

Annex 7

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

UNDP/GEF Terminal Evaluation
Management Response and Tracking Template

Project Title: Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management

Project PIMS #: 3936

Terminal Evaluation Completion Date: 06 December 2019

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 1. Pass the draft PA Bill – the Project did handover to CEPA, a Bill that was cleared by State Solicitor and the Legislative Council. As the Bill seems to be hung up on considerations of revenue collection and subsequent distribution (related to Trust Fund mechanisms), it is suggested to *not* include the details of revenue collection and transfer in the Bill, but to specify instead *commitment* to examine current precedents for collection and distribution of revenues, that might apply to conservation (for example, the -Road Transport Authority model advised by Department of Treasury during the PA Bill inter-government consultations). These can then be picked up and adapted, as agreed by all parties, in subsequent regulations and guidelines. Furthermore, CEPA can more actively engage with ministers, Members of Parliament, and even the Prime Minister, to encourage quick adoption of the PA Bill, before further time is lost, and cynicism sets in while UNDP supports CEPA in playing the lobbying role. The concerns of private sector lobbyists have been taken into consideration, but the Bill was formulated by the majority of the rural customary landowning communities during the Bill's extensive consultation process with all the regions of PNG. The Bill has captured the aspirations of the majority rural population for the sake of effective conservation in PNG.

Management response: The Bill was led by CEPA during extensive meaningful consultations over 18 months and supported by the GEF 4 Project. For sustainability purposes, CEPA has ownership of the Bill and is responsible for progressing the Bill to enactment. The Government shall lead now the process for endorsing the Bill.

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 2. Prioritize quickly gazette the WMAs and proposed CCAs facilitated by the project. This gap can be taken by GEF6.

Management response: This is the area that CEPA has to lead on. One gazettal has been completed by CEPA and the East New Britain Provincial Administration. CEPA will continue to progress the gazettal of the other WMAs, in collaboration with their other Project Partners, where relevant, given that CEPA administers the relevant Conservation laws.

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 3.

With the lack of sufficient technical and financial support, it is recommended to establish more cohesive and coordinated system to continue support the development of provincial institutions that are mandated for conservation.

The provincial offices and their functions provide a critical link between national government agencies; districts and local communities, therefore, engaging provincial offices in all project activities that go to local communities, so that their bridging/facilitating role is enhanced¹.

Management response: Acknowledged, despite that no key actions are required at this stage as the project will be closed, however, UNDP will ensure its continuous support is provided to strengthen the relation between CEPA and its provincial counterparts through other programme and projects.

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 4.

Developing wide-scale work by CEPA and NGOs and CBOs on conservation areas in the hinterlands (higher altitude forested areas) in West New Britain and East New Britain (Baining, Nakanai, Whiteman range). It is recommended that this effort is initiated with review of the recent biodiversity surveys and detailed analysis of recent GoogleEarth images. Ultimately, the

¹ Due to fiscal difficulties in PNG, most provinces have a joint division or unit with conflicting mandates covering forestry, mining, environment, conservation, and climate change. The Provincial Administrations of East and West New Britain have gone through a restructuring process to establish a separate environment and climate change unit/branch with 3-4 dedicated staff: West New Britain-Division of Forestry, Climate Change and Environment, effective as of January 2020; and, the Forestry, Environment and Climate Change Program under the Division of Agriculture and Livestock with ENB provincial administration was created in year 2000. CEPA has been advocating for the increased functions of these divisions

large size and contiguity of forest habitats (evident in the hinterlands) will have a bigger biodiversity impact than the smaller WMAs and CCAs and should therefore be given more attention ² .				
Management response: Acknowledged, this work shall be performed now by CEPA, so far the later initiated the support to the Provincial Administration of West New Britain to support the gazettal application of Via River Catchment; exercised a follow-up on a separate application of the Nakanai Range under the UNESCO WHS tentative list and used drone to follow-up on the status of OSR with the landuse planning that incorporates conservation uses as a proposed WHS. Under GEF 5, CEPA's capacity.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 5.				
Support CEPA and provincial/district governments to develop ecotourism profiles and feasibility studies for each community site in New Britain, being realistic and specific about opportunities, and identifying the required infrastructure and services ³ .				
Management response: Partially agree; UNDP will commit to working through other GEF funded projects on some sites, committing to other sites is not possible to guarantee at present. Greater support might be provided through the established Biodiversity Fund, if it is capitalised and operational.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
5.1 Scanning exercise of in West New Britain. Tourism is identified as a finance option for this area.	Jan 2020	GEF6 team		Completed
5.2 Conduct a financial and technical feasibility linked to the Kimbe Bay MPA	Jan 2021	GEF6 team		Pending

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 6.				
Develop business models for each local community venture (within those communities who have been involved with the GEF4 project), to properly understand viability, timeframes, required investments, potential profits, and benefit sharing associated with such initiatives as cocoa exports, market gardening, ecotourism, etc. (there is scope here for being more expansive and creative about potential business opportunities in the communities, such as insect collection and sales). it is recommended to consider encouraging more WMA accountability for revenue flows related to such ventures (a little more transparent) while ensuring that there are no lapses with the current cocoa export initiative (maintain export flows to meet buyer expectations) ⁴ .				
Management response: Partially agree. There is an assumption here that there has not been any work done in terms of business modelling. The New Britain Provinces have had a long history in agribusiness and information is probably located under various public and private entities that could be subject of a separate study. The WMA comprise parts of the natural environment of the Provinces and managed locally and it should be stated here that the East New Britain Provincial Administration is probably the best functioning provincial governments in PNG, with good infrastructure and communications facilities, compared to other Provinces. Furthermore, where WMAs are concerned, that the CEPA can cultivate linkages with other national government entities, for technical support but only at the invitation of the respective Provincial administrations, for ownership and sustainability purposes.				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 7.			
For any future involvement in conservation area, it is recommended to reduce the involvement of intermediaries for community conservation and alternative livelihood initiatives, since they increase the cost of project delivery (and it is not always clear that there is added value from them).			

² Supported by GEF4, the Via River Catchment (150,000 hectares) is a proposed PA in the Whiteman Range which encompasses a transect area (150,000 hectares) from the ridge to reef. Also, wide-scale conservation areas in the Owen Stanley Range are being pursued under the umbrella of the UNESCO World Heritage Site tentative listing through the Kokoda Initiative. A separate UNESCO WHS application for the Nakanai Range is being pursued by CEPA and James Cook University wherein WMAs and CCAs in Pomio District are presented as a network of protected areas.

³ ENB still favours the Rabaul area for tourism development, given the heavy investments required for infrastructure development elsewhere in the province, including Pomio District. Despite this, Pomio District is going ahead with some infrastructure improvements to facilitate increased tourism. In West New Britain, the Coral Triangle Initiative continues to support the province to complete the Nature-based Tourism plan and policy.

⁴ A comprehensive value chain analysis and action plan was developed for the cocoa initiative, to help sustain it, and new solar dryers continue to be built in ENB, so this promising.

Management response: Acknowledged, the recommendation will be taken into consideration in any future involvement with community conservation. During the Inception Workshop of GEF6, CEPA and UNDP are committed to build more flexibility in partnering directly with Districts and community groups.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
7.1 Based on GEF4 lessons, provide inputs to review arrangements and stakeholder engagement plan of GEF6	Jan 2020	GEF team 6)	Discussions made with ongoing GEF projects from 5-14 Feb 2020 as part of handover.	Completed
7.2 Share experience of grant making to communities with GEF6 to influence the design of the grant making process with communities under the Biodiversity Fund. it will be incorporated into the design of the biodiversity fund operational manual. Dec 2020.	Aug 2020	GEF 6	Experiences to be captured during the concept note for the Biodiversity Fund under GEF6.	Pending

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 8.
Communities are encouraged to develop more specific action plans for their conservation activities (monitoring and evaluation of their WMAs), since at the moment, the status of their protected areas is often unclear and based on subjective perceptions. As noted previously, a time-series of GoogleEarth or drone images of each conservation area (updated every two years) could be developed⁵. These can then be housed in the PA Registry at CEPA. Youth in these communities could be engaged in science projects related to conservation and biodiversity monitoring (youth in several communities that were consulted expressed keen interest in doing this). Related to this, if there are specific zones or land use plans in the community conservation management plan, there is a need to set capacity limits for all activities within those zones. This means limiting the number of people or number of activities in specific zones.

Management response: Through the Project and GEF 5, CEPA has facilitated for drones to be purchased and also for drone training, in collaboration with the East and West New Britain Provincial Administrations to support landuse planning that incorporates protected areas. The respective Administrations have taken ownership of this process and as such there is continuity and sustainability of the drone initiative that the Project started.

East and West New Britain provincial administrations have committed to establish an information hub to house stitched images to monitor real-time forest and land cover and resource inventory as well as to reconfirm demarcated boundaries of a protected area. Drone images that will be hosted in CEPA's PA Registry was reflected in the PA Registry manual as part of follow-up action.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
8.1 Continuing GEF5 drone trainings to include GEF4 sites	Nov 2020	GEF5	Included in the approved GEF5 2020 AWP	Initial
8.2 Facilitate sharing of stitched drone images between CEPA and provinces	Nov 2020	GEF5		Pending

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 9.
It is beneficial to consider volunteer-type people with little cash incentives from the project or CEPA to work in the communities at least 3-4 weeks at a time and 4-5 times per year, if more technical support to be provided to local communities (whether conservation-related or addressing alternative livelihood development), that will help creating traction and develop effective working relationships.

Management response: In partial agreement. The management will consider the recommendation when developing other programmes and projects. CEPA may have their own constraints on resources and competing priorities to take this recommendation forward and will need developing partners for this outreach but at the invitation of the communities and the respective provincial administrations.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking

⁵ There has been active support to training and drone deployment, and this holds good promise for habitat monitoring.

			Comments	Status
9.1. Cost efficiency will be factored through the development of GEF 7 FOLUR, in collaboration with CEPA.	June 2020	UNDP project manager for FOLUR project		Pending

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 10. Encourage setting up exchanges between WMAs/CCAs in New Britain, to disseminate the lessons learned (good and bad experiences) to all communities interested in conservation and developing alternative livelihoods.

Management response: Acknowledged, CEPA will prepare their follow up action plan based on the evaluation report and will consider the recommendation as part of their plan.

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 11.

For future, it is recommended to accurately assess the progress in building capacity through tracking all training events as a separate file, with topics, name of trainer, names and gender of trainees, and their positions/affiliations at the time of training (for ease of tracking capacity-building programmes).

Management response: Agree. As the project has ended, the CO will ensure capturing this recommendation through other programme and projects.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
11.1 Develop Training Tracking tools and share with other projects	March 2021	GEF6 team, CEPA, UNDP		Pending

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 12.

In all future project performance reporting, do not revert to ‘cumulative’ to show previous achievements; retain a record of project achievements for each specific year (otherwise, future evaluations will have to revert to “forensic” review to determine project accountability for annual workplans, as these details will remain obscure). Also, be clear in reporting what has actually been done and achieved; avoid aspirational statements about results expected in the future.

Management response: Acknowledged, clear and proper reporting on indicators and results will be ensured

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 13.

Review gender action plan to clarify on the level of women engagement and their role in the project and ensure a project reporting system includes gender disaggregated data⁶.

Management response: Agree- Gender action plan will be developed for other GEF-funded projects .

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
13.1 The GEF 6 will develop a gender analysis and action plan	March 2021	GEF6 team	Discussions made with ongoing GEF projects from 5-14 Feb 2020 as part of handover.	Pending

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 14.

The METT scoring system for PA management effectiveness is a “given” with GEF conservation type projects and is intended to help track progress during a project and also supposedly to allow comparisons between projects and countries. The METT experience with the GEF4 project, however, was mixed⁷. On the one hand, the report on METT scores in 2017 is a very useful “round-up” of PA status throughout PNG, based on the perceptions of the communities associated with these protected areas. On the other hand, there were issues with how questions were perceived, as well as how the answers were obtained (in a

⁶ There are other categories of potential beneficiaries that also need to be included in disaggregated reporting; such as the disabled, youths, amongst others. Furthermore, the cultural dynamics of patrilineal and to some extent matrilineal communities should not be ignored in considering gender issues.

⁷ After the METT exercise with SPREP, the project introduced, through a South-South arrangement with UNDP Philippines in 2016, an initiative on how the Department of Environment and Natural Resource has used this instrument to come up with their strategy for the National PA system; e.g., tying down the updated POWPA map and results of 2017 METT, including tweaks introduced, that can be applied to a range of PA types. The results of the National Ridge to Reef conservation assessment (the updated national prioritization exercise) influences the investment for future conservation areas in PNG; e.g., Bismark Range to include Madang Lagoon – USAID, GEF6; Western and Eastern Highlands – GEF7 STAR, East and West New Britain – GEF7 Impact.

workshop format, without clear on-the-ground verification⁸). A true measure of PA management effectiveness is the area and quality of habitats and biodiversity in specific areas (this information being obtained scientifically and objectively). While many of the discussion points in the METT system are relevant and interesting, the evaluators believe it is important to introduce actual evidence of PA management effectiveness into the METT observations and scores (for example, drone images, or time-series of GoogleEarth images). Further, the utility of the METT scores is greatly increased when each WMA/CCA, or institution, develops a specific action plan directly responding to the constraints and issues evident in the scores. In other words, the METT scores and apparent constraints are reviewed with the WMAs, and responsive action plans are developed⁹.

Management response:
Agree- METT will be improved through other GEF funded projects .

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
14.1 Activity to re-examine PNG METT	Sep 2021	CEPA, GEF6 team	Included in approved GEF6 2020 AWP	Pending
14.2 Revised METT for PNG	Dec 2021	CEPA, GEF6 team	TOR to be advertised by GEF6 project in Q2.	Pending

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 15.
it is recommended to undertake a feasibility study (one site, as a pilot) for mini or micro-hydropower (using a horizontal Straflo-type turbine in the river).
Also based on field observations, it is recommended to examine the feasibility and develop gravity feed water systems in all project communities where this seems practical (simple plastic pipes coming from the river, streams, or springs) and feeding a community water storage tank, and then individual household feeds¹⁰.

Management response:
This is to acknowledge the recommendation, as the Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management project will be closed, the recommendation will be implemented through other projects as per the targeted sites approved in these projects.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
15.1 Feasibility study will be conducted through RE project,	March 2021	Renewable Energy project		Pending

⁸ Due to costs, on-the-ground verification was limited, but carried out by SPREP with CEPA on selected sites.

⁹ In the earlier METT exercise, a specific action plan for each individual PA was incorporated into the PNG METT to bring together the analysis on threats and 30 questions (taken from Philippine's approach). In the discussions after each METT exercise, the top 3 priority actions are tied to the implementation of respective management plans (good; then this needs to be regularly checked and updated).

¹⁰ While not in the purview of GEF4, these legitimate observations might inform other donors and the communities themselves.