

Points for Clarification:

- PNG will not use the RPP resource to recreate or restart any readiness process in PNG
- The RPP resources will only be used to support additional gaps, not fully covered under the existing UNREDD Programme, meanwhile complementing existing government support
- Utilize this RPP resources to draw in the expertise of the NGOs and Civil Society to work with the government and delivery partner implement those gaps
- Restrict activity implementation to Delivery Partner's Limitation. If this R-PP is approved and funding is disbursed into the UN system for implementation by UNDP, the scope of implementation will be heavily subjected to the UN Processes (Eg; Recruitment processes, funding disbursements, security and risks measures surrounding implementation). Some of the concerns for prioritization in implementation may rise in conflict with the role of UN as a delivery partner in the process.
- Draw in existing government expertise and strength in co-supporting the process, where by the government complements its support to strengthen areas where delivery partner cannot implement
- Budget will be reduced drastically, but will then be prioritized only for the areas of gaps and immediate needs,

Important Note on the Budget Columns:

- The 2012 Itemized Activities indicate those current activities funded and supported by government as well as the UNREDD Program. Most of them are intended to be continued under the additional support of this R-PP

TAP Reviewer's Comments:

No	Comments	PNG's Response
1	<u>Component 1. a</u>	<u>Issues on Capacity Building:</u> a) The targeted activities within this proposal are those existing as well as emerging activities addressing issues within the capacity and capability of the OCCD officers. At this stage the government needs the assistance of the delivery

		<p>partner to manage as well as finance activities with this funding which will be implemented not only through the OCCD but those organizations, whose lines of responsibility corresponds to the relevant activities.</p> <p>However, if capacity building is of a major concern here, then the onus would be up to government in future to do a thorough review and assessment of each of the staff's capacity building needs including those of its Technical Working Group member institutions, as well as identifying the costs associated with them and resubmit for consideration to the FCPF</p> <p>b) The OCCD coordinates all sectors including the non-forest sectors. Not having to detail the information in this R-PP doesn't mean, we don't recognize their inclusive role. It only indicates our effort to restrict the scope of the information we provide to this proposal seeking funding to enable a delivery partner maximizes its capacity in assisting government progress REDD+ in PNG. Although the inquiry on the role of the OCCD regarding this coordination is important, its relationship to be explained within this proposal bears no direct link with the future intended outcome of how this R-PP will be implemented.</p> <p>c) First of all the NFI is the obligated responsibility of FAO under the UNREDD Program, and funding is already available for that activity through the existing UNREDD Program. For NFS Staff Capacity, it's a matter of number and not expertise. What PNG is currently doing is slowly increasing its university forestry in take on an annual basis to increase the number and it costs the government more than US\$ 10 million on an annual basis to do that.</p> <p>Budget:</p>
--	--	--

		<p>a) The government here is the main funder of REDD+ in PNG. If there are other specific funding from donors or the private sector for a specific activity then it will be indicated, other wise other funding and technical support not directly related to any existing activity within this proposal will not be indicated in order to avoid prejudging the bilateral partners and donors in their commitment for REDD+ beyond 2013</p> <p>b) There is sufficient technical infrastructure and human resource at the sub-national level (Provincial, District and Local government). The issue here is not capacity but forestry plan alignment with the National REDD+ Strategy. That is why this R-PP is requesting funding assistance for the review of forestry plans at the sub-national level. Once each provincial forestry plan is reviewed an aligned with the National strategy, then provinces themselves can utilize their existing program funding to enhance their capacity building</p> <p>c) The recommendation to improve the technical capacity of technical institutions including the establishment of the Climate Change Monitoring Centre is sensible. However, the capital cost of doing business in PNG is very high, and this work would require an independent assessment and proposal, in which the current R-PP alone cannot address. Also, this R-PP 's focus has been on requesting additional funding for policy and consultation work, most of the outstanding MRV technical work have yet to be implemented by FAO under the UNREDD program.</p> <p>However, the government finds this suggestion useful for consideration in a dialogue with FAO for implementation support through the UNREDD Program as there has already been approved funding allocation for Capacity Building as well for technical experts and nationals, which is yet to be materialized through</p>
--	--	---

		<p>the role of FAO.</p> <p>d) The proposal on a Bi-Partisan committee is very well taken. Again, we cannot prejudge and pre-commit the government to establish such a committee, unless we have a fair idea on the role of this committee, its intention, as well as ability in consistently promoting greater awareness. To do this, the government will need to do a stakeholder engagement and consultation prior to availing itself to writing this into the proposal and how it will impact on the existing overall government structure for climate change in PNG.</p> <p>e) We do agree that Capacity Building is important. However, we may find ourselves in a situation of dilemma if we falsely convince ourselves that this R-PP funding can meet all capacity development needs of institutions in PNG. Though it's a concern that is genuine; the practical tasks involved and the costs associated with it goes well beyond the implementation capacity of the delivery partner, as well as the R-PP funding ceiling.</p> <p><i>(This section in the R-PP has been updated as well)</i></p>
2	Component 1.b : Consultation and Participation Process	<i>(This section in the R-PP has been updated)</i>
3	Component 1 c	This component has been reassessed and focus now has be centered on the changes done. Focus has be diverted from the pilot areas to a more general approach but restricted to the key gaps identified.
4	Component 2 a: Assessment of Land Use,	Most of the initial September comments referred to in the October comments not being addressed in terms of being very specific has been assessed and found to be

	Forest Law, Policy and Governance	<p>outside the expected requirements of this R-PP.</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>1) The recommendation regarding the extensive work being proposed to the government within this proposal on carbon rights and legislation is well taken.</p> <p>However, as a country, what is most important within this section is the need to educate people about existing land laws and regulations that will enable them to make informed decisions on how they can assist government as well as themselves manage their issues surrounding land tenureship and rights. This then makes any preceding work on carbon rights and ect, much easier for implementation by government, meanwhile being appreciated by the communities.</p> <p>2. Also take note that the activities and budget have been re-diverted as well as reprioritized also in consideration of the limited implementation capacity of the delivery partner (UNDP).</p>
5	Component 2b: REDD+ Strategy Options	<p>We also wish to advice that the R-PP funding is limited and cannot be used to address new suggested capacity initiatives. Question 4 from the September review falls outside the intended outcome of this R-PP. We want to clarify that PNG does not intend to request funding for those activities, and to basically launch ourselves into the process of providing those additional information may not only look foolish on our path but cause us to further divert the reviewer’s attention from focusing on what this R-PP intends to achieve..</p> <p>This whole section has been revised</p>
6	Component 2c: REDD+	Details:

	<p>Implementation Framework</p>	<p>The whole section has been revisited and revised</p> <p>Additional Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are existing OCCD Officers who act as the Secretariat for the REDD+ TWG 2. The home grown PES model is a model that the government of PNG has acknowledged and as such this includes the OCCD as a government organization. The PES being developed and tested in PNG, is locally orientated to suit the desired environment of accommodating incentive payment at the community level. The Study on the Benefit Sharing Distribution System to be carried out in communities will not only expand from the lessons of PES but provide an extensive variation in the models of how incentives should be distributed in PNG.
7	<p>Component 2d: Social Environmental Impact Assessment</p>	<p>Recommendations and Questions:</p> <p>This section has been reviewed</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>PNG gained independence in 1975. Everyone is well educated and are aware of their rights to engaged in meaningful participation. In such required engagements such as above, during all consultations, women are not subjected to force or persuasion to participate.</p> <p>They participate out of freewill and their willingness to engage understanding their roles as equal parties in development. The role of the National Council of Women can be very useful if this proposal was requesting FCPF for 'Incentive Funding', which makes the NCoW's role in advocating fair and equal <i>incentive sharing (REDD+ payment distribution for REDD+)</i> amongst women with a view to comparison with</p>

		<p>mining royalties.</p> <p>It's not that they cannot be included at this stage; it's the relevance of their participation and what they need to advocate on behalf of women that women themselves don't already know.</p>
8	Component 3: Develop a Reference Level	Whole Section has been revised
9	Component 4a: Design a National Monitoring System	<p><i>Additional Comments</i></p> <p>The government has taken a very firm position of ensuring that the UNREDD Program delivers on Component 3 and 4. Most of the narrative within both sections, describe those that currently fall in line with the requirements of the country's National REDD+ Strategy to be fully implemented through most of the UNREDD funding which has yet to be fully operationalize by FAO</p>
10	Component 4b	<p><i>Recommendations and Questions</i></p> <p>This section has been reviewed so as to allow government to focus on getting FAO to implement its priorities quickly under the UNREDD Program component</p> <p><i>Additional Comments:</i></p> <p>The country can only address each issue through a step wise approach. We need to see the UNREDD Programme deliver first before we start prioritized specific community MRV activities through international proposals. Its not because, we don't intend to do that, some initial work begun by NGOs and government are on-going, but to have that as an immediate priority would be after the system at the national level becomes well established, as we believe in consistency.</p>

11	Component 5 and 6	Budget Tables have been inserted
12	Annex	TORs and additional information has been provided

Response to the Review by Australia, Japan, USA, Indonesia and Germany

We have reviewed comments provided by Australia, Japan, USA, Indonesia and found them to be very specific. Most have been useful, while the rest falls outside the expected scope of the R-PP's intention. The TAP reviewer's comments are those we find useful for addressing.

The comments are noted and also addressed within the refined document.

