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| Name: Tim Boyle, UN-REDD | **Tel No.** +66819005402 |
| **Approved Mission Itinerary:**BKK-Singapore-Port Moresby -BKK | **List of Annexes**:  |
| Inclusive Travel Dates: | **Key counterpart(s) in each location:** |
| 26 Oct. – 1 Nov. 2012 |   | * UNRC-O (David McLachlan-Karr)
* OCCD and PMU (Varigini Badira, Gwen Sissiou, Lydia Bobola)
* WCS (Colin Moore)
 |
| **Purpose/Objectives of Mission**To serve as a resource person in REDD+ training for Port Moresby-based stakeholders |
| **Context**PNG has been implementing its national UN-REDD Programme for 18 months, but progress has been slow, largely due to political upheavals and frequent changes in staffing and status of the OCCD. The REDD+ training represents the first step in activities under Outcome 5 to raise awareness of all stakeholders. PNG has been proposing a project-based approach to REDD+, largely influenced by the thinking of McKinsey. The training materials, prepared by WCS, tended to reflect this philosophy.  |
| **Summary of Mission Activities/ Findings****Training**Planned for 4 days, the training course started very badly when only 6 participants turned up on day 1. It was agreed to postpone the training and condense the schedule into 2 days. On the next 2 days more participants were present, peaking at about 22. Although the prepared materials strongly emphasized project-based approaches, I repeatedly emphasized the weaknesses of such an approach and the rationale for a planning-based approach. By the end of the course, and in discussions with OCCD the following day, the concept of a project-based approach appeared to have been restricted to voluntary market and CDM projects.**Concerns about internal coordination of the UN-REDD programme**Gwen S. raised this issue. In one way, the UN-REDD/PNG programme faces fewer problems than other NPs in that almost all of FAO’s work is in partnership with the PNGFA, whereas UNDP (and UNEP) work with OCCD. This arrangement conforms more closely to a classic “pass-through” joint programme than most other UN-REDD NPs. Gwen S. agreed that the main concern over coordination related to communication on planned activities and timing of activities. In fact, communications and coordination among UN agencies at the regional/global level is generally good (the current mission was originally scheduled to coincide with the recent FAO mission, and the timing was only changed to address GoPNG issues). Clearly, communication between PNGFA and OCCD is sub-optimal – this is an issue which the two GoPNG agencies need to work on. Concern was also expressed by the UNRC that he and his office were unaware of the recent FAO mission until shortly before it started, and were therefore unable to schedule a meeting with the mission members. Future such missions need to ensure that the UNRC’s office is informed well in advance.**Mission travel costs**A recurring theme during the mission was the relative infrequency of visits from UN-REDD advisors compared with support provided to other NPs. The reason is simply the excessive cost of travel to, and staying in PNG. Gwen S. agreed that costs of travel (ticket and DSA) for agency advisors could be charged against the NP budget. This agreement will apply in the first instance to a mission by the UNDP Stakeholder Engagement specialist to advise on FPIC, likely in January, 2013 (see below).**HACT micro-assessment**When the NP programme document was signed, OCCD was administratively a unit of DEC, and a micro-assessment of DEC already existed. Thus it was considered that the implementing partner was DEC, and no further assessment was required. Now, however, OCCD is administratively independent of DEC, and in the process of transitioning to become an authority. The DEC micro-assessment is therefore irrelevant. On the other hand, the feasibility of assessing an implementing partner in transition is questionable. Where a HACT micro-assessment does not exist, a default assumption of high-risk applies, and fund management arrangements should reflect this (normally direct payment or direct implementation). Both UNDP and FAO are currently applying direct payment, and Gwen S. expressed satisfaction with this arrangement. The need for eventually conducting a micro-assessment was explained, even though it is unlikely to alter current fund management arrangements. Varigini urged that a micro-assessment should be conducted soon, as the transition process may continue for one or two years.**Work planning**Work planning in 2012 was sub-optimal. An AWP was approved in August that set unrealistic disbursement targets, and no subsequent QWPs were prepared. Gwen S. and Lydia were urged to begin preparation of the AWP for 2013 now, so that it can be finalized as early as possible in 2013, and the importance of the preparation of QWPs for Q2, 3, and 4 was explained. The AWP/2013 needs to be aggressive in setting challenging disbursement targets, without setting unrealistic targets.**PMU size and structure**It was confirmed that the PMU structure is as shown below:The importance of filling all vacant positions was emphasized. The Communications position has been advertised, but only one, inadequately qualified candidate applied. It will be re-advertized as soon as possible. It was noted that this is a small PMU for such a large programme, and consideration should be given to hiring additional staff. For example, an apparently strong candidate for an awareness raising specialist participated in the REDD+ training. To support the PMU, the UNRC will investigate the possibility of recruitment of an AYAD. It is also expected that FAO will post a staff member to Port Moresby to support UN-REDD implementation.**Technical issues**In identifying opportunities for more rapid progress on the UNDP component of the programme, the following issues were discussed.Benefit distribution. Not originally part of the NP, OCCD had subsequently requested UN-REDD support on this issue, and the matter was referred to the PEB for approval. The 2nd PEB meeting did endorse activities on BDS. A PNG-based NGO, FORCET, has been working for some years on piloting PES, and have experience and expertise on PES BDS. It is therefore proposed that ToR be prepared for FORCET to undertake an analysis of requirements for a REDD+ BDS. A short-term contract with an international consultant may also be necessary to ensure that FORCET fully understand the additional complexity of a REDD+ BDS, compared with a PES BDS. This can proceed immediately.FPIC (and a project-based approach). Draft FPIC guidelines have been prepared, which a review by UNDP HQ specialists suggested to be problematic. Some of the concerns identified in the current guidelines related to the assumption of a project-based approach to REDD+. During the REDD+ training (see below), it was clarified that OCCD are considering a project-based approach only in relation to voluntary market and CDM projects. Since the UN-REDD Programme is focused on building capacity for REDD+, the issue of how FPIC for REDD+ may differ from FPIC for voluntary market.CDM projects is important. It was agreed that the UNDP/UN-REDD regional Stakeholder Engagement specialist would travel to PNG to advise on how the project-based guidelines may need to be modified and improved in order to be suitable for REDD+. Travel costs will come from the NP budget. The initial mission will probably be in January, 2013.Carbon rights. OCCD had requested UN-REDD to undertake a carbon rights study, which was not identified in the original NP. The matter was referred to the 2nd PEB meeting for endorsement, but in the interim, OCCD decided to request GIZ (CCCPIR) to undertake the study. Consequently, the PEB did not endorse the request. The GIZ study is scheduled for completion in November 2012; the report will be reviewed to analyze whether there is a need for a follow-on UN-REDD-supported study. Social safeguards. Part of Outcome 2, it was noted that FAO considered that the design of an SIS should await further guidance from the COP/SBSTA, but that this did not imply the need to delay the design of a safeguard system. However, it is important to integrate work on social and environmental safeguards, requiring UNDP to work alongside UNEP. This, in turn, requires UNEP to finalize a SSFA with OCCD, which should be pursued urgently.REDD+ training and awareness raising. Discussion of the training at the conclusion of the course emphasized that some of the materials was too complex for sub-national stakeholders, and the content needed to be adjusted accordingly. The importance of having presenters who are able to communicate complex ideas effectively was also highlighted. **FCPF/R-PP**In discussion with the UNRC, it was agreed that we are essentially obligated to respond positively to the request from the GoPNG to be the delivery partner on the R-PP. This was subsequently discussed with Gwen S. and Varigini, who were informed that the UNRC would communicate this officially.It was clarified that WCS had been asked to prepare the most recent version of the R-PP in time for submission for the recent PC meeting. WCS (Colin Moore) informed me that they had been instructed by OCCD to use the existing UN-REDD NP document as the basis for the technical content of the R-PP just so as to be able to meet the submission deadline, which is why there appears to be an enormous overlap between the R-PP and the NP document.It was agreed with Gwen S. that while WCS would continue to b responsible for addressing the TAP comments, UNDP, FAO and UNEP should be consulted regarding the technical content of the R-PP. |
| Follow up actions:* UNRC to provide response to OCCD on UNDP as R-PP delivery partner
* TB to follow up with Gwen S. and Lydia on work planning issues
* Celina to plan mission to PNG in early 2013 to advise on FPIC guidelines for REDD+ (as opposed to voluntary market/CDM projects)
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