Management Responses PAN Project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendations | Responsible parties | Timeline | Management Responses |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **Category 1: Completing critical outstanding deliverables** | | | |
| **A.1** | The legal designation of Jokadu NP remains pending due to COVID19-related delays in the official approval of the submitted documents. DWNP should follow up on this to ensure that it takes place without delay. | DPWM, GEF OFP | By 31 December 2021 | The Director has shared trails of follow-ups on the issue. He has advised that notification will be sent out in case of complaints and then official gazettement. No timeframe could be given. However, the Programme Unit will consistently engage with the department to close the matter by the end of 2021. |
| **A.2** | The management plan for Bao Bolong WR was a key project deliverable that was not fully completed (the draft did not include the extension area). This should be completed as soon as possible to enable effective management of the whole PA. | DPWM | By 31 December 2021 | The Department of Parks and Wildlife Director has informed the Programme unit that the plan will be complete to cover the entire protected area and validated by December 2021.  In the meantime, the completion of the management plan is pending. The department manages the park in its entity, including the extension areas, and all relevant works and studies (international and national) entail data of the whole park. |
| **B** | **Category 2: Resolving outstanding audit queries and safeguard issues** | | | |
| **B.1** | According to PIR 2020, some budget deviations must be resolved as the project approaches closure. These include some PMC discrepancies, misallocation of DPCs under activity budget lines, DPCs being slightly exceeded, and the addition of new budget lines not provided for in the Project document. No justification has been given, over 5% of the total grant. The UNDP Regional PA is recommended to work closely with the UNDP CO, IP, and project team to resolve these deviations. | UNDP and DPWM | By 31 December 2021 | The CO will reach out to the regional office to identify the exact discrepancies between the DPC allowed and the DCP charged and liaise to resolve the matter by the end of 2021. The Country Office has already investigated how much DPC the CO has charged to the project as a whole. This information will be shared with the regional office in (August 2021) to start resolving the matter. |
| **B.2** | As indicated in PIR 2020, an independent review report released in March 2020 stated some gaps in identifying and rating safeguards risks. It recommended that the SESP risk rating should be raised to Moderate. It was too late to make the recommendations during implementation. However, some recommendations should be included in the project's closure report to assist the IP with ongoing monitoring and management of any safeguard-related risks to sustainability. | UNDP | By 31 December 2021 | The project closure report will be drafted and the identified risk incorporated by Q4 of 2021. |
| **C** | **Category 3: Facilitating outcome sustainability** | | | |
| **C.1** | Facilitate ongoing liaison with and support for PACs and communities adjacent to PAs to maintain harmonious engagement in co-management, and control over external threats to biodiversity | DPWM | Ongoing | Thus far, there is harmonious engagement in co-management over external threats to biodiversity, with the PACs independently conducting meetings and monitoring activities since the project’s closure. This particular aspect of the management plan is discussed at the PAC meetings. The UNDP Programme unit will continue to engage with DPWM to follow up on whether the current arrangements continue. UNDP will not be facilitating these meetings as this defeats the matter of sustainability. |
| **C.2** | Facilitate ongoing collaboration with agricultural, rural development and environmental initiatives around the targeted PAs to sustain and replicate livelihood benefits (eg SLM farmer field packages, community woodlots, bee-keeping, saline tolerant rice varieties and fuel-efficient cookstoves) to surrounding communities and reduce pressure on natural resources (eg through the IFAD ROOTS project) | DPWM, GEF OFP | Immediate and ongoing | Collaboration is mainstreamed at the ANR level and maintained at the field level through the TAC. Through technical input and training, projects in PA areas integrate PAN activities, especially the SLM components. |
| **C.3** | Align UNDP-led projects with the respective outcomes to support the continued flow of socio-economic and environmental benefits. (eg, Rapid Response Facility, Small Grants Programme, climate change resilience and governance/democracy projects that empower citizens to take control of their environment, BIOFIN, etc.) | UNDP CO, GEF OFP | Immediate and ongoing | Alignment fully considered with the RFF targeting the PAs peripheral communities to cope with the impacts of COVD-19. Other UNDP-led projects in the process. Generally, the alignment processes and results are satisfactory. |
| **D** | **Category 4: Follow up strategy** | | | |
| **D.1** | A systemic improvement approach is needed to break the lack of progress achieved from the projects. This should be a programmatic approach that aims to build systemic capacity for biodiversity conservation and PA management to become self-sustaining (perhaps through a regional programme). Such systemic capacity development should take account of the IUCN Global Register of Competences for Protected Area Practitioners[[1]](#footnote-1) (which is being applied in China through the GEF C-PAR Programme) | UNDP, GEF OFP | 2021-22 | This will be considered when developing future projects to build upon the successes of the PAN project in this area. |

1. <https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/content/documents/global_register_of_competences_for_pa_practitioners_e_version_0.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)