigate biodiversity loss, innovative PA management models such as concession</p>	<p>Linkages through training and knowledge management coordination mechanisms have been established between the national and regional project as described earlier. As mentioned in the PIF and in the Project Document, the project is part of a medium-term modular approach to strengthening biodiversity conservation in PNG. It complements work undertaken under the GEF-4/Australia supported Community-Based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management project (GEFSEC PMIS 3954) to develop models for conservation in the Owen Stanley Range and New Britain island. A third module focusing on biodiversity finance (biodiversity offsets framework, concession bidding, development of effective fund management mechanisms such as trust funds, etc.). With the startup of the GEF 6 replenishment cycle in July 2014, the Government of Papua New Guinea and UNDP had a discussion in fast-tracking the design of the financing project in order for it to overlap in time with the proposed GEF 5 project. The Operational Focal Point has already issued a Letter of Endorsement and the design of this project will begin as soon as the proposed GEF 5 project has been</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>bidding, and fund management structures such as biodiversity trust funds". STAP welcomes this linkage and urges the proponents to set out their suggestions for collaborative work to connect with the regional support project (GEF ID 5404).</p>	<p>submitted and endorsed. This project will extensively deal with the financial sustainability of protected area, and therefore the proposed GEF 5 project has only a limited focus on PA system financing.</p>	
<p>Regional considerations 8. The capacity building linkage of the project to the University of Papua New Guinea would be a welcome development, and should be augmented by outreach to regional capacity building and knowledge platforms. Even though the project does not have specific International Waters focal area funding support, nevertheless the R2R Program linkage implies more than simply "alignment" with the Program. Instead exchange between the family of child national projects focused on training capacity building knowledge management and adaptive management suggestions mediated by the program should be supported.</p>	<p>Specific linkage to University of Papua New Guinea established in Output 1.3 on capacity development, however mostly with a terrestrial PA management focus. Additionally capacity building linkages to the Pacific R2R program are made and include in the project design under output 1.2, including budgetary allocations.</p>	<p>SEE SECTION I – PART I: Baseline analysis, as well as SECTION I – PART II: Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes And Outputs/Activities, Output 1.2.</p>
<p>Regional considerations 9. STAP recommended in its screening of the regional support project that it should include support for a multi-focal "PaciW:LEARN" for the region, which could act to sustain a peer to peer scientific and technical network for in-service training. This would satisfy the long standing demand under the Mauritius Strategy for Implementation, at least in this Pacific SIDS area. This advice was provided for the reason that, given the complex multidisciplinary threats and barriers shared by many of the PICs to be</p>	<p>The interaction with the regional Programme "Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities "Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods" will be on three fronts: (i) formal - Project Steering Committees; (ii) informal technical coordination; and (iii) capacity building and knowledge management interaction.</p> <p>UNDP will serve as the lead R2R Program Coordinating Agency. The R2R programme as a whole will be guided by a R2R Program Steering Committee (PSC), which will meet annually to review progress, provide strategic guidance and advice, and facilitate program level coordination and communication. The national PNG R2R Programme project will feature a representative, multi-stakeholder steering committee including relevant local and national government agencies, NGO/CBO, private sector and UN system participants. This committee will meet bi-annually to review progress, provide strategic advice and support adaptive project management project).</p>	

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>overcome, the sharing of expertise between PICs would strengthen sustainability of individual projects within the Program, but also across the other GEF and non-GEF projects delivering against allied environmental targets. In this connection the inclusion in the present project of knowledge management, as mentioned above, is essential and STAP advises that the project brief should show how it could connect more formally to the proposed regional network as discussed above. Additionally, the baseline PaciWRM project's successful delivery of distance learning and twinning for IWRM capacity development is an excellent basis to build on regionally and nationally.</p>	<p>The regional project will provide overall R2R coordination support and will be executed through the South Pacific Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC) of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). A full time international staff person will be hired through the regional project to coordinate and support the implementation of the national R2R projects. The coordinator will be part of the broader regional R2R team that will provide technical and programmatic support not only for the regional project activities but also for the national R2R projects as may be requested by the countries. PNG will employ a Technical Coordinator that will oversee the implementation of the project nationally. There will be an informal interaction between the Project Management (PNG component) and the coordinator (Regional component) regarding work planning. The national project will share with the regional project any lessons learned and information obtained during implementation, while the regional project will undertake capacity development activities in which the national component will participate. Regional collaboration, lesson learning and capacity building has been built into the project activities as well as budget allocations made for participation of FSM nationals in regional R2R programme activities.</p> <p>The UNDP-GEF Regional R2R Project “Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods” (the executing agency for this project is SPC’s Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC) based in Suva, Fiji) will support the development of technical capacities and information sharing networks to support national R2R projects, including the proposed project in PNG. As part of this effort, the regional project will develop and deliver a post-graduate training program in Integrated Water and Coastal Management for project managers of the regional project’s pilot activities and national STAR projects through a partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes. The design of this postgraduate training programme enables eligible project managers and R2R stakeholders to progress towards a Master’s degree qualification. The course will be delivered remotely (online), with annual face-to-face meetings coinciding with the regional R2R project’s steering committee meetings.</p>	
<p>Regional considerations 10. One of the lessons learned from a related regional project on fisheries (GEF ID 2131 Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific Small Island Developing States) in the region, coordinated through the Secretariat of the Pacific</p>	<p>The interaction with the regional Programme "Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities “Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods" will be on three fronts: (i) formal - Project Steering Committees; (ii) informal technical coordination; and (iii) capacity building and knowledge management interaction.</p> <p>UNDP will serve as the lead R2R Program Coordinating Agency. The R2R programme as a whole will be guided by a R2R Program Steering Committee (PSC), which will</p>	<p>SEE SECTION I – PART I: Baseline analysis, as well as SECTION I – PART II: Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes And Outputs/Activities, Output 1.2.</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>Community (SPC), is that each child project in a program through its full project brief needs to detail the support relationship envisaged and responsibilities respectively of the (PNG) project unit and the regional unit.</p>	<p>meet annually to review progress, provide strategic guidance and advice, and facilitate program level coordination and communication. The R2R PSC will include representatives for each PIC (preferably the Chairperson of the national inter-ministerial committee that is described below), the GEF agencies (UNDP, UNEP, FAO) and the SOPAC. The national PNG R2R Programme project will feature a representative, multi-stakeholder steering committee including relevant local and national government agencies, NGO/CBO, private sector and UN system participants. This Committee will meet bi-annually to review progress, provide strategic advice and support adaptive project management project).</p> <p>The regional project will provide overall R2R coordination support and will be executed through the South Pacific Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC) of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). A full time international staff person will be hired through the regional project to coordinate and support the implementation of the national R2R projects. The coordinator will be part of the broader regional R2R team that will provide technical and programmatic support not only for the regional project activities but also for the national R2R projects as may be requested by the countries. PNG will employ a Project Manager that will oversee the implementation of the project nationally. There will be an informal interaction between the Project Management (PNG component) and the coordinator (Regional component) regarding work planning. The national project will share with the regional project any lessons learned and information obtained during implementation, while the regional project will undertake capacity development activities in which the national component will participate. Regional collaboration, lesson learning and capacity building has been built into the project activities as well as budget allocations made for participation of FSM nationals in regional R2R programme activities.</p>	
<p>Regional considerations 11. As a member of the R2R Program the present project also needs to show how the scientific and technical linkages outlined in the parent program translate into practical action to benefit PNG. STAP has noted that the Mauritius Strategy for Implementation cites the concept of "SIDSTAP", the operationalization of the small island developing States roster of experts. While little progress has been achieved, as noted in regional meetings held prior to the Rio+20 Conference, the present</p>	<p>The UNDP-GEF Regional R2R Project “Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods” (the executing agency for this project is SPC’s Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC) based in Suva, Fiji) will support the development of technical capacities and information sharing networks to support national R2R projects, including the proposed project in PNG. As part of this effort, the regional project will develop and deliver a post-graduate training program in Integrated Water and Coastal Management for project managers of the regional project’s pilot activities and national STAR projects through a partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes. The design of this postgraduate training programme enables eligible project managers and R2R stakeholders to progress towards a Master’s degree qualification. The course will be delivered remotely (online), with annual face-to-face meetings coinciding with the regional R2R project’s steering committee meetings. This will be</p>	<p>SEE SECTION I – PART I: Baseline analysis, as well as SECTION I – PART II: Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes And Outputs/Activities, Output 1.2.</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>project has the opportunity, at least alongside the cluster of 14 countries represented with the Program, to benefit from a strengthened set of scientific and technical linkages between the PICs, building upon the SOPAC mechanism. The project brief should therefore detail how the Science, Technology and Resources Network (STAR) of SOPAC could assist the present project to draw upon a regional multidisciplinary network similar to the SIDSTAP concept, augmented with SOPAC-STAR support and in coordination with the University of the South Pacific.</p>	<p>complemented with a community-based certification programme in R2R planning and CC adaptation for stakeholders at project sites, which will be led and coordinated nationally by participants of the regional training programme. Supporting activities include: the development of a register of national and regional water, land and coastal management practitioners to facilitate intra-country and multi-lateral sharing of skills and expertise; and the development of an online database of past and present projects relating to land, water, forests, coasts and climate change adaptation to assist in information sharing on available specialist expertise and technical resources and to serve as a repository for lessons learned. The Regional R2R project will fund the course development costs as well as the participation of its national pilot project managers, while the proposed PNG R2R project will fund the participation of its project staff / key stakeholders (estimated at 4-5 persons) in these activities.</p> <p>In addition, the national project will participate in the activities of the regional project to strengthen the scientific and technical linkages between Pacific Island Countries for Ridge to Reef approaches. Component 2 of the regional project will establish a Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) that will serve as a forum for reconciling both sectorial and national interests and priorities, and will foster the incorporation of sound science into decision-making and national and regional planning. The PNG R2R project will participate in the RSTC, and will benefit from the work of that body to develop regionally appropriate knowledge tools to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning in PICS. In addition, national stakeholders from PNG will participate in the Regional Scientific Conference on coastal and marine spatial planning in PICs, which will support the uptake of regionally accumulated scientific knowledge in policy-making and planning and will facilitate exchanges between government and the scientific community</p>	
<p>Regional considerations 12. STAP advises the project proponents to consider the guidance offered through the joint GEF/CBD publication on Marine Spatial Planning in order to maximize the potential of the ICM/IWRM approaches planned to resolve unsustainable trajectories for biodiversity, land and water use within the coastal zones and related catchments concerned. At present one of the key deficits of the parent Program outlined in the R2R documents is the absence of a strategy for assisting the countries with planning within the Ridge to Reef</p>	<p>Read and noted, however mostly terrestrial work included in project design. Reference passed on to collaborating partners for future reference.</p> <p>The YUS CA is currently the only PA targeted by the project with a distinct marine area, although both other PAS do fall under a R2R landscape setting. The guidance will be applied as relevant into the ILUP and management plan development processes at each site.</p>	<p>SEE SECTION I – PART I: Baseline analysis, as well as SECTION I – PART II: Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes And Outputs/Activities, Output 1.4, Output 2.1, and Output 2.3.</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project document
<p>approach towards a realizable and sustainable future, the present project should show how this strategic support will be realized.</p>		
<p>Further reading Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel GEF (2012). Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity: A study carried out in response to CBD COP 10 decision X/29, Montreal, Technical Series No. 68, 16 pp.</p>	<p>Read and noted. As the project is focused on the terrestrial component of the Ridge to Reef system, marine spatial planning is not directly relevant to the project, however its concepts have been included in the design of the ILUPs for the three project sites.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁷

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

Detailed report on PPG activities planned and undertaken:

PPG activity	Status	Steps to undertake during Implementation
Component A: Technical review		
<p>Baseline Study element A: To corroborate and expand the barrier description outlined in the PIF.</p> <p>(i) Describe in more detail the capacity of the DEC in their role of oversight of and support to gazetted CAs/PAs. Systems and policies for PA management should be described and its adequacy evaluated. An analysis of the review of the National PA Policy should be conducted. Analysis should also be done on the technical and financial capacity of DEC.</p> <p>(ii) At site level, where communities have come together to establish and manage Conservation Areas, analyse the limited institutional capacity to organise landowners to work with potential conservation partners and of landowners in accessing institutional and technical support to management the conservation areas. (iii) Analyse and describe in detail the barrier in terms of a lack of a national system to support or monitor progress of Conservation Areas.</p>	Done	
<p>Baseline Study element B: (b) To fully justify and detail specific outputs proposed in the PIF:</p> <p>(i) Component 1: (a) Describe the relevant policy relating to PA management and biodiversity conservation that needs strengthening under this project, (b) Describe the trainings and methods to be employed to emplace capacity in the Conservation and Environmental Protection Authority (CEPA) for effective management of the national PA system; (c) Describe the contents of a training programme targeting PA managers that will be institutionalized within national training curricula and institutions, (d) Describe the necessary the project will employ to establish a functional Varirata NP as a showcase of the PNG national park system, (e) Describe the activities to be undertaken leading to the establishment of a designated conservation zone within the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan, encompassing the existing Varirata National Park (1,060 ha) and at least 7,000 ha of adjacent forest landscape, (f) Describe the activities to be undertaken by the project that will lead to improvements in watershed management in the Sirinumu catchment through conservation farming, establishment of community-agreed riparian buffers and other measures within the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan, and (g) describe the process the project will employ to integrate national environmental standards and regulations (from CEPA) into the development and implementation of the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan (ii) Component 2: (a) Describe and justify the process of the expansion of the gazette YUS Conservation Area from 76,000 ha to 151,000 ha including the process of improving management systems and improving capacitating Community Rangers and technical staff through training and equipment; (b) Describe and justify the project approach to formally gazette the Torricelli Mountain Range Conservation Area (app. 180,000 ha) and adopting an approved management plan; (c) Describe the activities that will take place on the project related to conservation farming and livelihood support that will have a direct reduction on threats to the YUS and Torricelli landscapes; (d) Describe the process the project needs to undertake to promote organic coffee and cocoa production and sale that result in increased income directly associated with the Conservation Area for at least 10 villages in the YUS landscape, (e) Describe the activities to be undertaken by the project in order to stimulate the cultivation of alternative protein sources (e.g. rabbits, farmed fish) that will contribute to the reduction of hunting pressures</p>	Done	

⁷ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

<p>from at least 18 villages in Torricelli; and (f) Explain in detail the improvements to be made by the project in watershed management in the YUS catchment system through conservation farming , establishment of community-agreed riparian buffers and other measures within community landscape management plans; (g) Provide details on the establishment of buffer zones and reforestation of degraded hill slopes as part of the PNG Dam Authority catchment management plan which will reduce soil erosion from farming activities in the Sirinumu Dam.</p>		
<p>Baseline Study element C: (c) To collect the baseline data for indicators. This will include as a minimum: (i) establishing the baseline of institutional capacity of the Ministry of Environment and Conservation and relevant Provincial Government counterparts for PA system planning and management by filling the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard; (ii) update the baseline Management Effectiveness for Varirata NP, YUS Conservation Area and Torricelli Mountain Range Conservation Area using the METT; (iii) establish the baseline sedimentation levels in the Laloki River as measured at the Sirinumu Dam intake ; (iv) establish the baseline populations of Emperor Bird of Paradise (<i>Paradisaea guilielmi</i>), Matschie’s Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus matschiei</i>) for YUS CA; Tenkile Tree Kangaroo (<i>Dendrolagus scottae</i>), Weimag Tree Kangaroo (<i>D. pulcherrimus</i>), Black-spotted Cuscus (<i>Spiloglossus rufoniger</i>), Northern Glider (<i>Petaurus abidi</i>) for Torricelli CA; (v) establishing baseline erosion and sedimentation levels in the Yuruwa River (YUS CA at measurement sites to be defined) and Laloki River (Varirata NP at the Bomana water intake).</p>	Partially done	Sedimentation levels in Laloki river to be established during inception period; part of capacity support needed
<p>Baseline Study element D: (d) To address specific technical issues and questions raised by the GEF Sec; Council members and STAP. (A) GEF Sec comments: (i) Please provide SMART indicators that will be used to track progress towards achieving the Aichi targets at CEO Endorsement, and (ii) No later than the endorsement stage, please consider revisiting the option of benefiting from SFM funds, subject to availability of funds and in line with GEF procedures. As conveyed, this project is an excellent candidate to incorporate SFM. (B) Germany comments: Given that the core of the project proposal is to improve governance of the PA system while strengthening PA management, it is suggested to conduct a governance assessment and development of action plan during the PPG-phase (e.g. using IUCN Best Practice Guidelines No. 20, 2013). <i>[in response to this comment, an comprehensive institutional and governance review of the current DEC and analysis of the proposed CEPA, focusing on its conservation mandate and specifically its role as the focal institution for the national PA system will be conducted and an action plan developed listing steps in preferred institutional set-up, PA reporting protocols, staffing structure and staff competency profiles, levels and skills for CEPA staff in order to manage the national PA system effectively]</i> The full proposal shall as a consequence strengthen the governance-related outcomes and outputs (such as improved legal frameworks for community management of CAs, strengthened capacities of CA management committees, etc.). Particularly with regard to the showcase Varirata NP the full proposal shall be more explicit as to whether a separate management plan (in addition to the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan) will be developed which shall include a business plan and feasibility study of a potential PES arrangement with the water/city authorities. The role of the private sector and parastatal agencies shall be defined more clearly in the full proposal. (C) STAP Comments (main points only, please refer to full STAP Screening): (i) Review the baseline situation of PAs within the broader PNG land and water planning framework, particularly that through the support by the Department of Lands and Physical Planning. Arrangements to apply relevant methods such as Integrated Landscape Management Plans within the family of spatial planning and management approaches and it is necessary to build inter-Departmental capacity to share necessary expertise and to agree inter-Ministerial policy support for ILMP or equivalent; (ii) Component 1: The statement in the PIF to the effect that “The project will ensure that support for Conservation Areas and other community-managed conservation areas is integrated into relevant national, provincial and local land-use and sectoral planning processes”, is welcome, but needs to be more explicitly formulated in a full project brief that also details how the Ridge to Reef Program will support development of necessary inter-Departmental working arrangements, relevant expert capacities, on-going training and regional peer review. Particularly important will be the proposed pilot Integrated Land Use Plan for the Sogeri Dam catchment area as a practical focus for the national to local</p>	Done	

<p>cooperation required. (iii) Component 2: While the actions proposed under this Component appear to be well described and focused on two sites, nevertheless STAP is concerned that the ambitious plans to designate and manage increased PA areas may compromise the pressing need to consolidate existing PAs and existing community livelihood concerns. STAP requests an explanation, i.e. why this trade-off has been proposed, which may distract from the core need to demonstrate increased management effectiveness of the current portfolio of PA area, within a well-planned R2R framework.</p>		
<p>II. Undertake the following studies to address any opportunities/risks identified during an environmental and social screening of the project proposal (See ESSP developed during PIF preparation): (a) A Gender Strategy to ensure that the project design effectively addresses gender dimensions. (b) Undertake a social mapping exercise to identify communities and clans with claims on the natural resource bases to be managed to ensure that these communities are effectively engaged in the plans and processes to be developed.</p>	<p>Both studies undertaken during PPG, however, more detailed longer-term strategies to be implemented as part of project.</p>	<p>At CA site level, specific gender training and development of CA specific Gender Strategies are part of the project design and will be integrated into the onsite work throughout the project implementation period.</p>
<p>III. Identification of specific sites for intervention Sites need to be selected for project outputs: (1) Establishment of a functional National Park management system for Varirata NP, with effective management, infrastructure and facilities, to allow the Park to function as a showcase for the PNG national park system (i) Establishment of a designated conservation zone within the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan, encompassing the existing Varirata National Park (1,060 ha) and at least 7,000 ha of adjacent forest landscape; (ii) Improvements in watershed management in the Sirinumu catchment through conservation farming, establishment of community-agreed riparian buffers and other measures within the Sirinumu Dam Integrated Land Use Plan, and (2) Expansion of the gazetted YUS Conservation Area through the redelineation of agreed conservation zones with participating landowners, to increase the total Conservation Area from 76,000 ha to at least 151,000 ha; (3) Conservation farming and livelihood activities result in reductions in pressure on the YUS and Torricelli landscapes; (4) Alternative protein sources (e.g. rabbits, farmed fish) contribute to a reduction hunting pressure from at least 18 villages in Torricelli; (5) Income generation from organic coffee and cocoa cultivation and sale provides increased cash incomes directly associated with the Conservation Area for at least 10 villages in the YUS landscape; (6) Improvements in watershed management in the YUS catchment system through conservation farming, establishment of community-agreed riparian buffers and other measures within community landscape management plans; and (7) Reduced soil erosion from farming activities in the Sirinumu Dam catchment through establishment of buffer zones and reforestation of degraded hill slopes as part of the PNG Dam Authority catchment management plan.</p>	<p>Done</p>	<p>Sirinumu sites to be confirmed during project implementation; high political volatility and community conflicts in the area must be addressed through well-established ILUP process.</p>
<p>IV. Integration with development plans, policies, budgets and complementary projects: Further describe and cost the programmatic baseline projects as discussed in the PIF; analyse weaknesses and gaps in these, and identify opportunities for joint action/identification for co-financing. This will among others include: (a) Describe in detail the national PA system policy and legislation, as well as the protected areas established and managed under the policy framework. Describe each protected area category in detail and its significance in the PNG context. . (b) Elaborate further and cost the work that the Department of Environment and Conservation does in terms of technical advisory and support services regarding PAs managed by other entities and the actual management of PAs it does. (c) Describe the previous GEF projects that supported biodiversity conservation in PNG in particular describe the lessons learnt from the three UNDP-GEF projects: the <i>Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management Programme</i>, the <i>Community-Based Coastal and Marine Conservation in Milne Bay Province Project</i>; and the <i>PAS: Community-Based</i></p>	<p>Done</p>	

<p><i>Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in PNG Project.</i></p> <p>(d) Further elaborate on the conservation work being done in the management of the sites such as YUS and Torricelli and cost the investment that these PAs will receive in the next 5 years. Also clearly indicate the sources of the funds that sustain the activities. Also detail the work of District and Provincial Governments in which the proposed site areas fall and describe and cost the environmental work these Government entities will undertake during the project implementation period.</p> <p>(e) Describe the process that the Government of PNG is currently in the process of completing regarding the reconstituting of DEC as a Statutory Authority with expanded powers and revenue-raising capacity should be detailed. The exact functions and operational mechanism of the new authority, to be called Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA), should be described and the proposed budget and sources of funds should be detailed for the project period.</p>		
<p>V. Completion of GEF focal area tracking tools: METT for each protected area (existing and new) to be targeted by the project; LMAT tracking tool for the land degradation part of the project and the International Waters Tracking Tool.</p>	Done	
<p>VI. Stakeholder consultations during technical review: Mobilize and engage stakeholders during project design. Negotiate partnerships with on-going projects to align their activities and the project to build synergies. Document these consultations.</p>	Done. Detailed reports available.	
<p>B. Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation</p>		
<p>I. Finalization of project results framework: Further define the results framework with appropriate objective-level and outcome-level quantitative and qualitative indicators, and end-of-project targets.</p> <p>II. Definition of monitoring and evaluation (M&E)</p> <p>III. Define sustainability plan</p> <p>IV. Definition of management arrangements</p> <p>V. Stakeholder consultations during Component B</p>	Done. Detailed reports on stakeholder consultation available.	
<p>C. Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments</p>		
<p>I. Prepare a detailed multi-year budget</p> <p>II. Explore multilateral and bilateral co-financing opportunities</p> <p>III. Ensure completion of required official endorsement letters</p> <p>IV. Stakeholder consultations during Component C</p>	Done. Detailed reports on consultations available.	
<p>D. Component D: Validation workshop</p>		
<p>A validation workshop will gather representatives from all relevant stakeholders to present, discuss and validate the final draft project document.</p>	Done. Final Local Project Appraisal Committee meeting to be held after GEF approval.	
<p>E. Component E: Completion of final documentation</p>		
<p>I. Consolidation of all technical and consultation inputs into a clearly written UNDP Prodoc document with all relevant sections and annexes</p> <p>II. Completion of a CEO endorsement request form</p>	Done	

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A - Technical review	40,000.00	26,860.34	13,139.66
Component B - Institutional arrangement, monitoring and evaluation	125,000.00	83,938.56	41,061.44
Component C - Financial planning and co-financing investments	60,000.00	40,290.51	19,709.49
Component D - Validation workshop	40,000.00	26,860.34	13,139.66
Component E - Completion of final documentation	35,000.00	23,502.80	11,497.20
Total	300,000.00	201,452.54	98,547.46

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)