

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

**Outcome Evaluation**  
of the  
**Environment and Energy Component**  
within the  
**UNDP Papua New Guinea**  
**Country Programme (2008-2012)**

**Philip Tortell and John Duguman, *consultants***

**October 2011**

**THE EVALUATION TEAM**

**Philip Tortell**

*International Consultant*

*Environmental Management Limited*

*P O Box 27 433, Wellington, NEW ZEALAND*

*Tel +64-4-384 4133, Fax +64-4-384 4022, Email [tortell@attglobal.net](mailto:tortell@attglobal.net)*

**John Duguman**

*National Expert*

*Senior Lecturer, University of Papua New Guinea*

*PO Box 320, University 134, PAPUA NEW GUINEA*

*Tel +675-326 7210, Fax +675-326 0369, Email [dugumanj@upng.ac.pg](mailto:dugumanj@upng.ac.pg), [john.duguman@gmail.com](mailto:john.duguman@gmail.com)*

# CONTENTS

<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Background: The development context in PNG	8
1.2 The evaluation	9
1.3 Methodology of the evaluation	9
1.3.1 The approach adopted	9
1.3.2 Documents reviewed and consulted	10
1.3.3 Consultations	10
1.3.4 Structure of the Report	10
1.4 The Government's response	11
1.4.1 Country Development Strategy	11
1.4.2 Government's commitment to Environment	11
1.5 Confirming the Environment Outcome	13
<b>2 FINDINGS</b>	<b>16</b>
2.1 The status of the Outcome	16
2.1.1 Monitoring carried out	16
2.1.2 Progress achieved	17
2.1.2.1 The selected Projects	17
2.1.2.2 Indicators for the Outputs	19
2.1.2.3 Assessment of the status of the Outcome	21
2.2 Factors affecting the Outcome	24
2.3 UNDP contribution to the Outcome	25
2.4 UNDP partnerships	26
<b>3 CONCLUSIONS AND RATINGS</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4 RECOMMENDATIONS: POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE UNDP CONTRIBUTION</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
1 Terms of Reference	
2 Documents reviewed	
3 Persons met and consulted	

## **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

ADR	Assessment of Development Results
APR	Annual Project Review
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community Based Organization
CO	Country Office (of UNDP)
CP	Country Programme (of UNDP)
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
DaO	Delivering as One (One UN approach)
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation
FBO	Faith-Based Organization
GEF	Global Environment Facility
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MTDS	Medium-Term Development Strategy (of the PNG government)
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OCCD	Office of Climate Change and Development
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PNG	Papua New Guinea
QPR	Quarterly Progress Report
SGP	Small Grants Programme (of the GEF)
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SRF	Strategic Results Framework
TRAC	Target Resource Allocation from Core
UN	United Nations
UN-CP	United Nations – Country Programme
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UN-REDD	United Nations – Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Background

This is an outcome evaluation and, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators describe it as - *an assessment of how these results contribute, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions*. Its focus is the Energy & Environment cluster of interventions by the UNDP Country Office in Papua New Guinea over the current programme cycle between 2008 and 2012 (revised to 2011 to align with the government planning cycle).

Although Papua New Guinea has more than 5% of the world's biodiversity in less than 1% of the world's total land area, environmental protection has not been a priority for the Government and the focus has been on economic rather than sustainable development.

Similarly to other areas of the government sector in Papua New Guinea, weak capacity is a major issue in environment. There are few champions to engage with and there is little depth behind them. The lack of technical expertise affects monitoring and evaluation capacity and data gathering. As a result, the basis for environmental planning and management is weak and little if any progress has been made towards MDG-7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability.

UNDP has responded to the environment situation in Papua New Guinea by targeting the following Outcome:

*By 2012, DEC effectively plans, manages, monitors and coordinates with other relevant government institutions the sustainable use of natural resources and selected communities use their natural resources sustainably to enhance their livelihoods*

Together with the following three Outputs:

*1 Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has the capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and regulatory framework to promote environmental sustainability*

*2 Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) has the capacity to develop climate change policy and coordinate activities to address initiatives on climate change*

*3 Rural communities have the awareness and mechanisms to apply innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry*

### Key findings and conclusions

**Overall conclusion** – The UNDP Country Programme for 2008-2012 has been curtailed by one year in order to align it with the Government's planning cycle. At the time of writing, the Environment Outcome has been partly achieved and in the remaining time before the end of the Country Programme, it is unlikely that the Outcome can be fully achieved. Overall performance and achievement are deemed to have been **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** because while the implementation of some components is in compliance with the formally-revised plan, some other components require remedial action. The rating also recognizes the challenges faced by UNDP and the external factors influencing delivery.

**Relevance** – The UNDP contribution in the area of environmental protection and management in PNG over the past four years has been relevant. In the absence of an identification of environmental priorities by Government, UNDP has addressed the major barrier of weak institutional capacity and focused on communities and their livelihoods. It has also supported the Government to honour its obligations entered into when it signed various international environmental conventions

and agreements. However, the approach has not been strategic or cohesive. Some interventions did not fall within the scope of the Outcome and conversely, there were a number of missed opportunities. Overall, the Environment CP is deemed to have been **Satisfactory (S)** in terms of its relevance to the needs of PNG.

**Effectiveness (degree of change)** – For the Outcome to be achieved, two changes in development condition are expected –

- DEC will be effectively coordinating the sustainable use of natural resources
- Communities will have enhanced livelihoods

Indicators to help determine whether these development changes have indeed taken place, have either not been set or are not helpful. Using the subsidiary Outputs as a measure of success towards the Outcome and effectiveness of the CP, the findings are that modest progress has been made towards both components of the Outcome, through both projects and non-project interventions such as advocacy. However, the two components of the Outcome are not likely to be achieved fully by the end of the CP cycle. The Environment CP is deemed to have been **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** in terms of its effectiveness in achieving the Outcome.

**Efficiency** – The Environment Outcome and other targets have been subject to review and more than one version exists which, while all along the same lines, are not identical. The differences are more marked at the lower levels of the SRF. The review can be seen as a good example of adaptive management, but it needed to be better documented and formally adopted. In spite of the review, the CP Environment framework was not robust in terms of strategic thrust, programme cohesion, delivery, performance, organization, management and monitoring, and many improvements are possible. Over 60% of the financial resources for the Environment Programme were from non-core sources, however, these relied almost exclusively on GEF and a broader resources base will result in better security and enable UNDP to better reflect the needs of PNG. In terms of efficiency, the Environment Programme is considered to have been **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**.

**Sustainability** – Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the programme domain, after UNDP assistance has come to an end. The modest achievements under the first component of the Outcome, namely, capacity enhancement of DEC, are likely to be sustainable because the benefits have been accepted and internalized by DEC and mainstreamed within their core activities. However, achievements under the second component, community livelihoods, are probably not sustainable since the benefits accruing from the SGP will be deprived of funding and other support when the minor projects end. Overall, the sustainability of achievements towards the Outcome is considered as **Moderately Likely (ML)** because there is no known sustainability plan or exit strategy and the achievements are not entirely secure institutionally or financially.

## **Recommendations**

### **1 UNDP must adopt a more cohesive and strategic approach to its work in Environment**

In the absence of an identification of environment priorities by government, UNDP should take the initiative in developing a strategic approach for environmental protection and management for PNG – a well-structured and reasoned approach is expected to be welcomed by the government. The approach must comprise a balanced mix of UNDP corporate Strategic Plan goals, government priorities and identified needs/gaps. It must also reflect UNDP's comparative strengths and advantage. Projects must form part of a strategic, visionary thrust forming a cohesive portfolio with effective linkages between projects which should be mutually supportive and benefiting from synergies.

### **2 The Environment Country Programme must be based on a needs assessment, an analysis of the root causes of environmental problems, and an identification of the barriers that may hinder solutions**

Such an approach would start with a thorough needs assessment, establishing the baseline, identifying priority needs, problems and opportunities, and noting the root causes of the problems and barriers that can hinder success. This is to ensure that projects are not set up and initiated, only to stall because of barriers. Targets must be more explicit, realistic, and time-bound (five years).

**3 The Environment Country Programme must have a more robust structure**

The delivery framework, namely the Country Programme must be strengthened. A tighter alignment between the UN-CP, the UNDP Country Programme and the Environment Programme Components is essential. It is also important for project/programme design to pay better attention to the precise wording of the hierarchy of objectives, outcomes, outputs, and activities, as well as indicators. Available UNDP guidance should be applied to create the correct relativity between the framework components and to use indicators appropriately.

**4 The Environment Country Programme must avoid a large number of shallow, one-off interventions. It must also ensure a good balance between upstream and downstream focus**

In determining the scope of the portfolio the CO must guard against spreading resources (financial, time and human) too thinly. It must also ensure a balance of upstream policy interventions with more substantial, practical projects at community level. While the SGP could be used more strategically as a pathfinder for community projects, UNDP must complement GEF resources with others from other sources to address priorities of a more domestic nature.

**5 UNDP must consider foundational and intermediate interventions as a means to an end and not as ends in themselves - all must form part of a coordinated thrust towards the Outcome**

Projects that set up frameworks, build capacity and devise strategies, must also prepare the way for the application of the enhanced capacity and the operationalization of the strategies. Pilot projects are not ends in themselves, but only a means to an end – it is not enough for a pilot project to say that the technology/approach can be replicated or upscaled somewhere else by someone else – part of the exit strategy must prepare the way for such replication and/or upscaling.

**6 UNDP must establish an effective monitoring system based on the adopted SRF with its targets, timelines and indicators**

An effective monitoring system is required which addresses set targets and uses SMART indicators to gauge progress and success, not as targets in themselves. There also needs to be a serious commitment to utilize the results of monitoring and take the necessary corrective action when and where needed.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background: The development context in PNG

Papua New Guinea is a country rich in natural resources: gold, copper, oil, gas, timber and fisheries. The country has also an extraordinary range of ecosystems including mountain glaciers, humid tropical forests, swampy wetlands and pristine coral reefs. These resources are managed under customary land tenure systems and provide livelihoods for more than 80% of the total population who live in rural areas. However, the majority of the population has inadequate access to basic services and this has put intense pressure on the Government to utilize natural resources to help make trade the engine of economic growth for social development. Consequently, environmental quality and long-term natural resource sustainability are under threat. This is evidenced by increased resource extraction for over a decade due to the export driven economic policy of the Government.

Exploitation of natural resources, particularly through commercial timber and mining operations, have had significant impact on the terrestrial ecosystems including freshwater ecosystems and ultimately the coastal and marine ecosystems through the disposal of waste and the pollution of rivers. There are increasing pressures on fishery resources as they become one of the lucrative commercial industries in the country. The exploitation of natural resources and a steadily increasing population in recent years has led to increased environmental degradation and threatens people's livelihoods. With the onset of climate change, the country, its economy and people are more vulnerable and are at risk of not meeting basic human development needs. Some of these issues are also global and climate change, loss of biodiversity and ozone layer depletion cannot be addressed by countries acting alone.

With these increasing pressures in the environment and calls for improved environmental management and ensuring sustainable use of natural resources by government agencies experiencing resources and capacity constraints, UNDP works with the Government of Papua New Guinea to help develop people-centered policies that protect the environment and those that depend on it for their livelihood.

UNDP's support to the Government through the Environmental Management and Sustainable Livelihoods<sup>1</sup> portfolio is organized in three main pillars: 1- Institutional and Human Capacity Development for Environmental Mainstreaming; 2- Climate Change Institutional and Human Capacity Development; and 3- Rural Community empowerment for improved environmental management and betterment of livelihoods through Awareness, Education, Advocacy and Capacity Development. To achieve the pillars, UNDP has over the years allocated core funds and worked with relevant agencies to access special funds to build national institutional and technical capacity. UNDP collaborates with Department of Environment and Conservation, Office of Climate Change and Development, Department of Agriculture and Livestock, Energy Division of the Department of Petroleum and Energy and other civil society organizations.

UNDP has always spearheaded the implementation of international conventions at national level while ensuring government takes ownership and plays the leadership role. In addition, the strategy of UNDP is to maintain this position and to intensify the cooperation with key donors in the field of environment, in order to facilitate the incorporation of global environmental concerns and commitments into national development planning, taking into consideration all the UN Conventions and International Accords especially related to environment and sustainable development such as Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio in 1992 and the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg in 2002.

---

<sup>1</sup> The portfolio is also commonly referred to as the Energy and Environment portfolio, and both appellations are used in this report.



## 1.2 The evaluation

This is an outcome evaluation of the Energy & Environment Cluster of the UNDP Country Office in Papua New Guinea over the current programme cycle between 2008 and 2012 (revised to 2011 to align with the government planning cycle) and the Terms of Reference are in Annex 1.

According to the Evaluation Policy of UNDP (January 2011)<sup>2</sup>, Outcome Evaluations *address the short-term, medium-term and long-term results of a programme or cluster of related UNDP projects. They include an assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the programme against their own objectives, their combined contribution, and the contribution of external factors and actors. Outcome evaluations also examine unintended effects of the programme or projects. Rather than being ad hoc, the selection of the programme or project cluster to be evaluated should be guided by strategic decisions made by the programme unit, in line with the evaluation plan. This decision should be informed by agreements with national government and key stakeholders and partnership requirements, with attention to utility and linkage with strategic and programmatic evaluations.* And, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators<sup>3</sup> say - *Outcome evaluations move away from the old approach of assessing project results against project objectives towards **an assessment of how these results contribute, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions*** (our emphasis).

According to the Guidelines, the four standard activities of an outcome evaluation and their timing during the Country Programme cycle are the following:

- Assess **progress towards the outcome** (this will be most significantly explored during an outcome evaluation conducted later in the CP, although it could be examined early on depending upon the nature of the outcome);
- Assess the **factors affecting the outcome** (could be addressed early, midterm or later);
- Assess key **UNDP contributions** (outputs), including those produced through "soft" assistance, to outcomes (this information is yielded at least midway through and later in the CP);
- Assess the **partnership strategy** (useful information can be culled at any point during the CP).

An outcome evaluation does not look at the process of inputs, activities and other bureaucratic efforts but shifts attention to the **substantive development results** (outputs and outcomes) that they are aimed at affecting.

The Guidelines admit that *there is no official blueprint for how to conduct an outcome evaluation. Each must be tailored to the nature of the individual outcome under review as well as the realities of time and data limitations.* They also state that *Outcome evaluations do not replace project evaluations.* However, there is no doubt that the focus of an Outcome Evaluation is the Country Programme Outcome that the project or projects are striving to contribute to.

## 1.3 Methodology of the evaluation

### 1.3.1 The approach adopted

This evaluation was conducted in parallel with the broader Assessment of Development Results (ADR) of the UNDP contribution in Papua New Guinea. The evaluation team commenced its work from homebase in mid-March 2011 and convened in Port Moresby on 23 March. The evaluation team spent most of its time in Port Moresby with the exception of brief field visits to project sites in Madang and Goroka.

---

<sup>2</sup> UNDP (2011) *The Evaluation Policy of UNDP*. Presented to the Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, First Regular Session, January/February 2011.

<sup>3</sup> UNDP Evaluation Office (2002) *Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*. UNDP, New York

Following a period of just under three weeks, the evaluation team presented its preliminary findings to UNDP and the ADR mission ended on 14 April 2011.

Following the mission, the team embarked on a dialogue with the Country Office in an effort towards making this a truly joint evaluation. This process continued until August 2011 when a draft was produced and comments were received from the Country Office. The team considered all comments in finalizing this report.

Overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodologies is provided by the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results and the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators. The evaluation team based its approach on these guiding documents together with the ToRs, and in consultation with UNDP PNG.

According to the Guidelines, *Outcome evaluations rely on data generated through outcome monitoring as well as information from other external sources for validation and credibility purposes.* The team obtained additional information through the following activities:

- Desk review of relevant documents and websites
- Discussions with UNDP PNG senior management, personnel from other programmes and projects
- Consultation meetings with Government and other stakeholders, donors and other partners
- Field visit to Madang and Goroka and discussions with stakeholders

### **1.3.2 Documents reviewed and consulted**

The evaluation team was provided with an initial list of documents in the Terms of Reference. Further advice on relevant documents was provided by UNDP. The evaluation team sought additional documentation to provide us with the background to the projects, insights into project implementation and management, a record of project outputs, etc. The full list of documents reviewed and/or consulted is in Annex 2 which also contains a short list of websites reviewed.

### **1.3.3 Consultations**

Consultations by the evaluation team took place almost exclusively in Port Moresby. However, brief visits were also undertaken to Madang and Goroka and meetings were held there as well.

The team consulted 70 individuals in all. These came from a wide spectrum within UNDP, Central Government organizations, NGOs, donor partners, and community organizations. Most meetings followed the same pattern, namely, a brief introduction on the purpose of the mission followed by a discussion of the consultee's views on the Environment Outcome and its achievement.

A full list of persons met and consulted by the evaluation team is to be found in Annex 3.

### **1.3.4 Structure of the report**

This report is intended mainly for UNDP CO Papua New Guinea, including Senior Management and projects personnel. It is structured in three main parts. Following the Executive Summary, the first part of the report comprises an Introduction which also covers the methodology of the evaluation and the development context of the Outcome. The next part covers the Findings which is made up of four discrete but closely linked sub-sections, starting with the Status of the Outcome, then Factors Affecting the Outcome, UNDP Contributions to the Outcome, and UNDP Partnerships. The next part comprises Conclusions and Recommendations. A number of annexes provide additional, relevant information.

## 1.4 The Government's response

### 1.4.1 Country Development Strategy

Papua New Guinea's development progress since gaining independence in 1975 has been inconsistent. In the past decade, the government has made efforts to address critical development challenges. The national strategies and policies being implemented are aimed at social and economic progress at the national and sub-national levels. These include the five yearly Medium-Term Development Strategy 2005-2010 (MTDS), Vision 2050, and Papua New Guinea Development Strategic Plan 2010–2030 (DSP).

Vision 2050 maps out Papua New Guinea's development initiatives for the next 40 years with priorities underpinning economic growth and development, and the Papua New Guinea Development Strategic Plan translates Vision 2050 into directions for economic policies, public policies and sector interventions with clear objectives, targets and indicators. The 2005–2010 MTDS, which is the most relevant to this evaluation, identified the following priorities for focus by the government:

- Rehabilitation and maintenance of transport infrastructure
- Promotion of income earning opportunities
- Basic education
- Development oriented informal adult education
- Primary health care
- HIV and AIDS prevention
- Law and justice

### 1.4.2 Government's commitment to Environment

Papua New Guinea has more than 5% of the world's biodiversity in less than 1% of the world's total land area.<sup>4</sup> Its ecosystems range from lowland to montane forests, from coastal vegetation to alpine flora, and some of the most extensive pristine mangrove areas in the world. This wealth of natural resources is both an asset and a huge responsibility for Papua New Guinea. It is an asset because it is estimated that for the 85% of the population that lives in rural areas, native biological resources provide social livelihoods and physical and psychological sustenance. It is a responsibility because as a member of the global community and a signatory to many environmental international agreements,<sup>5</sup> Papua New Guinea has accepted obligations to protect and sustainably manage its unique natural resources on behalf of the global community. While Papua New Guinea has signed and ratified a number of multilateral environmental agreements, many lag in implementation. For example, the Papua New Guinea National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan,<sup>6</sup> a commitment under the Biodiversity Convention, was launched in 2007 with six goals expected to be reached within five years. This has not eventuated and stakeholders, including the Department of Environment and Conservation, are unclear as to the status and progress achieved.

Environmental protection has not been a priority for the Government of Papua New Guinea. Government plans and strategies since independence in 1975 have paid little attention to the

---

<sup>4</sup> See for example: AusAID, 2005, Australian Government Overseas Aid Available at [http://www.ausaid.gov.au/country/png/png\\_intro.cfm](http://www.ausaid.gov.au/country/png/png_intro.cfm)

<sup>5</sup> Papua New Guinea has signed and ratified 47 multilateral environmental agreements including the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification.

<sup>6</sup> The absence of a plan was noticeable during a CBD/ Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme workshop on Climate Change and its Impacts on Biodiversity in Nadi, Fiji, February 2010, attended by one of the ADR Team

environment, and the focus has been on economic rather than sustainable development as indicated in the MTDS 2005-2010. Since the 1992 Earth Summit, Papua New Guinea has had a National Sustainable Development Strategy but has not been acted upon it. Only recently has the National Strategic Plan Vision 2010–2050<sup>7</sup> included environment sustainability and climate change as a pillar for development consideration.

In the energy sector, Papua New Guinea has abundant oil and gas resources. Its long-term Vision 2050 revolves around a 40-year period during which the first proceeds of liquefied natural gas development come on stream. However, as with the ecological resources, converting energy resources into benefits for the 85% of the population in rural areas has yet to happen. Though some trials in rural electrification by the state-owned Papua New Guinea Power have been carried out, the Department of Petroleum and Energy and Papua New Guinea Power have only recently received World Bank assistance to develop a renewable energy policy and rural electrification policy.<sup>8</sup> These initiatives will build on an earlier draft national energy policy statement with an accompanying guideline of 2001.<sup>9</sup>

The establishment of the Office of Climate Change and Development (which replaced the Office of Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability) represents a new focus for the government. Though there is no broad climate change policy yet, the Papua New Guinea Forest Authority launched its policy on Forestry and Climate Change Framework for Action in 2010 as it prepared to participate in UN-REDD initiatives in Papua New Guinea.<sup>10</sup> In addition, funds from the Japanese government will help update the forest cover geographic and land information systems to allow correct estimates of forest density for REDD work.

Similarly to other areas of the government sector in Papua New Guinea, weak capacity is a major issue in environment. There are few champions to engage with and there is little depth behind them. The lack of technical expertise affects monitoring and evaluation capacity and data gathering. As a result, the basis for environmental planning and management is weak and as mentioned elsewhere, little if any progress has been made towards MDG-7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability.<sup>11</sup>

The Department of Environment and Conservation has gone through a number of restructuring exercises since 2000. Strategic directions have been identified by the Department, but they have not been followed; and experienced officers leaving the department has led to a loss of institutional memory. Despite UNDP-provided resources, capacity-building in the department remains a crucial need. Currently, the Department is seeking to become Conservation and Environment Protection Authority, which will lead to more restructuring and additional positions.

Another major environmental issue in Papua New Guinea is land tenure – communities own 97% of the land.<sup>12</sup> This is a double-edged sword – it makes it difficult to take a national, comprehensive perspective for protected areas, but in areas where there is a genuine commitment at the community level it produces the most effective protection. Many communities have a strong appreciation of the value of the environment. Havini is quoted as saying that “the origins of indigenous dissent and the escalation of the Bougainville conflict into a bloody civil war is environmental destruction.”<sup>13</sup> Customary ownership of land is often the cause of protracted

---

<sup>7</sup> Government of Papua New Guinea (2009) *Papua New Guinea Vision 2050*. National Strategic Plan Task Force. Port Moresby

<sup>8</sup> World Bank (2011) Draft Environmental and Social Management Framework for Papua New Guinea Energy Sector Development Project. Available on <http://www.pngpower.com.pg/news/news-pressrelease/ESMF-English.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> Johnston, P and J. Voss (2005) Regional Energy Assessment 2004: An Assessment of the Key Energy Issues, Barriers to the Development of Renewable Energy to Mitigate Climate Change and Capacity Development Needs for Removing the Barriers in Papua New Guinea. Papua New Guinea National Report, Volume 10. Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, GEF, UNDP.

<sup>10</sup> See [www.forestry.gov.pg](http://www.forestry.gov.pg) for further information.

<sup>11</sup> Millennium Development Goals : Second National Progress Summary Report 2009 for Papua New Guinea. *Op.cit.*

<sup>12</sup> Bourke, R.M. and Harwood, T.(eds) (2009) *Food and Agriculture in Papua New Guinea*. ANU E Press, The Australian National University, Canberra

<sup>13</sup> Havini, M (1990) Human rights violations and community disruption. In *The Bougainville Crisis*, ed. R.J. May and M. Spriggs, Bathurst: Crawford House Press. As quoted in Kenema, S (2010) An analysis of post-conflict explanations of

negotiation and litigation between developers and land owners. One contentious issue is a provision under the Mining and Oil and Gas Act, which gives the state ownership of any minerals or petroleum deposits that are more than two metres underground.

A major issue of concern is the rapid conversion of natural forest into plantation forests (e.g. cocoa or oil palm). This is in addition to significant environmental impacts from mining, agriculture and other consumptive land uses. The absence of a comprehensive national land use plan results in these uses taking place without reference to comparative soil values, potential economic benefits or environmental costs. Plans, such as the National Forest Plan, have been produced by the Papua New Guinea National Forests Authority but this is in isolation and in conflict with other plans for other uses, for the same land – the forestry concessions overlap areas with conservation values, while mining exploration tenements overlap onto high conservation value areas. Each government department is focussed on its goals and vision and there is no one with a comprehensive view of the how all sectors can work collectively to achieve mutual benefits for their departments and the people of Papua New Guinea.

The Environment Act 2000 (which replaced the Environment Planning Act 1978) together with the Environmental Contaminants Act 1978 and the Water Resources Act 1982, are the statutes under which considerations of the environmental impact of development proposals are taken into account. All activities that impact the environment, such as mining, petroleum, forestry, oil palm plantation and agriculture, are subject to the environmental impact assessment process. However, two mines (Ok Tedi and Bougainville Copper), which operated prior to 1978, are governed by separate legislation. In 2010, Parliament amended some sections of the Environment Act 2000 in order to give developers the possibility of avoiding environmental litigation – this deprives landowners of their right to claim for environmental damage on their land or property.

## **1.5 Confirming the Environment Outcome**

An Outcome Evaluation would normally refer to an obvious Outcome adopted under the UNDP Country Programme Document and operationalized by the CPAP. However, the situation in PNG over the past Country Programme period has been somewhat more complex through the adoption of the Delivering as One (DaO) approach by the UNCT. Under the DaO, a UN Country Programme was developed (in place of the UNDAF). However, UNDP developed its own Country Programme which, while being fully in harmony with the UN Country Programme showed some discrete differences in terms of outcomes and other targets. The UNDP CPD was formally approved by the UNDP Executive Board and became the guiding blueprint for UNDP operations. The CPD forms the basis of accountability by UNDP to the Executive Board and it is therefore one of the three sets of outcomes/targets that this evaluation must address.

Operationally, UNDP usually relies on the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) to implement the Country Programme. However, for the purpose of this Country Programme, UNDP did not prepare a CPAP and simply adopted the joint DaO UN-CP Action Plan with its outcomes and targets. The evaluators feel that at least in the case of Environment, this was indeed the most effective action. This is because under DaO, UNDP is the sole agency supporting the Government in its environment work – UNDP provides the entire membership of the Task Team on Environment. UNDP alone, is therefore responsible for delivery of the Environment Outcome/s under the UN-CP Action Plan.

The UN-CP Action Plan, together with its outcomes and targets, was the subject of a review which was carried out after one year of implementation, “... *to better articulate the development results, be more realistic and ensure the results are measurable ... aims to better adhere to results-based management principles, adding strong indicators of which the status can be updated regularly.*”<sup>14</sup>

---

indigenous dissent relation to the Bougainville copper mining conflict, Papua New Guinea. *eJournal of the Australian Association for the Advancement of Pacific Studies*. Issues 1.2 and 2.1, April 2010.

<sup>14</sup> United Nations Country Team, Papua New Guinea (2008) UNCP Action Plan, Revised Results Matrix, December 2008.

This created the set of outcomes and targets which, according to the CO, guided their implementation process for the Country Programme and which forms the second set of outcomes/targets to be considered by this evaluation. This set of outcomes and targets is reflected, more or less but not entirely, in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation which provide the third and latest set of outcomes and targets that need to be considered by this evaluation. The three sets of outcomes are juxtaposed in the table below.

**Table 1. Comparison of the Outcomes/Outputs from different documents**

ENVIRONMENT OUTCOMES/TARGETS/RESULTS		
FROM UNDP CPD (2007)	FROM UN-CP ACTION PLAN adopted as UNDP CPAP (revised in Dec 2008)	FROM ToRs (2011)
<p><b>Two Outcomes:</b> Department for Environment and Conservation effectively plans, manages, monitors, and coordinates with other relevant government institutions the sustainable use of natural resources at the national, provincial and local levels</p> <p>Communities in selected provinces use their natural resources sustainably to enhance their livelihoods</p>	<p><b>Intermediate Outcome 10:</b> Communities apply national policies and regulatory frameworks to implement environmentally sustainable livelihood opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry</p>	<p><b>Intended Outcome:</b> By 2012, DEC effectively plans, manages, monitors and coordinates with other relevant government institutions the sustainable use of natural resources and selected communities use their natural resources sustainably to enhance their livelihoods</p>
<p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National authorities trained on mainstreaming and monitoring of environmental issues.</li> <li>Integrated environmental monitoring and compliance database is established in Papua New Guinea.</li> <li>Effective network established between Department for Environment and Conservation and other relevant government institutions with provincial and local authorities and NGOs, community-based organizations (CBOs) and FBOs.</li> <li>Provide selected communities with training on more sustainable use of their resources, community-based tourism, renewable energy, accessing funding, and managing small-scale initiatives– all with a special focus on women and women's groups</li> </ul>	<p><b>Output 10.1:</b> Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has the capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and regulatory framework to promote environmental sustainability</p>	<p><b>Output 10.1</b> Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has the capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and regulatory framework to promote environmental sustainability</p>
	<p><b>Output 10.2:</b> Office of Climate Change (OCC) has the capacity to develop climate change policy and coordinate activities to address initiatives on climate change</p>	<p><b>Output 10.2:</b> Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) has the capacity to develop climate change policy and coordinate activities to address initiatives on climate change</p>
	<p><b>Output 10.3:</b> Rural communities have the awareness and mechanisms to apply innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry</p>	<p><b>Output 10.3:</b> Rural communities have the awareness and mechanisms to apply innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry</p>

According to UNDP,<sup>15</sup> an Outcome represents “changes in development conditions which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact.”

As the table above illustrates, the Strategic Results Framework in the UNDP Country Programme 2008-2012<sup>16</sup>, set two Outcomes which focus on two, clear capacity targets, one in DEC and the

<sup>15</sup> United Nations in Papua New Guinea (2007) *UNCP Action Plan Papua New Guinea*. Between the Government of Papua New Guinea and the United Nations System in Papua New Guinea

<sup>16</sup> United Nations Development Programme (2007) *Draft Country Programme Document – Papua New Guinea (2008-2012)*. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, Annual Session 2007, New York

other in the community. If achieved, these two Outcomes represent important, positive changes in development condition in terms of Environment in Papua New Guinea.

The UN-CP Action Plan (also the UNDP CPAP) departs from the two distinct Outcomes approach and presents a single Outcome (entitled Intermediate Outcome) focussed only on community. As such, it covers only one of the dual targets which were set up in the UNDP CPD. However, if achieved, this Intermediate Outcome will also represent important, positive changes in development condition.

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation present one 'Intended' Outcome which incorporates, almost verbatim, the two original targets of the UNDP CPD. Like the other Outcomes, the Intended Outcome from the ToRs will also result in important, positive changes in development condition if achieved.

Each of the three SRFs above, sets a cluster of Outputs which are defined by UNDP (*op. cit.*) as *"The products and services which result from the completion of activities within a development intervention."*

All the Outputs under the UNDP CPD do contribute to the achievement of the Outcomes. However, only one of the three Outputs under the revised UN-CP Action Plan contributes to the Outcome; and, two of the three Outputs in the Terms of Reference (identical to those under the UN-CP Action Plan) contribute to the Outcome.

Faced by the three different versions of Environment Outcome and Outputs, the version given in the Terms of Reference is adopted for the purpose of this evaluation. This is firstly because it is the most recent; and secondly, because it is close to the original Outcome targets set by the CPD.

The Environment Outcome is therefore confirmed as:

***By 2012, DEC effectively plans, manages, monitors and coordinates with other relevant government institutions the sustainable use of natural resources and selected communities use their natural resources sustainably to enhance their livelihoods***

and the three Outputs are:

***1 Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has the capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and regulatory framework to promote environmental sustainability***

***2 Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) has the capacity to develop climate change policy and coordinate activities to address initiatives on climate change***

***3 Rural communities have the awareness and mechanisms to apply innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry***



## 2 FINDINGS

The original timescale was the five years to 2012. This was revised to 2011 to align with the government planning cycle. This means that at the time of writing, the CO had a maximum of four months remaining to achieve the Outcome and wrap up the current programme.

### 2.1 The status of the Outcome

#### 2.1.1 Monitoring carried out

According to the Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators,<sup>17</sup> outcome evaluations “rely on data generated through outcome monitoring” and an “outcome evaluation depends on good monitoring”.

The Guidelines also state that “Evidence pertaining to the status of an outcome and the other categories of analysis should ideally be available from the continuous monitoring efforts of country offices .....The role of evaluators is not to do massive primary data collection. It is the country office’s responsibility to collect and, if possible, undertake a light primary analysis of data related to the outcome to be evaluated and to provide the evaluation team with the data and the analysis” (our emphasis).

Following repeated requests, the CO provided the evaluators with copies of various reports covering the period from 2008 to 2011 as an illustration of the monitoring that has been carried out. The reports ranged from Quarterly Project and Programme Reports (QPRs) to Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) for GEF projects, to Annual Performance Review (APRs) for the Outcome. Some reports remained outstanding; for example, the EMSL (Environmental Management and Sustainable Livelihoods) QPRs and APRs for 2008 and 2009; and all monitoring documents for the Community-Based Ecotourism Project and the DEC Capacity Building Project.

The documents sent by the CO were presented without any analysis of the contained data. However, also following a request from the Team, the CO carried out a self-assessment of progress towards the Outcome and Outputs. This self-assessment, however, was not analytical and comprised merely a forecast of whether the output/outcome was likely to be achieved.

From the documents available, it would seem that at project level, and for projects that benefited from GEF funding support, some monitoring was carried out using the annual PIR which is normally a very effective monitoring tool. PIRs have been made available by the CO for three GEF projects selected for this Evaluation by the CO namely, Second Communication to UNFCCC, NCSA, and Capacity for SLM, for the period 2009-2010. The PIR templates used appear either incomplete or old versions, and in each case there is little analysis and even less problem solving. Each of the three projects is running excessively behind time – National Communication by two years, NCSA almost four years (since completed), and SLM by two years. The common problem is obviously systemic and it seems to lie on the government side in spite of repeated efforts by the CO.

Another common feature of the three PIRs that are available, is that the CP Outcome or Outputs are not mentioned in any of them.

As noted elsewhere, the CO proposed five projects as representative of the portfolio for the purpose of this Outcome Evaluation. Two projects are TRAC funded and monitoring reports were not available<sup>18</sup>. This situation, whereby GEF-funded projects are better monitored and reported upon, is common to many UNDP offices and it is not restricted to PNG.

---

<sup>17</sup> UNDP Evaluation Office (2002) *Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*. UNDP, New York

<sup>18</sup> The CO advised that most monitoring reports sent to the DEC for concurrence take long periods of time before they are returned.



The CO also provided copies of Quarterly Progress and Management Reports focussed on the Intermediate Outcome. The Team is confused by the apparent use of the original version of the Outcome, before it was reviewed in 2009. Both types of reports are cryptic and somewhat mechanical in nature. There is no analysis, no reference to baselines, targets or indicators. Challenges are identified and some mitigation is proposed but there is no follow-up and no indication in subsequent reports of whether the remedial action was indeed carried out and whether it had been successful. There is no connection with the past or the future, no identification of trends.

The last type of report provided by the CO is the APR for Outcome 10, for 2010. This report is fuller and describes progress over the past year. It lists achievements but these are almost out of context since there is no reference to baselines, targets or indicators. Under the heading of Risks and Assumptions, the report discusses challenges, thus totally misunderstanding the benefits of risk identification and mitigation. Just like the other documents, the APR is not analytical.

The documents received from the CO, at project and Outcome level, represent a great deal of work. They also show that the CO is well in touch with the level of progress being made at project level. Unfortunately, reporting for non-GEF projects is not as robust or effective as it should be and the CO appears constrained by templates in its monitoring work<sup>19</sup>, reducing the monitoring activity to a mere mechanical exercise. All monitoring activity and reporting need to be taken a step further and analysed against baselines, targets and indicators that have been set for the Outputs and the Outcome.

## 2.1.2 Progress achieved

Projects (which are the equivalent of activities in a programme) are the means through which the Country Programme achieves the targeted Outcome and these are examined first below to determine their relevance to the Environment Outcome and Outputs. Next level in the framework of the Country Programme is the Outputs level and these too are examined for progress/achievement below using the set indicators as a guide and noting the CO self-assessment. Finally, also using the CO self-assessment as a departure point, an overall assessment is made of the status of the Outcome and its three Outputs.

### 2.1.2.1 The selected projects

In aiming for the Outcome, the UNDP CO had a portfolio of twelve projects (including the SGP<sup>20</sup> and three regional climate projects) and the CO has selected the following five as representative of the portfolio, for this evaluation:

1. Community-based Eco Tourism
2. DEC Capacity Strengthening
3. Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management
4. Second National Communication
5. National Capacity Self-Assessment Project

In keeping with the guidance provided for Outcome Evaluators, the Team has not evaluated projects, however, it has been cognizant of their relevance to the Outcome (all projects must in principle target the Outcome), their progress and the extent of their achievement. The following table examines the projects' relevance to the Outcome and Outputs.

---

<sup>19</sup> For example, the CO advised that under DaO there are *"limitations which does not allow UNDP to provide adequate analysis of the situation"*.

<sup>20</sup> Although not selected for the evaluation, the SGP is considered important for its work at community level

**Table 2. Contribution made by the selected projects to the Outcome and Outputs**

OUTCOME AND OUTPUTS	PROJECTS SELECTED BY THE CO AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PORTFOLIO				
	National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management (NCSA)	Department of Environment and Conservation Capacity Strengthening	Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management (SLM)	Enabling activity for the preparation of PNG's Second National Communication to UNFCCC	Community Based Eco-Tourism Project
<b>INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME:</b> By 2012, DEC effectively plans, manages, monitors and coordinates with other relevant Government institutions the sustainable use of natural resources and selected communities use their natural resources sustainably to enhance their livelihoods	This project is relevant in general to the first component of the Outcome and to Output 1, namely, the capacity of DEC. However, the capacity targeted by the Project (implementation of the 3 Rio Conventions), is not the same as that targeted by the Outcome – sustainable use of natural resources. The Project has been completed after significant delays.	This project is very relevant, directly, to the first component of the Outcome as well as Output 1, namely, the capacity of DEC. Unfortunately, it is not based on a needs assessment and its effectiveness is not assured. It has had extensions and follow-ups and the latest iteration is still on-going.	This project targets SLM capacity in DEC and as such it is relevant to the first component of the Outcome as well as Output 1. However, it raises the question why the IP is not the Dept of Agriculture and Forests. The project has been rated Highly Unsatisfactory in PIR2010 following a stalemate with DEC which prevented progress. The Project has been extended and it is still on-going.	The Outcome makes no reference to Climate and this project (which was designed before the UNCP) is not directly relevant to the Outcome.	This project is very relevant, directly, to the second component of the Outcome, namely, enhanced livelihoods for communities
<b>OUTPUT 1:</b> Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has the capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and regulatory framework to promote environmental sustainability				The Project is not relevant to this Output	The Project is not relevant to this Output
<b>OUTPUT 2:</b> Office of Climate Change (OCCD) has the capacity to develop climate change policy and coordinate activities to address initiatives on climate change	The Project is not relevant to this Output.	The Project is not relevant to this Output.	The Project is not relevant to this Output.	The Project is relevant in general to this Output even though it does not address policy and/or coordination. Neither the Project nor the Output are relevant to the Outcome.	The Project is not relevant to this Output.
<b>OUTPUT 3:</b> Rural communities have the awareness and mechanisms to apply innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry	The project is not relevant directly to this Output.	The Project is not relevant to this Output.	The Project is not relevant to this Output.	The Project is not relevant to this Output.	This Project is directly relevant to this Output with its focus on one of the identified potential livelihood interventions. The Project was a small 'design' project to produce a project document. It has completed its preliminary phase but a potential donor has withdrawn. No final evaluation or reports are available.

Of the five projects selected as representative of the portfolio, three dealt with DEC capacity, one dealt with Climate Change, and one with Communities. As such, all three Outputs were covered and so was the Outcome. Since the Outcome did not cover Climate, the project dealing with Climate was not relevant to the Outcome, however, the other four were.

If the whole portfolio of 12 projects is taken into account, a similar pattern emerges – all projects are relevant to their respective Output and all but the Climate projects are collectively relevant to the Outcome. This means that, in theory, if all attempted projects are successfully completed, the Outcome should have been achieved.

## 2.1.2.2 Indicators for the Outputs

According to UNDP<sup>21</sup> “Indicators are signposts of change along the path to development. Indicators are what we observe in order to verify whether – or to what extent – it is true that progress is being made towards our goals”. Good indicators must comply with the SMART<sup>22</sup> criteria. It is also important to note that projects do not set about trying to achieve indicators – projects aim to achieve objectives, outcomes and outputs as evidenced by indicators.

The Country Office was invited to assess progress towards the three Outputs as evidenced by the indicators and the response is in the table below. The table also includes the Team’s comments on the indicators themselves, particularly their relevance and specificity to the outputs, and an assessment of the progress they were expected to help determine.

**Table 3. Progress towards the Outputs as measured by various indicator sets**

OUTPUTS INDICATORS	PROGRESS AS ASSESSED BY THE COUNTRY OFFICE	EVALUATORS’ ASSESSMENT
<b>Output 10.1: Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has the capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and regulatory framework to promote environmental sustainability</b>		The indicators should show evidence of DEC capacity for the tasks outlined
Protected Areas policy and legislation are made available	Will not be achieved due to lack of clarity from DEC as they are now focused on creating a new institution called Conservation and Environment Protection Agency	Indicator not Specific and Relevant to the Output. In fact, this is not an indicator but an output. The connection between PAs policy and legislation and DEC focus being diverted is not clear. Changes should have been instigated through adaptive management.
Concept and definition of environmental sustainability made available	Target will be achieved because trainings were organised for DEC and other relevant government agencies including private and civil society organisations. In addition, DEC has planned to undertake 2011 regional consultation in 2011	Indicator is Relevant to the Output but very vague and non-specific. Since the indicator only seeks concept, etc, being made available, it may well have been obtained but it is not helpful in determining if the Output has been achieved.
# of natural resource-related government sectors have incorporated principles of environmental sustainability into their planning and strategies	Representatives from Relevant government agencies and civil society organisations have participated in trainings and consultations organized by DEC since 2008	Indicator not Specific and Relevant to the Output. The indicator sought the incorporation of principles into planning and strategies by government sectors; the CO reported on training. This is a mis-match and we can

<sup>21</sup> UNDP (undated) *RBM in UNDP: Selecting Indicators*. Indicators Paper in the series Signposts of Development.

<sup>22</sup> **SMART INDICATORS :**

**Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective, and only that objective.

**Measurable:** The monitoring system and its indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what the system covers and there are practical ways to measure the indicators and results.

**Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.

**Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.

**Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group to be impacted by the project or program

		only assume that the targets will not be attained.
Regulatory guidelines and policies on natural resources management and environmental sustainability made available to public	These are available to public however poor transportation and communication facilities especially provincial, district and community levels have hindered accessibility	Indicator Relevant to the DEC capacity and therefore the Output. Guidelines and policies were sought by the Indicator, but the CO response indicates barriers that should have been addressed first.
3/4 of new policies/strategies of natural resource related departments reflect on and integrate environmental sustainability principles	The concept of promoting environmental sustainability has been captured in Vision2050 and Medium Term Development Plan. At the sectoral level, DEC programmes target principles of environmental sustainability and likewise the PNG National Forest Authority's Forest and Climate Change Policy Framework	Indicator not entirely Relevant to Output since it does not measure DEC capacity; but it may show DEC influence. We concur with the CO that some significant progress has taken place.
Update MDG 7 indicators annually	Not likely to be achieved because compilation of data has been difficult because there is no integrated database system	Indicator not Relevant to Output. The CO response indicates that in the situation analysis, there was no recognition of this major root cause and barrier = poor project/programme design
# of natural resource-related private, government and civil society sectors represented in government's environmentally sustainable economic growth agenda	Likely to be achieved because the key institutions are part of the National MDG7 Initiative implemented by DEC	Indicator not Relevant to Output. It simply measures sector representation rather than DEC capacity. Target was 14 (5 in 2012), CO response does not give figure; it also ties the response to MDG7 initiative which is of doubtful effectiveness.
<b>Output 10.2: Office of Climate Change (OCCD) has the capacity to develop climate change policy and coordinate activities to address initiatives on climate change</b>		Indicators should provide evidence of OCCD capacity for the tasks outlined
Climate Change policy is made available	Climate Change Policy is expected to be completed by December 2011 therefore will be achieved	Indicator Relevant to Output. CO assessment accepted as an indication of achievement.
National Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) Policy Framework is made available	Likely to be achieved because OCCD has received additional financial resources to develop a REDD framework including a policy	Indicator partly Relevant to Output. The availability of funds is no guarantee that the Framework will be developed. We cannot agree that it is likely within the next 4 months.
3/4 of new development policies/strategies reflect/address climate change impacts	Likely to be achieved because there is ongoing collaboration with PNG National Forestry, DEC to integrate climate change considerations into the policies	Indicator partly Relevant to the Output. The Indicator sought reflection and addressing, the CO reported collaboration – the result is not assured yet.
# of awareness raising workshops conducted to the general public on REDD	Target will be achieved as there have been a number of consultation activities carried out since 2009	Indicator is not Relevant or Specific to Output as it provides no evidence of OCCD capacity. The target was 14 (5 in 2012), the CO is not explicit. It is still not certain that the target will be reached.
# of consultations conducted involving community based organization, landowners and governments to discuss on REDD implementation	Target will be achieved as there have been a number of consultation activities carried out since 2009	Indicator is not Relevant or Specific to Output as it provides no evidence of OCCD capacity. The target was 8 (2 in 2012), the CO is not explicit. It is unlikely that the target will be reached.
<b>Output 10.3: Rural communities have the awareness and mechanisms to apply innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry</b>		Indicators should provide evidence and examples of awareness and mechanisms among communities to perform the tasks listed
# of communities participate on innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities	More than 10 CBOs have received grants hence this target will be achieved	Indicator is Relevant and Specific to the Output. The target was for 8 communities participating and the CO reports that more than 10 have received grants. If this is seen as participating, the target has been met.
# of community based ecotourism	Out of the 10 CBOs that have received	Indicator is Relevant and Specific to the

strategy piloted in selected communities	grants have targets to link their biodiversity conservation initiatives to income generation opportunities such as eco-tourism therefore his target will be achieved	Output. The target in the revised UNCP-AP was 3 pilots, and the CO reported that an unknown number have merely “targets to link”.
# of applications received by SGP that promote environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities	Out of the 10 CBOs that have received grants have targets to link their biodiversity conservation/protected areas/natural resource management initiatives to environmentally friendly income generation opportunities hence his target will be achieved	Indicator not directly relevant to the Output, although it is related. The target was for 20 (of which 8 were in 2012); the CO assessment refers to 10. We do not agree that the targets have been achieved.
# of applications received by SGP awarded SGP funds in environmentally sustainable income earning projects	Same as above	Indicator not directly relevant to the Output, although it is related. However, this Indicator repeats the same measurements as above and it is redundant.
GEF SGP Country Programme made available	Target to be achieved because the draft is through final revision stages	Indicator not Relevant to the Output. The Output sought awareness and mechanisms; the project produced the SGP Country Programme.

Of the 17 indicators set up by the Country Programme for the Outputs, nine are not relevant to the respective Output. Taking the indicators as a measure of progress and achievement, none of the three Outputs is expected to be achieved outright<sup>23</sup>.

### **2.1.2.3 Assessment of the status of the Outcome**

The CO was invited to carry out a self-assessment of progress achieved towards the Outcome and Outputs. This was used as the departure point for the Team’s overall assessment of progress and is shown on Table 4 on the next page.

<sup>23</sup> The CO maintains that there has been progress towards all the outputs because the focus of the Environment Component of the CP was to improve environmental management and improve peoples’ livelihoods. Therefore, the outputs were divided between the duty bears (DEC and OCCD) and communities. The enabling environments such as institutions, policy and legislation, coordination, awareness and consultations mechanisms are critical to achieve the output therefore the indicators were designed accordingly. The evaluators do not agree.

Table 4. Outcome and Outputs and progress achieved

OUTCOME/OUTPUTS	PROGRESS ACCORDING TO THE COUNTRY OFFICE	ASSESSMENTS BY THE EVALUATION TEAM
<p><b>Intended Outcome:</b> By 2012, DEC effectively plans, manages, monitors and coordinates with other relevant government institutions the sustainable use of natural resources and selected communities use their natural resources sustainably to enhance their livelihoods</p> <p>If the Outcome is achieved, two changes in development condition are expected –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEC will be effectively coordinating the sustainable use of natural resources</li> <li>Communities will have enhanced livelihoods</li> </ul>	<p>Likely to be achieved for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since UNDP's involved in 2006, we have observed institutional review and reform that was completed by 2009. The outcome statement does not mean DEC is entirely responsible itself but with other relevant government institutions. For this reason, I have observed DEC's efforts on a more programmatic approach to implementing their mandates such as institutionalizing projects so they are not ad hoc standalone initiatives. In addition, in cases where other key stakeholders in public, private and civil society organisations need to be consulted, DEC has made every effort to ensure than happens such as environmental mainstreaming trainings, design of green economy scoping study TOR. Given the options you have, I will say just likely and I believe this rating will improved in the future.</li> <li>More than 10 community organisations have accessed the GEF Small Grants Programme to undertake sustainable resources management/biodiversity conservation and encouraged to simultaneously pursue opportunities that will contribute to improve their livelihoods such as income generation options.</li> </ul>	<p>As written, these are two discrete outcomes and unfortunately, success with one could be masked by failure with the other since achievement of the Outcome is tied to both components.</p> <p>The language of the first component (DEC capacity) is somewhat extravagant in that it aims for a list of achievements and they <u>all</u> would need to be obtained before it can be claimed that the Outcome has been achieved.</p> <p>Success with the second component (community livelihoods) is impossible to ascertain within the lifetime of a CP, since the <i>use of natural resources sustainably</i> is something that can only be measured over a period of time longer than the CP cycle.</p> <p>The CP design did not include baselines.</p> <p>The CO expects the first component to be achieved after softening the definitive wording of the Outcome. But the Team disagrees that the Outcome is likely to be achieved. The list of proofs provided by the CO (programmatic approach, consultation, training, etc) does not provide evidence that DEC is planning, managing, monitoring and coordinating effectively, the use of natural resources on a sustainable basis.</p> <p>As for the second component, which is also quite definitive, the Team finds the CO arguments as weak – there is no proof that communities are using natural resources sustainably, or that livelihoods have been enhanced.</p> <p><b>The Team finds that while modest progress has been made towards both components of the Outcome, neither is likely to be achieved fully by the end of the CP cycle. The gains made under the first component are likely to be sustainable; those under the second component may not be.</b></p>
<p><b>Output 10.1</b> Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has the capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and regulatory framework to promote environmental sustainability</p> <p>The change in development condition expected through this Output/Outcome is as from the first component of the Outcome.</p>	<p>Likely to be achieved because a draft Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth Policy has been completed.</p>	<p>As written, this is an Outcome, not an Output.</p> <p>No needs assessment was carried out and no baseline or departure point established.</p> <p>The Output sought DEC capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and a regulatory framework. In response, the CO quotes a draft policy as proof of this! At most, this is an indication of capacity to develop policy, but says nothing about capacity to implement or monitor. Neither does it even make a reference to the required regulatory framework.</p> <p><b>The Team finds that the development of a draft policy falls far short of what this Output aimed for – it will not be achieved fully.</b></p>
<p><b>Output 10.2</b> Office of Climate Change (OCCD) has the capacity to develop climate change policy and coordinate activities to address initiatives on climate change</p>	<p><b>No assessment provided by CO</b></p>	<p>The Output, as written is more of an Outcome.</p> <p>NCSA could have served for setting the baseline, but no explicit connection was made.</p> <p>It has an exclusive focus on OCCD and is not linked with the Outcome. Even if achieved fully, it will not contribute to DEC capacity or to communities' use of natural resources.</p> <p><b>The Team is unable to assess this Output.</b></p>

<p><b>Output 10.3</b> Rural communities have the awareness and mechanisms to apply innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry.</p> <p>The change in development condition expected through this Output/Outcome is as from the second component of the Outcome.</p>	<p>Target will be achieved because the GEF Small Grants Programme currently operational has provided the opportunity to interested communities to access grants for biodiversity conservation and promote sustainable resource management initiatives.</p>	<p>As written, this is an Outcome not an Output and the language is loose since one cannot <i>apply</i> an <i>opportunity</i>. However, it is closely allied with the Outcome.</p> <p>No baseline or departure point established.</p> <p>The Output sought awareness and mechanisms to apply income earning opportunities. In response, the CO reports that the SGP has provided opportunities to access grants and that therefore the target will be achieved.</p> <p><b>The Team finds that this Output will only be partly achieved .</b></p>
---	--	--



As can be seen from the comments above, the Outcome is composed of two distinct components, each of which could be a separate outcome. Furthermore, each of the three so-called Outputs is in fact written as an Outcome.

In terms of achievement, the above assessment confirms the assessments made above which found that none of the three Outputs is expected to be achieved outright, and neither is the Outcome.

## 2.2 Factors affecting the Outcome

A number of external factors created hurdles for UNDP in its pursuit of the Outcome. These are outlined briefly below.

### The political situation

PNG is politically volatile with unstable governments susceptible to frequent votes of no confidence. A report on the PNG political climate in 2003 (commissioned by UNDP) identified three main structural problems: (1) unstable political system with weak parties and intense political competition, (2) parliament dominated by the executive instead of the other way around, (3) widespread belief that PNG politics and government sustain a high level of corruption.<sup>24</sup> The uncertain political situation has led to a lack of stability which has hampered progress with programme initiatives particularly those that required consideration and action by the Government, such as new or revised legislation and new institutions.

### Government priorities

Environment is not a priority for Government and this is illustrated by the MTDS 2005-10 which pledged *“To maximize the value of our natural resources and environment, through sustainable primary production and downstream processing, with a focus on agriculture, forestry, fisheries and tourism supported by mining petroleum and gas.”* This lack of recognition of environmental values or sustainability, led the Indo-Pacific Conservation Alliance to comment that *“various activities such as logging, forest conversion for agriculture, introduced exotic species, and overexploitation of resources present a serious and increasing threat to the Indo-Pacific’s rich trove of biological and cultural diversity.”*<sup>25</sup> The lukewarm attitude of Government to environment has made it more difficult for UNDP to implement its Environment Programme.

### Government capacity

As in other areas of the Government sector in PNG, weak capacity is a major issue in Environment. There are few champions to engage with and there is little depth behind them. The lack of technical expertise affects monitoring and evaluation capacity and data gathering. As a result, the basis for environmental planning and management is weak and as mentioned elsewhere, little if any progress has been made towards MDG-7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability.<sup>26</sup>

The DEC has gone through a number of restructuring exercises since 2000. Strategic directions have been identified by the Department but they have not been followed; experienced officers leaving the department has led to a loss of institutional memory. Capacity building in the department remains a paramount need in spite of resources that UNDP has made available over time. Currently, the Department is seeking to become a Conservation and Environment Protection Authority and this will lead to more restructuring and additional positions. This has made it difficult for UNDP to pursue a strategic approach.

---

<sup>24</sup> Narokobi, B., and Clements, Q., 2003. *‘Strengthening a parliamentary democracy for the 21st century’*, Legislative Needs and Assessment Report: National Parliament of Papua New Guinea.

<sup>25</sup> Indo-Pacific Conservation Alliance <http://www.indopacific.org/biodiversity.asp#NGB>

<sup>26</sup> Millennium Development Goals : Second National Progress Summary Report 2009 for Papua New Guinea. *Op.cit.*



### **The challenging environment**

PNG is a country of 6.6 million ethnically diverse people speaking some 850 languages. Its geographical features affect transport infrastructure and communication, isolating communities. Its security situation adds to the barriers faced by those wishing to work with communities. PNG relies heavily on development aid (about a third of its income) but all donors without exception find PNG a most difficult country to work in – there are few champions and little depth. The political fluidity and uncertainty and the constant changes in the public sector make it difficult to cultivate partners in Government. The Environment Component may have fared marginally better than some other thematic areas but the impact on Outcome targeting capacity building is inescapable.

## **2.3 UNDP contribution to the Outcome**

The value of the PNG environment and the country's international obligations have been recognized by UNDP which has responded to two of the key issues, namely, the weak capacity and governance structure and the need to involve communities as land-owners. The UNDP contribution has therefore been very relevant to the needs of PNG's Environment. However, it has not been enough.

UNDP has not been very effective through its portfolio of Environment projects. No Output has been achieved outright and only slight progress has been made towards the overarching Outcome. The UNDP environment programme appears to be somewhat *ad hoc* and not according to a well-founded strategic approach. The CO explained that the Government commitment over the years has not been adequate to ensure a sustained approach in responding to environmental problems and the Team agrees that these circumstances tend to suppress a strategic approach.

Some gaps and missed opportunities, such as for land-use planning, are foundational and could have underpinned a Protected Areas Programme to identify and secure areas of high ecological and biodiversity value. It could have also provided a basis for decision-making in the face of LNG developments, mining, and other consumptive land use developments. It could have also served as the basis for a thorough and effective EIA process. In Bougainville, for example, UNDP has been instrumental in reviving the economy mainly through the cocoa industry, however, in the absence of a comprehensive land use plan, soil map and flora and fauna surveys, native forests are being cleared for both cocoa and oil palm without reference to comparative values and potential benefits.

The CO advised that interventions on the environmental implications of LNG development, cocoa production, mining, oil palm plantations, waste management, land use planning, the EIA process and State of Environment monitoring, had all been considered, but it was decided that UNDP would not engage in these areas *"because other development partners were assisting the Government through other initiatives"*. The Team does not see this as a valid reason for UNDP holding back on these important areas of support particularly since UNDP chairs and provides the entire membership of the DaO Task Team for Environment, signalling no or little interest in this thematic area by other development partners. The Team sees these as missed opportunities.

The UNDP contribution to Environment has not been very efficient. A common feature of Environment interventions has been the inordinate delays and slipping deadlines that seem to afflict many projects. This is seen as the result of government capacity being so weak that it is unable to absorb the full measure of support that UNDP is providing. But UNDP's support is not as strong as it could or should be because its capacity is also low. For example, according to the Quarterly Progress Report (QPR) for the Third Quarter 2010, the delivery rate of the Environment Task Team (chaired by UNDP and made up exclusively of UNDP members) was about 35% which is well below the average of 59% achieved by all Task Teams. According to the same QPR, the Environment Task Team had the highest rate of delayed deliverables at 40%, and the lowest rate of deliverables on track, 53%. It was not possible for the Team to ascertain why this is – weak capacity on both the UNDP side and the Government side is definitely a contributing factor, but to this can be added the difficulty of working on environment projects in PNG where there are security concerns and

problems relating to land ownership and corruption. In addition, UNDP does not always engage well with local experts and may not benefit from the local information they possess.

## 2.4 UNDP partnerships

The OECD<sup>27</sup> considers Partners as “*The individuals and/or organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives*” and adds that “*the concept of partnership connotes shared goals, common responsibility for outcomes, distinct accountabilities and reciprocal obligations*”.

The CPD listed a number of potential implementation partners, namely, Department for Environment and Conservation, National Forest Authority, Environmental Law Centre, Papua New Guinea Eco-Forestry Forum, Centre for Environmental Law and Community Rights, Department of Agriculture and Livestock, Sustainable Development Programme Ltd., UNICEF, international NGOs, NGOs, FBOs. And the CO reported a number of implementing partners among Government agencies viz. DEC, DAL, Department of Petroleum and Energy, National Forestry Authority, OCCD, Tourism Promotion Authority, Department of National Planning and Monitoring. It also noted that it has implementing partners in civil society, viz. Eco-Forestry Forum and its member organizations. The majority of the listed implementation partners were actually beneficiaries who, while satisfying the definition of partners in general, usually acted as recipients more than contributors to projects and programmes.

UNDP relies substantially on the GEF as a donor partner, and this is illustrated by the fact that three out of the five projects proposed by the CO as representative of the portfolio, are GEF-funded. However, apart from GEF, UNDP has few if any discernible funding partners among the donor community<sup>28</sup>, or the private sector or even the UN system in the Environment thematic area in PNG although there has been some input from UNEP on Strategic Environmental Assessment within DEC with linkages through SPREP.

In fact, UNDP is in an invidious position regarding funding partnerships for its Environment work in PNG. It is the only agency among the donor community represented in DaO, that is providing membership to the Environment Task Team. However, the CO expects the partnership to grow and the donor base to increase.

---

<sup>27</sup> DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (2002) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OECD, Paris.

<sup>28</sup> The CO reported that funding support was received from AusAID on climate change specific to REDD. In addition, potential linkages and synergies have been noted and integrated, for example, with the Sustainable Land Management initiative.

### 3 CONCLUSIONS AND RATINGS

#### Overall conclusion

The UNDP Country Programme for 2008-2012 has been curtailed by one year in order to align it with the Government's planning cycle. At the time of writing, the Environment Outcome has been partly achieved and in the remaining time before the end of the Country Programme, it is unlikely that the Outcome can be fully achieved. Overall performance and achievement are deemed to have been **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** – while the implementation of some components is in compliance with the formally-revised plan, some other components require remedial action. The rating also recognizes the challenges faced by UNDP and the external factors influencing delivery.

#### Relevance

The UNDP contribution in the area of environmental protection and management in PNG over the past four years has been relevant. In the absence of an identification of environmental priorities by Government, UNDP has addressed the major barrier of weak institutional capacity and focused on communities and their livelihoods. It has also supported the Government to honour its obligations entered into when it signed various international environmental conventions and agreements. However, the approach has not been strategic or cohesive. Some interventions did not fall within the scope of the Outcome and conversely, there were a number of missed opportunities. Overall, the Environment CP is deemed to have been **Satisfactory (S)** in terms of its relevance to the needs of PNG.

#### Effectiveness (degree of change)

For the Outcome to be achieved, two changes in development condition are expected –

- DEC will be effectively coordinating the sustainable use of natural resources
- Communities will have enhanced livelihoods

Indicators to help determine whether these development changes have indeed taken place, have either not been set or are not helpful. Using the subsidiary Outputs as a measure of success towards the Outcome and effectiveness of the CP, the findings are that modest progress has been made towards both components of the Outcome, through both projects and non-project interventions such as advocacy. However, the two components of the Outcome are not likely to be achieved fully by the end of the CP cycle. The Environment CP is deemed to have been **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** in terms of its effectiveness in achieving the Outcome.

#### Efficiency

The Environment Outcome and other targets have been subject to review and more than one version exists which, while all along the same lines, are not identical. The differences are more marked at the lower levels of the SRF. The review can be seen as a good example of adaptive management, but it needed to be better documented and formally adopted. In spite of the review, the CP Environment framework was not robust in terms of strategic thrust, programme cohesion, delivery, performance, organization, management and monitoring, and many improvements are possible.

Over 60% of the financial resources for the Environment Programme were from non-core sources, however, these relied almost exclusively on GEF and a broader resources base will result in better security and enable UNDP to better reflect the needs of PNG. In terms of efficiency, the Environment Programme is considered to have been **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**.

## Sustainability

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the programme domain, after UNDP assistance has come to an end. The modest achievements under the first component of the Outcome, namely, capacity enhancement of DEC, are likely to be sustainable because the benefits have been accepted and internalized by DEC and mainstreamed within their core activities . However, achievements under the second component , community livelihoods, are probably not sustainable since the benefits accruing from the SGP will be deprived of funding and other support when the minor projects end. Overall, the sustainability of achievements towards the Outcome is considered as **Moderately Likely (ML)** because there is no known sustainability plan or exit strategy and the achievements are not entirely secure institutionally or financially.

## 4 RECOMMENDATIONS : POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE UNDP CONTRIBUTION

### 1 UNDP must adopt a more cohesive and strategic approach to its work in Environment

In the absence of an identification of environment priorities by government, UNDP should take the initiative in developing a strategic approach for environmental protection and management for PNG – a well-structured and reasoned approach is expected to be welcomed by the government. The approach must comprise a balanced mix of UNDP corporate Strategic Plan goals, government priorities and identified needs/gaps. It must also reflect UNDP's comparative strengths and advantage. Projects must form part of a strategic, visionary thrust forming a cohesive portfolio with effective linkages between projects which should be mutually supportive and benefiting from synergies.

### 2 The Environment Country Programme must be based on a needs assessment, an analysis of the root causes of environmental problems, and an identification of the barriers that may hinder solutions.

Such an approach would start with a thorough needs assessment, establishing the baseline, identifying priority needs, problems and opportunities, and noting the root causes of the problems and barriers that can hinder success. This is to ensure that projects are not set up and initiated, only to stall because of barriers. Targets must be more explicit, realistic, and time-bound (five years).

### 3 The Environment Country Programme must have a more robust structure

The delivery framework, namely the Country Programme must be strengthened. A tighter alignment between the UN-CP, the UNDP Country Programme and the Environment Programme Components is essential. It is also important for project/programme design to pay better attention to the precise wording of the hierarchy of objectives, outcomes, outputs, and activities, as well as indicators. Available UNDP guidance should be applied to create the correct relativity between the framework components and to use indicators appropriately.

### 4 The Environment Country Programme must avoid a large number of shallow, one-off interventions. It must also ensure a good balance between upstream and downstream focus

In determining the scope of the portfolio the CO must guard against spreading resources (financial, time and human) too thinly. It must also ensure a balance of upstream policy interventions with more substantial, practical projects at community level. While the SGP could be used more strategically as a pathfinder for community projects, UNDP must complement GEF resources with others from other sources to address priorities of a more domestic nature.

### 5 UNDP must consider foundational and intermediate interventions as a means to an end and not as ends in themselves - all must form part of a coordinated thrust towards the Outcome

Projects that set up frameworks, build capacity and devise strategies, must also prepare the way for the application of the enhanced capacity and the operationalization of the strategies. Pilot projects are not ends in themselves, but only a means to an end – it is not enough for a pilot project to say that the technology/approach can be replicated or upscaled somewhere else by someone else – part of the exit strategy must prepare the way for such replication and/or upscaling.

**6 UNDP must establish an effective monitoring system based on the adopted SRF with its targets, timelines and indicators**

An effective monitoring system is required which addresses set targets and uses SMART indicators to gauge progress and success, not as targets in themselves. There also needs to be a serious commitment to utilize the results of monitoring and take the necessary corrective action when and where needed.

# ANNEX 1      TERMS OF REFERENCE

## Energy & Environment Cluster Outcome Evaluation

### **1 INTRODUCTION (Background & Context)**

#### **Background**

Papua New Guinea is a country rich in natural resources: gold, copper, oil, gas, timber and fisheries. The country also is an extraordinary range of ecosystems including mountain glaciers, humid tropical forests, swampy wetlands and pristine coral reefs. These resources are managed under customary land tenure systems and provide livelihoods for more than 80% of the total population who live in rural areas. However, majority of the population's inadequate access to basic services has put intense pressure on the government to utilize natural resources to help make trade the engine of economic growth for social development. Consequently, the environmental quality and long-term natural resource sustainability is threatened as evidenced with increased resource extraction for over a decade due to the export driven economic policy of the government.

The natural resources exploitation particularly through commercial timber and mining operations have had significant environmental impact on the terrestrial ecosystems including freshwater ecosystems and ultimately the coastal and marine ecosystems with the disposal of wastes and pollution of rivers. There is increasing pressures from fisheries as it is becoming one of the lucrative commercial industries in the country. The exploitation of natural resources and a steadily increasing population in recent years has led to increased environmental degradation and threatens people's livelihoods. With the onset of climate change, the country, its economy and people are more vulnerable and are at risk of not meeting basic human development needs. Some of these issues are also global as climate change, loss of biodiversity and ozone layer depletion cannot be addressed by countries acting alone.

The money generated from these activities has provided minimal benefits to local people. There are growing concerns of unequal distribution of revenue through royalty payments to resource owners. This is exacerbated with high illiteracy contributing to people making ill informed decisions for benefits distribution between private sector, government and local communities. In addition, the government institutions mandated to undertake monitoring and surveillance to ensure compliance with resources extraction policies, rules, guidelines and legislatives are inadequately resourced. Even certain line agencies have duplication of functions thus causing confusions resulting in environmental protection and sustainable resource management not treated as priority.

With these increasing pressures in the environment and calls for improved environmental management and ensuring sustainable use of natural resources by government agencies experiencing resources and capacity constraints, UNDP works with the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG) to help develop people centered policies that protect the environment and those that depend on it for their. In addition, provide targeted capacity development initiatives to address environmental challenges at global, national and community levels which will ultimately enhance local efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

UNDP's support to the government through the Energy and Environment/Environmental Management and Sustainable Livelihoods portfolio is organised in three main pillars: 1- Institutional and Human Capacity Development for Environmental Mainstreaming; 2- Climate Change Institutional and Human Capacity Development; and 3- Rural Community empowerment for improved environmental management and betterment of livelihoods through Awareness, Education, Advocacy and Capacity Development. To achieve the pillars, UNDP has over the years allocated core and worked with relevant agencies to access special funds to build national institutional and technical capacity for the implementation of various multilateral environmental agreements to which PNG is a party. UNDP collaborates with Department of Environment and Conservation, Office of Climate Change and Development, Department of Agriculture and Livestock, Energy Division of the Department of Petroleum and Energy and other civil society organisations. The support through these partners targets selected provinces to represent the four regions in the country.

UNDP has always spearheaded the implementation of international conventions at national level while ensuring government takes ownership and plays the leadership role. In addition, the strategy of UNDP is to maintain this position and to intensify the cooperation with key donors in the field of environment, in order to facilitate the incorporation of global environmental concerns and commitments into national development planning, taking into consideration all the UN Conventions and International Accords especially related to environment and sustainable development such as Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio in 1992 and the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg in 2002.

#### **Context**

UNDP Papua New Guinea (PNG) Country Office (CO) has been implementing a Country Programme Document (CPD) and a Country Programme Action Plan including Results Matrices under the 1<sup>st</sup> integrated UN Country Programme (UNCP) document for the period 2008-2012. This integrated UNCP document was developed together with the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG) and other UN agencies (as a self-starter Delivering as One Country). The UNCP and the UNDP CPAP includes the following general outcomes: (1) Governance and Crisis Management, (2) Foundations for Human Development, (3) Sustainable Livelihoods and Population; (4) Gender, and (5) HIV and AIDS.

To better assist the GoPNG in the achievement of its national development priorities, UNDP CO is in the process of developing a second integrated UNCP for the coming period 2012-2015 to realign its planning cycle with the government's planning cycle particularly capturing the development priorities that related to biodiversity conservation, natural resource management and climate change following the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

Having in mind the coming planning period, UNDP PNG CO wants to undertake among others an evaluation of the Outcomes belonging to the UNDP Energy & Environment practice area. In this specific case, the **Environmental Management and Sustainable Livelihoods Outcome** of the UNDP CPAP, that fits within the UNCP Outcome 3: Sustainable Livelihoods and Population. The results framework for the E&E portfolio **Environment and Sustainable Livelihoods Outcome** is summarized below:

<b>OUTCOME: Environment and Sustainable Livelihoods (E&amp;E Portfolio)</b>	
National Goal	Ensure natural resources and environment are conserved and used for the collective benefit of us all and be replenished for the benefit of future generations
Source of National Goal / Priority	Papua New Guinea's Fourth Directive Principle of the National Constitution
Relevant MDG(s)	MDG1: Decrease hunger and poverty; MDG7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability
UNCP Outcome 3.1 UNDP CPD Outcome 10	By 2012, rural communities in selected provinces of each region use improved sustainable livelihood practices
Donor Partners	AusAUD, NZAID, E U, Global Environment Facility (GEF), UN-REDD
Coordination Mechanisms	Annual Work Plan Steering Committee, Sustainable Livelihoods Task Team and GoPNG MDG7 Technical Task Force Committee

**Intended Outcome:** By 2012, DEC effectively plans, manages, monitors and coordinates with other relevant government institutions the sustainable use of natural resources and selected communities use their natural resources sustainably to enhance their livelihoods

<b>Output 10.1</b> Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) has the capacity to develop, implement and monitor policies and regulatory framework to promote environmental sustainability	
<b>Output Indicators</b>	<b>Projects that contribute to the Output</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protected Areas policy and legislation are made available</li> <li>Concept and definition of environmental sustainability made available</li> <li># of natural resource-related government sectors have incorporated principles of environmental sustainability into their planning and strategies</li> <li>Regulatory guidelines and policies on natural resources management and environmental sustainability made available to public</li> <li>3/4 of new policies/strategies of natural resource related departments reflect on and integrate environmental sustainability principles</li> <li>Update MDG 7 indicators annually</li> <li># of natural resource-related private, government and civil society sectors represented in government's environmentally sustainable economic growth agenda</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Department of Environment and Conservation Capacity Strengthening</li> <li>National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management (NCSA)</li> <li>Sustainable Land Management (SLMP)</li> <li>Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management</li> </ol>
<b>Output 10.2:</b> Office of Climate Change (OCCD) has the capacity to develop climate change policy and coordinate activities to address initiatives on climate change	
<b>Output Indicators</b>	<b>Projects that contribute to the Output</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change policy is made available</li> <li>National Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) Policy Framework is made available</li> <li>3/4 of new development policies/strategies reflect/address climate change impacts</li> <li># of awareness raising workshops conducted to the general public on REDD</li> <li># of consultations conducted involving community based organization, landowners and governments to discuss on REDD implementation</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UN-REDD National Joint Programme for PNG</li> <li>Second National Communication to UNFCCC</li> <li>Enhancing adaptive capacity of communities in Papua New Guinea to climate change and disaster risks in the Coastal and Highland regions</li> <li>Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change</li> <li>Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy</li> </ol>
<b>Output 10.3:</b> Rural communities have the awareness and mechanisms to apply innovative environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities, including community based ecotourism, non-timber forest products, sustainable agriculture and eco-forestry	
<b>Output Indicators</b>	<b>Projects that contribute to the Output</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of communities participate on innovative environmentally</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small Grants Programme</li> </ol>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sustainable income earning opportunities</li> <li># of community based ecotourism strategy piloted in selected communities</li> <li># of applications received by SGP that promote environmentally sustainable income earning opportunities</li> <li># of applications received by SGP awarded SGP funds in environmentally sustainable income earning projects</li> <li>GEF SGP Country Programme made available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Community Base Ecotourism Project (Ended)</li> <li>3. Milne Bay Conservation and Development (Ended)</li> </ul>
---	---

## 2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

As part of its efforts in enhancing Results Based Management (RBM), UNDP has shifted from traditional project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to results-oriented M&E, especially outcome monitoring and evaluation that cover a set of related projects, programmes and strategies intended to bring about a certain outcome.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess, within the context of the UNCP/MDGs/Country Priorities, UNDP's critical role in the achievement of this key outcome in PNG. More specifically the evaluation will assess UNDP PNG's role in the context of the challenges described above and the extent of its response to the Environment and Livelihoods Sustainability challenge in the country. The evaluation will assess the outcomes of UNDP's strategy, programmes and projects in addressing environmental issues in PNG, including policy advice, knowledge management and coordination issues. It will also assess UNDP PNG's partnership, funding strategies, key role and contribution to enhance the environment and the rural livelihoods of PNG; and will identify gaps, if any lessons learned and propose future directions.

The outcome evaluation will also assess to what extent UNDP, and its role as the RC has been successful in coordinating and implementing joint actions to address Environmental issues and the contribution to MDG 7: the role it played as a partner and how effectively it carried out will also need to be evaluated. It will finally look at the extent to which UNDP with other partners is assisting in developing realistic and achievable targets. How did UNDP influence to contribute to the sustainable management of the environment.

As the Country Programme nears its completion the opportunity exists to evaluate UNDP contribution and generate recommendations that will inform UNDP future programmes in Papua New Guinea. The evaluation of the CPAP outcome/outputs has the following objectives:

- I. Evaluate the results achieved against Environment & Sustainable Livelihoods to date, and likely to be achieved by end 2011;
- II. Provide inputs to the Assessment of Development Results exercise currently been carried out by the UNDP Evaluation Office;
- III. Provide information, recommendations and lessons learnt for the next Country Programme, for which drafting is already ongoing.

The outcome will be evaluated by independent and external evaluator from 1-25 March 2011, with desk review of materials from secondary sources, and field mission in PNG in late February or early March.

## 3. SCOPE & SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

Since this is the first Outcome evaluation in UNDP PNG the period covered by the evaluation will include the ongoing country programme (2008-2011) and the previous country programme (2002-2007). While the emphasis will be on the ongoing country programme, the Outcome Evaluation will cover ongoing projects that started in the previous one and the analysis may take a longer term perspective where appropriate. This evaluation exercise will cover only the **Environment and Sustainable Livelihoods Outcome** that fits under the UNDP Energy and Environment portfolio and practice area.

The evaluation will address the following questions for the selected outcome and related outputs: To what extent have the UNDP development interventions attained the intended results? How UNDP development interventions have generated changes, and at which level, in the CPAP outcome areas? Does the outcome address the national priorities? How efficient was the programme approach in the expected achievement of results:

Specifically this evaluation will determine the following.

- Outcome status:** whether or not the outcome has been achieved and, if not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement. Innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance will need to be listed, and the relevance of UNDP outputs to the outcome will need to be assessed. The progress made in relation to the outputs will have to be ascertained, with the factors (positive and negative) that affected the accomplishment of outputs listed. Good practices and what works or does not work will be highlighted, drawing lessons and promoting their application to policy and practice relating to future UNDP initiatives.
- Underlying factors:** analysis of the underlying factors beyond UNDP's control that influenced the outcome. Substantive design issues will be distinguished from key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners; involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out will be reviewed.

- UNDP contribution: the relevance of the outcome and the constituent components specifically for UNDP assistance. It will determine whether or not UNDP funded outputs and other interventions – including outputs, soft and hard assistance – can be credibly linked to the achievement of the outcome. It will assess the likelihood of the achievement of the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs, and will ascertain the perspective of sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome – it will answer if it can be ensured that the outcome is reached and maintained even after UNDP interventions.
- Partnership strategy: whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective; what were the partnerships formed; what was the role of UNDP; how did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome; what was the level of stakeholders participation; and examine the partnership among UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field.
- Resource mobilization: whether or not UNDP in cooperation with Government and other UN agencies, funds and programmes has been able to mobilize resources to strengthen the environmental portfolio in the country. Identify ways of strengthening the Resource mobilization efforts to be applied in the coming period.

#### **4. PROCESS & METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION**

The external evaluation should be based on a stakeholder approach, where all groups and individuals, who affect and/or are affected by the achievement of the outcome, are involved in the analysis. Moreover, the evaluation will take into consideration the social, political and economic context, which affects the overall performance of the outcome achievement.

The external evaluator is expected to follow the following process: data collection, validation of data, stakeholder participation, and evaluation progress reports. The main steps for data collection and analysis are the following:

- i. Desk review of existing documents and materials; (to be provided by UNDP)
- ii. Interviews with partners and stakeholders (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used);
- iii. Field visits to selected sites (if need it)
- iv. Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Government, as well as with other donors and development partners.
- v. Along the evaluation analysis process, and before the writing phases, the external evaluator will inform verbally about the major findings to the UNDP E&E portfolio manager.
- vi. Report writing phase
- vii. Final and public dissemination of the evaluation findings

#### **5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION**

It is likely that the outcome evaluation team will be constituted of one sectoral expert /evaluator (international), who will be supported by the following staff:

- UNDP E&E Programme Analyst and project managers: will support the international sector expert (evaluator) with all relevant materials for desk review, identify the potential stakeholders/persons to meet and support the expert in analysis during his mission in Papua New Guinea
- Government Counterpart Members: Several government counterpart officials will support the international sector expert (evaluator) with all relevant government information during the evaluation mission in Papua New Guinea.

#### **6. DURATION, PROCEDURES AND LOGISTICS**

##### ***Duration***

The total duration of the mission would be 15 working days (international travels time not included) starting from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011. The evaluation work will be conducted in three phases.

The first phase (home based) of Desk Review and data analysis will start as soon as the Evaluator is assigned (early October). During this phase the evaluator will review the relevant documents and reports, prepare the Work plan, collection of data (through national staff) and analysis, and provide initial remarks/inputs to the ADR Mission. The second phase will start from the day following the evaluator's arrival in Port Moresby. The third phase (home based) will start the day the evaluator will receive all the comments on the Draft report (21<sup>st</sup> March, 2011).

##### ***Logistic and administrative arrangements***

While the evaluator would be responsible for the delivery of quality outputs, UNDP will be responsible for organizing and facilitating the evaluation. Programme units staff will also assist the evaluator in performing his/her tasks. UNDP will arrange the logistic support upon requisition from the evaluator. Secretariat should be ensured by the evaluator. Transportation support will be provided by UNDP. Printing facilities and presentation facilities for workshops/meetings will

be provided by UNDP during the period in country. Internet access will be provided in UNDP country or projects offices (in locations where UNDP is present).

#### **Visa / Security requirements**

The Evaluator is responsible to obtain visa for entry and work permission for the duration of his mission. UNDP will provide letters for facilitating visa issuance. The Evaluator will be subject to UN security rules and procedures in PNG, namely field visits will be subject to Security Clearance.

## **7. DURATION & SCHEDULES OF MEETINGS**

The evaluation will be undertaken over a period of 23 days in accordance with the following steps:

	Activity	Days	Date	Responsibility
Preliminary phase	UNDP internal meeting to review zero draft of the TORs	0,5		E&E Programme Analyst
	Submission of draft TORs to UNDP EO with request for comments and suggestions of CVs for the international consultant.	5		E&E Team Leader, DRR
	Meeting to discuss and sign off on draft outcome evaluation TORs & clearance. TORs revised to incorporate amendments	0.5		E&E Team Leader, DRR
	Letter informing projects personnel and partners about outcome evaluation with TORs.	0,5		
	Preparation and signature of contracts by consultant/travel arrangements etc,	0,5		UNDP Operations
Evaluation Phase 1	Provide key documents to the consultant for a desktop review (Home base)	0,5		E&E Team Leader,
	Preparation of evaluation work plan and Desk reviews of available reports, project reviews and earlier evaluations prior to visiting	5		External evaluator
	Drafted notes on preliminary findings from the desk review	1		External evaluators
Evaluation Phase 2	Travel time for the external evaluator, arrival to PNG	1		External evaluators
	Meetings and Consultations/interviews with UNDP staff, GoPNG officials and selected stakeholders (AusAID, JAPAN, ADB, WB, NGOs, CSOs)	5		E&E Programme Analyst, External evaluators.
	Field visits to some projects sites	2		UNDP PNG and EO
	Preparation of draft report and presentation of key findings and distribution to all the parts from commment	3		E&E Programme Analyst, External evaluators.
	Travel time to evaluators home country			
Evaluation Phase 3	Submission of comments on the evaluation draft document	2		All the parts
	Incorporation of stakeholders comments and preparation of final outcome evaluation document	3		External evaluator
	Discussion of draft final outcome evaluation report			E&E Programme Analyst, External evaluators.
	Dissemination of review report	1		DRR

## **8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGMENTS FOR THE EVALUATION**

The work to be performed by the external evaluator will be guided by this ToRs and directly supervised by the Deputy Resident Representative in consultation with Energy and Environment Programme Analyst, who will be responsible for coordinating, organizing and managing the evaluation, facilitating all the documentation and meetings arrangements for the evaluator.

As request by the E&E Programme Analyst, other Programme staff members will be responsible for liaising with partners, logistical backstopping and providing relevant documentation and feedback to the external evaluator. Project partners will be duly informed of the upcoming outcome evaluation in order to provide substantive information and subsequent recommendations.

A plenary meeting with partners and stakeholders, including Government representatives to validate findings, lessons learned and recommendations will be held 1 working day prior to the scheduled completion date of the evaluation mission.

## **9. EVALUATION COST & FINANCING**

The following anticipated costs of the evaluation will be financed by UNDP. Breakdown of the resources required for:

- International Consultant – professional fees, international travel costs and DSA costs
- Local travel costs and DSA
- Workshop costs
- Printing material cost

#### **Evaluation Plan**

- Home base Desk Review and drafted of Work Plan= 3 days
- In Country Meetings with UNDP, GoPNG, and various Stakeholders= 5days
- Field Work/projects visits and Interviews with key informants = 3 days
- Travel time to provinces if necessary = 1days
- Preparation of Preliminary findings and first draft= 3 day
- Presentations of Preliminary findings and distribution of first draft = 1 day
- Review of first draft by stakeholders (1 week) no payment for this period
- Home base Incorporation and Analysis of comments /feedbacks = 3 days
- Finalization of Evaluation Report = 4 days
- **Total number of paid days = 23**

#### **10. ETHICS OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation will be carried out in an objective, sensitive and independent manner with varied and balanced considerations of both positive/negative aspects and areas in which significant improvement are required.

The products of the evaluation will be submitted in the right time and will be presented in a very clear maner.

#### **11. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION**

The evaluator is expected to provide the following deliverables for the indicated dates:

- A detailed **Evaluation approach and Work plan** describing the approach and methodology that will be used for the evaluation is due upon signing the contract;
- A full **Draft report** on **18th March** that will be submitted to UNDP at the end of the mission. This report will be discussed within UNDP and with its partners involved in the outcomes. UNDP will transmit to the evaluator the comments made on this draft within two weeks;
- The **Evaluation Report** on **25<sup>th</sup> March, 2011** integrating the comments will have to be submitted to UNDP, (MS Word and PDF format) within one week after receiving comments on the draft report. This report is subject to UNDP approval;
- An **Executive Summary** on **24<sup>th</sup> March, 2011** of the Evaluation Report, presented as a standalone document (MS Word and PDF format).

Other hand, all documents, material, questionnaires, surveys or intermediate reports that might be established for the purpose of the mission should be delivered to UNDP. All the deliverables are reputed to be public documents, owned by UNDP. Therefore the quality is a paramount. Documents should be in English language and be submitted in MS Office format (MS Word, MS Excel and PDF).

(a) The content and structure of the Final Evaluation report will be the following:

- Executive summary; (maximum 4 pages)
- Introduction;
- Description of the evaluation objectives and methodology;
- Analysis of the situation with regard to the outcome, the outputs and the partnership strategy;
- Rating on progress towards outcomes and progress towards outputs, and a rating on the relevance of the outcome;
- Key findings (including best practices and lessons learned concerning best and worst practices in producing outputs, linking them to outcomes and using partnerships strategically);
- Strategies for continuing UNDP assistance towards the outcome;
- Development of indicators that will assist in monitoring future progress and guide development of future interventions
- Conclusions and recommendations for formulating future assistance in the outcome if warranted;
- Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, Evaluation work plan. etc.

#### **12. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION TEAM**

Based on the above analysis, how should UNDP reposition its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the proposed outcome is fully achieved by the end of the CPAP period:

- What corrective actions are recommended for the new, ongoing or future UNDP work in the UNDAF and CPAP outcome?
- Provide preliminary recommendations on how the Energy and Environment/Environmental Management and Sustainable Livelihoods Programme can most effectively continue to support the Government in effectively responding to environment/natural resource management and climate change challenges.

### **13. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATION TEAM**

The following documents should be reviewed by the evaluator:

Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines	UN/UNDP Country Programme and Project Documents & Reports	GoPNG and other development partners/Donors relevant documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results</li> <li>• UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators</li> <li>• Results-Based M &amp; E Framework</li> <li>• UNDP Results-Based Management: Technical Note</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNCP 2008-2012 Document and Action Plan</li> <li>• UNDP CPD 2007-2011</li> <li>• Project documents and relevant project reports</li> <li>• Regional Strategies and projects</li> <li>• AWP</li> <li>• Technical Working Groups minutes/reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GoPNG MTDP 2011-2011,</li> <li>• GoPNG vision 2050</li> <li>• Government environmental reports, strategies, etc</li> <li>• GoPNG Action Plans</li> <li>• DEC Strategic Direction</li> <li>• Climate Compatible Development Strategy including Interim Action Plan</li> </ul>

### **14. SKILLS & QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM**

#### ***Qualifications and skills:***

- The M&E specialist should have a University Degree or Masters Degree or equivalent in rural development, sustainable development, environmental management/science or any other relevant field.
- S/he must be fluent in written and oral English and must be computer literate.
- S/he must have proven experience in designing and implementing M&E systems skills in development programmes.
- S/he must have the personal qualities to effectively network between the different stakeholders and have flexibility to work with people with different values and ability to appreciate cultural differences.

#### ***General Professional Experience:***

- S/he should have 10 years professional experience, with at least 5 years in monitoring and evaluation.
- S/he should have experience of working in developing countries and with rural communities.
- S/He should have general experience making evaluations workplans, analysis and reports,
- Preferably experience and knowledge of using of data management and using database programmes such as ACCESS.

#### ***Specific professional experience:***

- S/he will have experienced in the evaluation of environmental outcomes within the UN system.
- Extensive experience in the evaluation of participative community development initiatives
- Extensive experience in the South East Asia and Pacific islands Countries development context
- Proven English reporting, documenting and presentation skills

## ANNEX 2 DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

### a) Key documents reviewed and consulted

Asian Development Bank (2007) *Development Effectiveness Country Brief – Papua New Guinea*

AusAID (2005) Australian Government Overseas Aid Available – from  
[http://www.ausaid.gov.au/country/png/png\\_intro.cfm](http://www.ausaid.gov.au/country/png/png_intro.cfm)

Bourke, R.M. and Harwood, T. (eds) (2009) *Food and Agriculture in Papua New Guinea*. ANU E Press, The Australian National University, Canberra

DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (2002) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OECD, Paris

Government of Papua New Guinea (2009) *Papua New Guinea Vision 2050*. National Strategic Plan Task Force. Port Moresby

Government of Papua New Guinea / United Nations Development System (2007) *United Nations Country Programme Papua New Guinea 2008-12 : A Partnership for Nation Building*. Port Moresby

Havini, M (1990) Human rights violations and community disruption. In *The Bougainville Crisis*, ed. R.J. May and M. Spriggs, Bathurst: Crawford House Press

Johnston, P and J. Voss (2005) *Regional Energy Assessment 2004: An Assessment of the Key Energy Issues, Barriers to the Development of Renewable Energy to Mitigate Climate Change and Capacity Development Needs for Removing the Barriers in Papua New Guinea*. Papua New Guinea National Report, Volume 10. SPREP, GEF, UNDP

Kenema, S (2010) An analysis of post-conflict explanations of indigenous dissent relation to the Bougainville copper mining conflict, Papua New Guinea. *eJournal of the Australian Association for the Advancement of Pacific Studies*. Issues 1.2 and 2.1, April 2010

Narokobi, B., and Clements, Q., 2003. 'Strengthening a parliamentary democracy for the 21st century', Legislative Needs and Assessment Report: National Parliament of Papua New Guinea

Rufina, Peter, et. al. (2006) *Base Document for the United Nations Country Programme 2008-2012*. Port Moresby

United Nations in Papua New Guinea (2007) *UNCP Action Plan Papua New Guinea*. Between the Government of Papua New Guinea and the United Nations System in Papua New Guinea

United Nations (2008) *Delivering as One: A partnership for nation-building*. Papua New Guinea – Nupela we long wokim wok

United Nations Papua New Guinea (2010) *Delivering as One: Annual Progress Report 2009*. United Nations Country Programme

UNDP Human Development Report 2007

UNDP Human Development Report 2010

UNDP (undated) *RBM in UNDP: Selecting Indicators*. Indicators Paper in the series Signposts of Development

UNDP (2007) *UNDP Strategic Plan 2008-2011 – Accelerating Global Progress on Human Development*. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, Second Regular Session, September 2007, New York.

UNDP (2007) *Draft Country Programme Document – Papua New Guinea (2008-2012)*. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, Annual Session 2007, New York

UNDP (2009) Millennium Development Goals : Second National Progress Summary Report 2009 for Papua New Guinea

UNDP (2011) *The Evaluation Policy of UNDP*. Presented to the Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, First Regular Session, January/February 2011

UNDP Evaluation Office (2002) *Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*. UNDP, New York

UNEG (2007) *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation*. UNEG, United Nations Evaluation Group, New York

World Bank (2011) Draft Environmental and Social Management Framework for Papua New Guinea Energy Sector Development Project. Available on <http://www.pngpower.com.pg/news/news-pressrelease/ESMF-English.pdf>

## **b) Websites reviewed and consulted**

UNDP Country Office PNG <http://www.undp.org.pg/>

PNG Country Profile <http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=Papua%20New%20Guinea>

Indo-Pacific Conservation Alliance <http://www.indopacific.org/biodiversity.asp#NGB>

GEF benefits index for biodiversity <http://tradingeconomics.com/papua-new-guinea/gef-benefits-index-for-biodiversity-0--no-biodiversity-potential-to-100--maximum-wb-data.html>

UN Delivering As One in PNG [http://www.un.org.pg/attachments/061\\_Delivering%20as%20One%202004-2007.pdf](http://www.un.org.pg/attachments/061_Delivering%20as%20One%202004-2007.pdf)

## ANNEX 3 PERSONS MET AND CONSULTED

### UNDP Country Office

David McLachlan-Karr, Resident Representative  
Carol Flore-Smrecznik, Deputy Resident Representative  
Margaret Lokoloko, Assistant Resident Representative  
Jorg Schimmel, Programme Specialist  
Andrew Lepani, Programme Associate  
Gwen Maru, Programme Analyst (Energy & Environment)  
Robert Yen, Coordinator Small Grants Programme  
Emay Fajardo, SGP Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist  
Anthony Agyenta, CTA Crisis Prevention & Nation Building Programme, Bougainville  
Wesley Kenneth, Project Manager, Bougainville  
Emmanuel Tavits, Northern Region Coordinator, Bougainville

### Bismarck Energy Ltd

Joseph Dar, Hydro Expert

### Department of Environment and Conservation

Gunther Joku, Director Special Projects  
Kay Kalim, Deputy Secretary Sustainable Environment Programme  
John Michael, Executive Manager Sustainable Environment Programme  
Michael Bongro, Executive Manager International Environmental Policies  
Maino Virobo, Executive Manager Sustainable Land Management

### Asian Development Bank (ADB)

Charles Andrews, Country Director

### New Zealand High Commission

Dimitri Geidelberg, Counsellor (Development)

### Australian High Commission, AusAID

Dave Vosen, Counsellor Policy & Coordination  
Roselyne Kenneth, Programme Manager, AusAID Bougainville  
Tom Nettleton, Acting Programme Director  
Terry Apa, M&E Specialist

### United States Embassy in Papua New Guinea

Teddy Taylor, Ambassador

### Autonomous Bougainville Government (ABG)

Robert Tapi, Clerk of Parliament  
Lawrence Disin, Chief Administrator  
Paul Kabori, Chief Executive Officer, Human Resources Division  
Luther Smith, Policy Advisor (AusAID)  
Larry Helm, Planning & Budget Advisor, ABG Planning Division  
Moses Koliwan, Senior Aid Coordinator, ABG Planning Division  
Graham Kakarutz, Budget Officer, ABG Planning Division  
Siwi Aipe, ABG WebMaster / ICT Project  
Catherine Welbia, Economic Planner, ABG Planning Division  
Joseph Cheraha, Senior Planner, ABG Planning Division

### The Nature Conservancy (TNC)

Francis Hurahura, PNG Forest Director

### Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD)

Gwen Sissiou, Acting Executive Director  
Varigini Badira, Director Climate Change Adaptation

### Department of Petroleum & Energy

Idau Kopi, Senior Engineer, Energy Division, Country Coordinator PI GHG Abatement

### National Weather Services

Sam Maiha, Director

### PNG Forest Authority

Goodwill Amos, Manager, Climate Change & REDD



**Madang Research Institute NGO**

Steven Kadam, Director

**Tab Wildlife Management Area, Madang Lagoon**

Tamilong Tabb, Chairman

**Balek Creek Reserve, Madang**

Wagum Tagil, Chairman

**Foundation for People, Community and Development (FPCD)**

Linden Jamang, Forest Officer

**Department of Agriculture and Livestock**

Andrew Mika, Chief, Land Use Section

**Participants in GEF/UNDP Small Grants Programme Workshop, Goroka**

Michael Jinga, Kavali Memorial Wildlife Zoo

Warren Jano, Karamui Conservation and Resource Management Program

John Anuambo, Karamui Conservation and Resource Management Program

Sangion Tiu, Research & Conservation Foundation

Miriam Supuma, PNG Institute of Biological Research

Banak Gamui, PNG Institute of Biological Research

Junior Novera, PNG Institute of Biological Research

Jerry Wana, Sepik Wetlands Management Initiative

Joe Bik, Voice of Yongs

Gerry Benga, Marine Resource Management and Conservation

Densen Javohn, Sartelia Marine Conservation

**Participants in SGP National Steering Committee Retreat, Goroka**

Kumaras Kalim, Department of Environment and Conservation

Eric Kwa, University of PNG

Chalapan Kaluwin, University of PNG

Simon Saulei, PNG Forest Research Institute

Modi Pontio, Wildlife Conservation Society

Theresa Kas, The Nature Conservancy

Neil Stronach, WWF

James Sabi, Dept of Environment and Conservation

Garaio Gafiye, PNG University of Technology

**The World Bank**

Laura E Bailey, Country Manager, Papua New Guinea

**Delegation of the European Union to Papua New Guinea**

Roberto Cecutti, First Secretary Economics, Trade and Governance

**PNG Green Party**

Dorothy Tekwie, President, past UNDP staff, past Greenpeace staff

**UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre**

Martin Krause, Team Leader Environment and Energy

Joseph D'Cruz, Regional Environment Advisor