

TOPIC	IUCN Oceania	CI/SPREP/MSG	Secretariat Observation
Experience	<p>IUCN has a solid regional program and numerous ongoing projects in the hotspot. They have established relationships with governments of all three countries as well as with numerous civil society stakeholder groups including academia, local communities and the private sector. They have distinct programs for species and protected areas, and a focus on environmental governance and leadership, green growth and sustainability. All of these link closely to the CEPF investment strategy. The applicant presents some experience working with civil society, and the proposal provides specific examples of working directly with communities, which will be a major focus of the CEPF program. IUCN currently has field programs based in all three of the hotspot countries. IUCN has experience managing a range of large projects indicating that they would be capable of performing the role of the RIT.</p>	<p>CI has a Pacific Islands Program that nominally covers the hotspot countries but is only currently present in PNG in areas outside of the hotspot. CI's presence in the hotspot has declined over the last decade. Regardless, CI does demonstrate experience working with a wide range of potential partners, although only a small number of the examples cited are within the hotspot. SPREP has a dedicated focal area on biodiversity and ecosystem management and demonstrates significant experience in this area. They have an impressive record of securing funding and work with a wide range of organizations, yet they present limited experience with capacity building and working with local organizations and communities. The CI Pacific Islands Program in Samoa performed the role of RIT for CEPF's Polynesia-Micronesia investment and staff are well versed in CEPF grant making procedures.</p>	<p>IUCN demonstrates greater experience relevant to CEPF. Broadly speaking, CI/SPREP lacks on the ground experience in the hotspot, and specifically in working with local communities and stakeholders.</p>
Personnel	<p>There are no in-kind contributions or co-financing for staff salaries.</p> <p>IUCN staff percentages are constant throughout the eight-year investment period.</p> <p>4.1 full-time-equivalent (FTE) personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Coordinator Alan Saunders, 12%, Fiji</li> <li>• Team Leader, Admin, Luisa Tagicakibau, 100%, Fiji</li> <li>• Team Leader, Programs, Helen Pippard, 23%, Fiji</li> <li>• Program Advisor Helen Pippard, 15%, Fiji</li> <li>• Project assistant, tbd, 100%, Fiji</li> <li>• Finance assistant, tbd, 100%, Fiji</li> <li>• PNG Coordinator Gae Gowae, 15%, PNG</li> <li>• SI Coordinator Rieka Kwalai, 15%, SI</li> <li>• Vanuatu Coordinator Sarah Dodd, 15% Vanuatu</li> </ul>	<p>There are significant in-kind/co-financing contributions for staff salaries.</p> <p>SPREP staff percentages are constant throughout the investment period while CI staff time decreases each year. FTE for CI is calculated as a percentage of the total number of days in the eight-year period.</p> <p>2.15 full-time-equivalent personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RIT Manager Leilani Duffy, 37%, Samoa</li> <li>• Grant Coordinator Siniva Tuuau-Enosa, 37%, Samoa</li> <li>• Regional coordinator, tbd, 100%, Vanuatu</li> <li>• Operations, Pauline Johnson, 6%, Samoa</li> <li>• Tech Advisors Sue Taei/Terry Hills, in total 4%, Samoa/Australia</li> <li>• Development Coordinator Lela Stanley, 5%, US</li> <li>• SPREP advisors and senior staff in total, 26%, Samoa</li> </ul>	<p>IUCN presents a superior personnel plan. Their level of effort is higher, and placement of three national coordinators in all three hotspot countries is a distinct advantage. A key deficiency of the CI/SPREP application is that the identity of the regional coordinator is not yet known.</p>

Approach and Geographic Coverage	IUCN presents an acceptable plan for addressing the five components of the RIT, albeit short on detail in some areas. They propose to cover all three countries in the hotspot. They will use national coordinators in each country to work with partners speaking local languages and assist local partners to access support from CEPF. The applicant proposes an appropriate system, given the prohibitive costs of international travel, piggybacking on trips made under other IUCN projects in the hotspot. However, this may leave some islands/projects unvisited if there is not overlap with these initiatives.	CI/SPREP/MSG presents a plan that addresses four of the five components, and proposes to cover all three countries in the hotspot. They propose to have a single field staff person based in MSG in Vanuatu.  All components of the RIT-Admin TOR are adequately addressed. However, for RIT-Programs, the applicant fails to address Component 2 (Build the capacity of grantees), and this is insufficiently elaborated in the proposal. Capacity building is mentioned under the RIT Coordinator ToR but only in context of the administration role. The logframe contains numerous omissions and the work plan lacks sequencing of activities, with almost every deliverable running for the entire eight years and no breakdown by activity. The applicant makes no provisions to deal with the challenges of working in the most linguistically diverse hotspot in the world or to adapt to wide variations in capacity across the hotspot.	IUCN presents a comprehensive approach and proposes to have national coordinators based in each country in the hotspot. CI/SPREP/MSG present a plan that is less comprehensive, and inadequate to allow for frequent contact with applicants and grantees in Solomon Islands and PNG.		
Travel	IUCN proposes an allocation of \$50,400 for travel by national coordinators in their respective countries.	CI/SPREP propose approximately \$144,000 for the Vanuatu-based regional coordinator to travel twice per year during the investment period. The remaining funds (~\$46,000) would cover the manager of RIT-Administration to monitor grants and conduct capacity building. There are numerous possibilities for staff from the consortium to visit grantees on their various trips to the hotspot.	Neither applicant presents an ideal plan for travel and both would need modification prior to an award. The Secretariat considers the need to spend funds on international travel between islands because of the lack of in-country management a flaw of the CI/SPREP application.		
Budget	Combined Budgets and Notes				
		IUCN	CI/SPREP		
	Salaries	1,141,494	703,033	Salaries and Professional Services: These amounts are relatively similar if the CI subgrant is included as this \$300,000 is for salary costs for the regional coordinator.	There are two major differences in the budget: 1) with the funds allocated IUCN will provide more staff time; 2) CI/SPREP devote funds for travel allowing the RIT
	Professional Services	14,500	46,500		
	Rent and Storage	24,000	21,848		
	Telecommunications	14,400	55,669		
	Postage and Delivery	1,600	400		
	Supplies	14,260	18,600		
	Furniture and Equipment	4,446	3,500	Despite similar allocations,	

	<p>Maintenance 2,400</p> <p>Travel 50,400</p> <p>Meetings/Special Events 37,500</p> <p>Miscellaneous 0</p> <p>Sub-grants 0</p> <p>IDC 195,000</p> <p>TOTAL 1,500,000</p>	<p>0</p> <p>190,899</p> <p>16,300</p> <p>9,926</p> <p>300,000</p> <p>133,311</p> <p>1,499,986</p>	<p>IUCN's level of effort is significantly higher.</p> <p>Telecommunications: CI/SPREP place great emphasis on telecommunications based on the fact that they do not have anyone based in Solomon Islands or PNG.</p> <p>Travel: CI/SPREP allocate nearly \$18,000 per year for their Vanuatu-based regional coordinator, while IUCN's travel is exclusively domestic.</p> <p>Sub-grants: \$300,000 is CI's contribution towards the salary of the regional coordinator employed by SPREP.</p>	<p>manager to visit the hotspot four times, and for the regional coordinator to visit projects two times per year. While IUCN's travel budget is lower, it is dedicated to domestic travel only. IUCN's use of travel funds may be more efficient, but the investment may suffer if senior staff are not able to interact on the ground in the hotspot.</p>
Institutional Stability	IUCN does not anticipate any institutional or financial changes in their future.		<p>SPREP has secured multi-year funding and therefore regards the financial base of SPREP as stable. SPREP does not indicate that any institutional changes are planned for the future. CI states that it does not anticipate any major adverse institutional or funding changes affecting implementation of the RIT. CI suggests that they expect an increase in programmatic staffing effort being allocated to the greater Pacific region, including the East Melanesian Islands and specifically PNG.</p>	