



Expanding Conservation Areas Reach and Effectiveness(ECARE) in Vanuatu

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

9847

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

Project Title

Expanding Conservation Areas Reach and Effectiveness(ECARE) in Vanuatu

Countries

Vanuatu

Agency(ies)

IUCN

Other Executing Partner(s)

Government of Vanuatu, DEPC

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Biodiversity

Taxonomy

Protected Areas and Landscapes, Biodiversity, Focal Areas, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Coastal and Marine Protected Areas, Species, Threatened Species, Biomes, Mangroves, Coral Reefs, Sea Grasses, Wetlands, Tropical Rain Forests, Influencing models, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Demonstrate innovative approach, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Stakeholders, Type of Engagement, Partnership,

Information Dissemination, Consultation, Participation, Communications, Awareness Raising, Public Campaigns, Strategic Communications, Education, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Community Based Organization, Local Communities, Indigenous Peoples, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Access to benefits and services, Participation and leadership, Access and control over natural resources, Capacity Development, Gender Mainstreaming, Beneficiaries, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Gender-sensitive indicators, Women groups, Learning, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Adaptive management

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

48In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

220,541.00

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1_P1	(Focal Area Outcome 1.1) Outcome 3: Improved financial sustainability options for protected areas (Focal Area Outcome 1.2) Output 2.2. Community owned and endorsed PA Management plans and designation documentation for priority PAs submitted	GET	1,040,570.00	2,448,864.54
BD-1_P2	(Focal Area Outcome 2.1) Outcome 2. Expanded protected area network in Vanuatu	GET	801,316.00	2,018,224.52
BD-3_P6	(Focal Area Outcome 6.1) Outcome 2. Expanded protected area network in Vanuatu	GET	608,573.00	1,517,910.94
Total Project Cost(\$)			2,450,459.00	5,985,000.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

The project objective is to improve systems and capacity at all levels (community, provincial, national) to achieve a representative, effective and expanded protected areas network in Vanuatu with a focus on 3 provinces (Sanma, Malampa, Shefa) to ensure healthy ecosystems and viable livelihoods for local communities.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1. Vanuatu Framework and Strategy for Registering PAs.	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 1. Protected area policies, guidelines and knowledge developed and improved</p> <p>Indicator:</p> <p>a. PA policy and legal review</p> <p>b. Updated PA policy</p>	<p>Output 1.1. An updated legal framework and policy for PAs in Vanuatu covering terrestrial, coastal and offshore areas.</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>a. Policy and legal review report</p> <p>b. Updated policy framework</p> <p>Output 1.2. Tools and process guidelines for PA designation, management planning and effectiveness, and for integration in Area Council development plans, are enhanced and developed.</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>a. Guidelines for socioeconomic and gender equity in CCAs</p> <p>b. Management plan development guidelines</p>	GET	235,780.00	1,196,259.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
COMPONENT 2. Protected Area Management Planning, Capacity Building, and Communications	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 2. Expanded protected area network in Vanuatu</p> <p>Indicator:</p> <p>Hectares of PAs created (terrestrial and marine)</p> <p>Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector (CO2e tons)</p>	<p>Output 2.1 Socioeconomic and Ecological Field surveys of priority existing and proposed PAs conducted and new national PA categories validated.</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>a. Project CCA list</p> <p>b. FPIC documents signed by appropriate community leaders</p> <p>c. Socio-economic survey report summaries and baselines</p> <p>d. Ecological survey report summaries and baselines</p> <p>e. Number of community consultation sessions specifically engaging women</p> <p>f. Number of NiVanuatu scientists and students engaged in surveys</p> <p>Output. 2.2. Community owned and</p>	GET	1,360,906.00	3,179,751.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 3. Financial Sustainability of PAs	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome. 3. Improved financial sustainability options for protected areas</p> <p>Indicator:</p> <p>Funding gap for management of protect areas system (Number of PAs with increased income)</p> <p>Improved capacity for tourism operators to sustainably market protected area products (Tourism operators understanding)</p> <p>Community enterprises prepared to generate income related to PAs</p>	<p>Output. 3.1. Costs of running national PA network assessed</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>a. Number of national assessments</p> <p>b. Number of Ministerial staff who understand PA-running costs</p> <p>Output. 3.2. PA-related tourism in selected PAs supporting local community and kastomary owners</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>a. Number of tourism impact assessments</p> <p>b. Number of tourism income generation assessments</p> <p>c. Number of PA related tourism operators capacity improved</p> <p>d. Percentage increase of tourism</p>	GET	618,951.00	1,328,990.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 4: M&E and Knowledge Management	Technical Assistance	4. Project effectively monitored and lessons learned captured	Output 4.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators: Midterm and Final Evaluations completed Output 4.2: Knowledge management Indicators: Knowledge products are available to stakeholders	GET	120,000.00	
Sub Total (\$)					2,335,637.00	5,705,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
	GET		114,822.00		280,000.00	
	Sub Total(\$)		114,822.00		280,000.00	
	Total Project Cost(\$)		2,450,459.00		5,985,000.00	

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Government of Vanuatu	In-kind	4,215,000.00
Donor Agency	SPREP (PEBACC)	In-kind	570,000.00
GEF Agency	IUCN (BIOPAMA)	In-kind	800,000.00
GEF Agency	IUCN (Vanuatu Marine Spatial Planning)	In-kind	400,000.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)			5,985,000.00

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
IUCN	GET	Vanuatu	Biodiversity		No	2,450,459	220,541
Total Grant Resources(\$)						2,450,459.00	220,541.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required **false**

PPG Amount (\$)

100,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

9,000

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programmin g of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
IUCN	GET	Vanuatu	Biodiversity		No	100,000	9,000
Total Project Costs(\$)						100,000.00	9,000.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	10,000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	10,000.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDP A ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park	125689	Select		10,000.00		

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDP A ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	----------	---------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Indicator 2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	25,000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 2.1 Marine Protected Areas Newly created

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	25,000.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDP A ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park	125689	Select		25,000.00		

Indicator 2.2 Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	W DP A ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	-----------	---------------	----------------------------	--	----------------------------	---------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)	0	64809	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)		64,809		
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting		2022		
Duration of accounting		20		

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		47,899		
Male		49,664		
Total	0	97563	0	0

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

1. The global environmental problems, root causes and barriers identified remain unchanged but their description has been expanded on. Specificities regarding the areas of interventions have also been integrated to enable better understanding of the project context. Since the first submission, a major revision has been completed putting more emphasis on engaging communities to formalize their protected areas. Initiatives led by the Vanuatu government have been reduced. As such, the total area of protected area has been reduced from 3,000,000 ha to 35,000 ha. This is because the anticipated large areas of offshore MPAs would have been led by the central government, rather than communities. Such a large area cannot be delivered through community based resource management and on customary land.

2. The baseline situation was updated and further explained from the PIF to the Project Document. Information on the baseline situation and initiatives in Vanuatu were elaborated upon.

3. The proposed alternative scenario and logical framework of the project has been modified with a slightly reduced explicitly-focused attention to marine and offshore areas as much of that work was developed through the MACBIO project in the past year, and is continuing through the Vanuatu Marine Spatial Planning project. Coastal and offshore protected areas remain embedded in the outputs of the project.

The revised project has reduced the expected delivery of protected areas from 5,000,000 ha to 35,000 ha. The major revision required a shift from a top-down approach led by the government to a community-based conservation approach. The vast majority of the PIF's expected 5,000,000 ha were to be derived from large, off-shore marine protected areas that would be established through the government as these areas do not have the customary management approaches that dominate land and nearshore areas in Vanuatu. The revised project eliminated the top-down MPAs aspects of the project in favour of customary management that can only be applied to coastal, near-shore and terrestrial areas that are under customary community management.

We note that near-shore MPAs and terrestrial protected areas likely have higher levels of species richness than offshore areas. Near-shore and terrestrial protected areas in Vanuatu will require much more intensive community processes, consultations, and negotiations than the large off-shore areas might need. However, it is likely that the management costs will be lower and the sustainability of local protected areas will be higher. Off-shore MPAs will require significant resources in Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance that currently does not exist in Vanuatu. Local protected areas will require input from the communities but there are already good models for this and the local communities will see more benefits from their local protected areas than from the off-shore MPAs.

PIF	ProDoc	Notes
Component 1. Strengthening capacity for the management of a protected area network.	Component 1. Vanuatu framework and strategy for registering protected areas.	PIF notes: Similar to Component 1 in ProDoc ProDoc notes: Similar to Component 1 in PIF
Outcome 1.1. Government, NGOs and communities are using ECARE tools to more effectively manage protected areas.	Outcome 1. Protected area policies and guidelines developed and improved.	PIF notes: These outcomes are captured in Component 2 ProDoc notes: Revised Outcome 1.1 from PIF.
Output 1.1.1. Design of appropriate management effectiveness tools for protected areas.	Output 1.1. An updated legal framework and policy for PAs in Vanuatu covering terrestrial, coastal and offshore areas.	PIF notes: Moved to Output 2.2 in ProDoc ProDoc notes: New output
Output 1.1.2. On-the job training program designed and implemented for management effectiveness tools.	Output 1.2. Tools and process guidelines for PA designation, management planning and effectiveness, and for integration in Area Council development plans, are enhanced and developed.	PIF notes: Moved to Output 2.2 ProDoc notes: Similar to Output 1.1.1 in PIF
Output 1.1.3. Management effectiveness assessments conducted for three representative categories of protected area.		PIF notes: Moved to Output 2.3, but recognizing that management plans will be developed during the course of the project and management effectiveness assessments will be baselines.
Outcome 1.2. More comprehensive and accurate baseline information sets are being used by Government to inform protected area planning and management.		PIF notes: Part of Outcome 1 in ProDoc
Output 1.2.1. Collation of priority information about terrestrial, coastal and marine biodiversity assets and protected areas.		PIF notes: Moved to Output 2.1 in ProDoc

Output 1.2.2. Analysis of information to determine status, trends, issues and needs.		PIF notes: Moved to Output 2.1 in ProDoc
Outcome 1.3. Protected area managers and decision makers have increased awareness about the required systems and measures for improving management effectiveness.		PIF notes: Moved to Outcome 2 in ProDoc
Output 1.3.1. Awareness interventions for stakeholders designed and delivered for outcomes 1.1 and 1.2.		PIF notes: Moved to Outputs 2.2 and 2.3 in ProDoc
Component 2. Improving the financial sustainability of Vanuatu's protected area network.	Component 2. Protected Area Management Planning, Capacity Building, and Communications.	PIF notes: Moved to Component 3 in ProDoc
Outcome 2.1. Increased Government revenue for protected area is expended on management actions.	Outcome 2. Expanded protected area network in Vanuatu.	PIF notes: Mostly removed due to understanding that increased government funding is unlikely. ProDoc notes: Similar to Outcome 1.1 and Output 1.1.1 in PIF
Output 2.1.1. A comprehensive assessment of the cost of administering and operating Vanuatu's protected area network under different scenarios is undertaken and disseminated with operational and budgetary recommendations.	Output 2.1. Socioeconomic and Ecological Field surveys of priority existing and proposed PAs conducted and new national PA categories validated.	PIF notes: Moved to Output 3.1 in ProDoc ProDoc notes: Similar to Outcome 1.2 and related Outputs from PIF
Output 2.1.2. Review of existing maritime compliance systems and preparation of a strategy to optimize financial sustainability.	Output 2.2. Community owned and endorsed PA Management plans and designation documentation for priority PAs submitted.	PIF notes: Moved to Output 3.1 in ProDoc ProDoc notes: New output but implicit in Outcome 1.1 of PIF
Output 2.1.3. Legal and institutional framework for revised maritime compliance system to be given effect in law and in practice.	Output 2.3. Capacity building and support for PA tools implemented.	PIF notes: Included in Output 1.1 in ProDoc ProDoc notes: Similar to Output 1.1.2 in PIF
Outcome 2.2. Conservation stakeholders use ECARE knowledge products to improve sustainable financing mechanisms.	Output 2.4. Awareness and understanding of PAs increased at community and national levels.	PIF notes: Included in Outcome 3 in ProDoc ProDoc notes: Similar to Component 4, Outcome 4.1 and Output 4.1.1 in PIF

Output 2.2.1. Review of existing income generating enterprises for protected areas and design of good practices toolkit for national use.		PIF notes: Moved to Output 3.2 in ProDoc
Output 2.2.2. Disseminate toolkit nationally via a training program designed and trialled during the term of the project and modified as necessary for ongoing use.		PIF notes: Reduced scope. Included in Outputs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
Component. 3. Expansion of a representative network of marine protected areas.	Component. 3. Financial Sustainability of Protected Areas.	PIF notes: MPAs are included throughout all PA aspects of the project in the ProDoc without a specific MPA component ProDoc notes: Moved from Component 2 in PIF
Outcome 3.1. Government of Vanuatu increases the coverage of marine ecosystems under protection by at least 5,000,000 ha.	Outcome 3. Improved financial sustainability options for PAs.	PIF notes: Major revisions to project reduced central government involvement, as such 5,000,000 ha of offshore MPAs cannot be achieved with this project. Coastal marine areas may be designated. ProDoc notes: Similar to Outcome 2.1 in PIF but less specific and inclusive of options other than government funding.
Output 3.1.1. Collation of at least 150 marine datasets for use in the marine spatial planning processes.	Output 3.1. Costs of running national PA network assessed.	PIF notes: Already implemented by MACBIO project with ongoing support from follow-up grants ProDoc notes: Similar to Output 2.1.1 in PIF
Output 3.1.2. Three rounds of national consultations on marine spatial planning are conducted to agree Vanuatu's ocean zones.	Output 3.2. PA-related tourism in selected PAs supporting local community and kastomary owners.	PIF notes: Already implemented by MACBIO project with ongoing support from follow-up grants ProDoc notes: Similar to Output 2.2.1 in PIF
Output 3.1.3. Development of the legal and institutional basis for Vanuatu's marine spatial plan (including network of marine protected areas).	Output 3.3. Protected area-oriented sustainable community livelihoods developed.	PIF notes: Already implemented by MACBIO project with ongoing support from follow-up grants ProDoc notes: Similar to Output 2.2.1 in PIF
Output 3.1.4. Draft legal and institutional framework for the marine spatial plan, (including network of marine protected areas) to be given effect in law and in practice.		PIF notes: Implicit in Output 1.1 for offshore MPA categories

Component 4. Communication, awareness, monitoring and evaluation.		PIF notes: Communications and capacity building moved to Component 2 in ProDoc
Outcome 4.1. Key political and Administration stakeholders make decisions based on commitment to protecting Vanuatu's biodiversity.		PIF notes: Support from all stakeholders incorporated into Components 1, 2, and 3.
Output 4.1.1. One political out-reach program designed and implemented to advocate for biodiversity.		PIF notes: Implicit in Output 2.4
Outcome 4.2. Significantly more ni-Vanuatu (Government) are able to manage environmental projects and design new ones.		PIF notes: Capacity building limited to PA management capacities in ProDoc
Output 4.2.1. Project monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems established and implemented as required by agreements between funding agencies, IA and EA.		PIF notes: Project management component removed from ProDoc logframe
Output 4.2.2. Training program designed and implemented to build capacity in Government to manage and implement the current and future projects.		PIF notes: Project management component removed from ProDoc logframe

A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

NA

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

Stakeholders from government, international NGOs, national organisations, and final recipients have been detailed and their roles, means of engagement, method of information sharing, and resources required to do so, are captured in the table below.

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
Government institutions				
Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation (DEPC) / Ministry of Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology & Geo-Hazards, Environment, Energy, and Disaster Management	Lead executing agency for the project and chair of the National Project Board (NPB). Director of DEPC will chair the Project Steering Committee.	Continuously during the project implementation phase for the execution of the project.	The project is conducted by DEPC who will therefore manage all information generated by the project	The management of the project by a PMU to be hosted by DEPC has been budgeted for as well as staff time and travels for the implementation of the project.
Department of Forests (DoF), Vanuatu Fisheries Department (VFD), Department of Tourism (DoT), Department of Lands	Ministries and departments to be engaged in identification of CCAs to be surveyed, design and implementation of PAs. Department of Tourism to be engaged in Component 3. Representatives will sit on the NPB	At different stages of the project inception and implementation stages and for specific activities	Meetings will be organized when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the implementing partners	Budget is available to cover the costs of staff in workshops and meetings and some travel.
Vanuatu Cultural Centre (VKS)	VKS will be a key organization for participation in workshops, consultations, and engagement with communities. A network of PAs in Vanuatu may sit within their auspices. Will sit on PSC	At different stages of the project inception and implementation stages and for specific activities	Meetings will be organised when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the project partners.	Budget is available to cover the costs of staff in workshops and training activities.

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
Vanuatu Skills Partnership, Vanuatu Qualifications Authority (VQA), Provincial Training Boards (PTB)	The organizations will be engaged in capacity building activities, outreach to communities, development of training materials, and community capacity building activities	At different stages of the project inception and implementation stages and for specific activities	Meetings will be organised when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the project partners.	Budget is available to cover the costs of staff in workshops and training activities.
International non-government organisations				
IUCN	Implementation Agency. Observer status on the PSC. Support the DEPC to ensure execution of administrative and financial matters and will assist in key technical and scientific issues. Its role will also be to consolidate results, directly facilitate workshops and the convening of key stakeholders (consistent with its comparative advantage in capacity building), and secure national financial resources to complement project activities	Continuously during the project implementation phase. IUCN will participate in PSC meetings. Additional meetings will also be organised punctually between the PMU and the project team of cofinancing partners as required.	PSC meetings and additional meetings when necessary. All reports generated under the ECARE project will be shared with the co-financing partners. Detailed Information on the progress will be provided at PSC meetings.	Budget available for travel and staff time is included in management fees.
National organisations				

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
<p>? Malvatu Mauri Council of Chiefs, ? Vanuatu Christian Council, ? Vanuatu National Women's Council, ? Vanuatu Council of Youth</p>	<p>Contribute to selection, design and implementation on-the-ground project interventions with support from the project</p>	<p>Continuously during the project implementation phase for the implementation of the project interventions particularly under Outputs 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.3 including every stage of the PA creation process, participatory development planning, development of sustainable livelihoods</p>	<p>Meeting will be organised when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the project partners.</p>	<p>Budget is available to cover the costs of staff in workshops and training activities.</p>
<p>ACTIV ? Alternative Communities Trade in Vanuatu / EDA: Eco-livelihood Development Associates / Edenhope / VEAN ? Vanuatu Environmental Advocacy Network / VESS ? Vanuatu Environmental Science Society / Wansmol Bag</p>	<p>Experience sharing, technical insight and support to implementation according to their respective projects and expertise in particular for provinces where they are active. Key workshop and training participants.</p>	<p>At different stages of the project implementation phase to gather insight for the implementation of specific project interventions, and potentially for the actual implementation of some interventions.</p>	<p>Meeting will be organised when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the project partners.</p>	<p>Budget might be allocated to some of these partners through a service provider contract for the implementation of specific activities. This will be part of the budget lines for the service providers for each activities.</p>
Final recipients				

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
Area Councils (Village chiefs, women's groups, youth groups)	Area Councils will help form the foundations of the network of PAs in Vanuatu and provide modes of introduction to many communities. They will be one of the first points of communications with local communities.	Continuously during the project implementation phase for the awareness-raising interventions, and for data collection and knowledge-sharing activities, and contribution to implementation of project interventions	Continuous communication between the PMU and local communities on the project annual workplans, progress and results.	Outputs 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.3 of the project foresees a large amount of the GEF grant dedicated to supporting these community-based organisations.
Community-based organisations, including Vanua Tai Resource monitors network / Fisheries Resource Monitors	Take a prominent role in the design and implementation of ECARE interventions on the ground based on their specialties	Continuously during the project implementation phase for the awareness-raising interventions, and for data collection and knowledge-sharing activities, and contribution to implementation of project interventions	Continuous communication between the PMU and local communities on the project annual workplans, progress and results.	Outputs 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.3 of the project foresees a large amount of the GEF grant dedicated to supporting these community-based organisations.
Community Disaster Committees (CDCs).	CDCs are a recognized success in Vanuatu community organizing. They will be key components of building a network of PAs in Vanuatu and for lessons on building community champions and networks.	Continuously during the project implementation phase for the awareness-raising interventions, and for data collection and knowledge-sharing activities, and contribution to implementation of project interventions	Continuous communication between the PMU and local communities on the project annual workplans, progress and results.	Outputs 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.3 of the project foresees a large amount of the GEF grant dedicated to supporting these community-based organisations.

Documents

Title

Submitted

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only; Yes

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor; Yes

Other (Please explain)

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

This project proposes to build on the strengths of traditional gender specific roles and responsibilities but also to empower women to re-establish more balanced relationships, leading to improved gender equality, including through the following avenues:

? in line with the decentralisation reform, women representatives at Area Council levels will form an integral part of the decision-making process pertaining to natural resource planning and Protected Areas identification and management within their Area Council. At this level, as well as Provincial levels, women's networks are well established and women representatives, elected by their peers, are respected, often well-educated and powerful (which is less evident at national levels). The central role of Area Councils in the identification and oversight of Protected Areas guarantees that the necessary checks and balances as well as gender equality in decision-making are in place.

? Natural resource management initiatives undertaken under the ECARE project will recognise the important and specific role of women and will strengthen women's groups. It is planned that some project initiatives (and training modules) will focus on food security and food preservation, management of waste, or protection of specific natural resources used for cultural purposes (such as

Pandanus species used for traditional mat weaving). All these areas are the domain of women and women's groups (that already exist in most villages) and will be further empowered to manage these project components

Documents

Title

Submitted

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

Gender and GESI have been included throughout the Outputs of the project and included in the project results framework. Many activities have gender disaggregated indicators.

Output 1.1. An updated legal framework and policy for PAs in Vanuatu covering terrestrial, coastal and offshore areas.

Ensure that gender and equality are included in the consultation process and in the updated PA policy. Ensure the updated PA policy aligns with Vanuatu's National Gender Equality Policy

Output 1.2. Tools and process guidelines for PA designation, management planning and effectiveness, and for integration in Area Council development plans, are enhanced and developed.

ECARE will ensure that gender and equality are included in the consultations processes and resulting guidelines. Area Councils include a gender component in their composition to ensure that women's views are part of Area Council process in Vanuatu.

Output 2.1. Socioeconomic and Ecological Field surveys of priority existing and proposed PAs conducted and new national PA categories validated.

Socio-economic surveys will include gender-related data collection and be sensitive to gender when studies are undertaken, including GESI training for enumerators. An indicator for women's inclusion is part of the monitoring framework

Output 2.2. Community owned and endorsed PA Management plans and designation documentation for priority PAs submitted

Management plans will include sections on GESI. Management plan consultations will be designed to be GESI-sensitive and to ensure meaningful engagement with women.

Output 2.3. Capacity and support for PA tools built

Trainings will target women in each province for capacity building. Training materials and courses will be designed for GESI sensitivity.

Output 2.4. Awareness and understanding of PAs increased at community and national level
Awareness materials will be designed for GESI sensitivity and include GESI issues and the benefits of protected areas for women and vulnerable people.

Output 3.2 PA-related tourism in selected PAs supporting local community and kastomary owners
Women's businesses will be targeted for income generation assessments and trainings/ capacity building.

Output 3.3. Protected area-oriented sustainable community livelihoods developed.
Livelihood toolkits developed under Output 3.3 will employ a GESI approach and cross-visits will include women in capacity building activities and visits.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

Many Outputs and Activities have GESI and gender disaggregated indicators.

A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

Vanuatu is one of the most highly exposed countries in the world to climate change to disaster risks. The Vanuatu Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Policy (2016-2030) outlines the main climate risks and sets a series of strategic priorities for the country. These priorities are clustered around governance, finance, knowledge and information, adaptation and disaster risk reduction, low-carbon development, and response and recovery. ECARE contributes to several of these strategic priorities. By helping to protect critical ecosystems and protect biodiversity, ECARE will be helping Vanuatu and NiVanuatu communities to reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts by having healthy and functioning ecosystems that they can rely upon for livelihoods.

The main climate change risks that Vanuatu faces include (*inter alia*):

? by 2040, daily temperatures will increase from 1995 levels by 1.2°C;

- ? sea level rise will continue and accelerate;
- ? ocean acidification will degrade 80% of coral reefs within 20 years;
- ? extreme temperatures will reach higher levels and become more frequent;
- ? extreme weather events, including cyclones and storms, will increase in intensity but not necessarily in frequency;
- ? dry periods will last longer; and
- ? extreme rainfall will be more frequent and intense.

Projected consequences of climate change include:

- ? reduced availability of fresh water;
- ? shifts in crop seasonality of harvest, planting and fruiting;
- ? more pests and diseases of animals, crops and trees;
- ? saltwater inundation and intrusion of coastal land and groundwater;
- ? compromised food security;
- ? coral reef deterioration;
- ? reduced fisheries productivity;
- ? increased risk of human disease and health problems, including vector-borne disease transmission and heat related illness;
- ? damage to infrastructure;
- ? loss of coastal land; and
- ? reduced economic growth and revenue generation.

ECARE will contribute to strategic actions, including:

Strategic action	ECARE contribution
7.1. Governance	

Strengthening climate change and disaster risk reduction capacity of provincial, municipal and area council personnel;	Several ECARE activities will focus on Area Council capacity to understand ecosystem values and to protect ecosystems.
7.4 Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction	
7.4.5 Ecosystem-based approaches	
Prioritising adaptation and risk reduction actions that build on, incorporate and protect taboos, conservation areas, heritage sites, locally managed areas and vulnerable habitats and ecosystems and carbon sinks;	Outcomes 1, 2, and 3 focus on protected areas that include taboo areas, conservation areas and locally managed areas to protect ecosystems that will be better enabled to adapt to impacts of climate change.
Utilising sound land-use planning approaches, and implementing and enforcing ecosystem-related development policy documents (e.g. Land Use Planning Policy, Foreshore Development Act, Physical Planning Act).	Outcomes 1 and 2 will build capacity for communities and Area Councils to plan for ecosystem-related development.

The main risks identified are summarized below:

Risk description	Probability	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)	Risk Owner
External risk					
Climate variability (e.g. drought, cyclone, storm surges)	Med	High	Med	Special attention to the impacts of recovery and post disaster actions in priority protected areas	DEPC PMU
Technical and operational risks					

Risk description	Probability	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)	Risk Owner
<p>Limited Understanding of and commitment to the value of an expanded and representative protected areas network</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Med</p>	<p>Med</p>	<p>Awareness and information campaign designed and Implemented (Outputs 2.2, 2.3).</p> <p>The increase of visibility of protected areas resulting from project activities should significantly increase the interest for conservation which is problematic in Vanuatu (Outputs 1.1, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1)</p>	<p>Ministry of Climate Change</p> <p>DEPC</p> <p>PMU</p>

Risk description	Probability	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)	Risk Owner
Low level of cooperation and coordination between stakeholders (between relevant sectors and between central and decentralized administration)	Med	Med	Med	<p>The joint involvement of the different relevant sectors in most of project activities should lead to better cross-sector integration and new synergies. (Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1)</p> <p>Systematic information and the involvement of decentralized entities must also foster a good cross-sectoral integration at the local level (Output 1.3, Output 2.3, 3.3)</p> <p>Outputs of the component 4 will bring additional support to ensure cooperation and coordination between stakeholders</p>	<p>Ministry of Climate Change</p> <p>DEPC</p> <p>Relevant sectoral departments (Forestry, Fisheries, Agriculture)</p> <p>ECARE coordination</p> <p>Decentralized authorities (Province, Area Councils)</p>
Weak implementation capacity at the local and institutional levels	High	Med	High	<p>Capacity building through innovative approaches (peer to peer, learning by doing) constitutes a major part of project activities. (Output 3.3)</p> <p>Most of the activities are rooted in traditional knowledge and practices relaying on already existing good practices (Outputs 1.3, 2.1, 3.3)</p>	<p>Ministry of Climate Change</p> <p>DEPC</p> <p>PMU</p>
Delays for the preparation of designation and/or registration documentation	Med	Med	Med	Respective requirements for the preparation of designation/registration documentation for each registered CCA must be tailored according to the specifics of the CCA and the Area Council. (Outputs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3)	<p>Ministry of Climate Change</p> <p>DEPC</p> <p>ECPMU</p>

Risk description	Probability	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)	Risk Owner
Delays in work plan and procurement plans validation and disbursements	Med	Med	Low	Guarantee the fluidity of administrative and project management IUCN procedures (Component 4)	IUCN Oceania Regional Office Ministry of Climate Change PMU
Poor reliability of rapid assessment outputs	Med	Med	Med	Special attention must be given to the field survey methodology quality (Output 1.3), based on existing Melanesia adapted surveys.	PMU Survey contractors
Poor project delivery	Low	High	Low	Institution structure and coordination meetings Mid-term evaluation Annual audits	PMU Ministry of Climate Change
Changing priorities of the government	Low	High	Low	Institution structure and coordination meetings	PMU Ministry of Climate Change
Weak engagement of government participants	Med	Med	Med	Institution structure and coordination meetings Mid-term evaluation Close engagement of ECARE Coordination with Ministry of Climate Change	PMU Ministry of Climate Change

Risk description	Probability	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)	Risk Owner
Lack of potential training candidates in government	High	Low	Low	Close engagement of ECARE Coordination with Ministry of Climate Change	PMU Ministry of Climate Change

Risk description	Probability	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)	Risk Owner
Covid-19 disruptions to project implementation	Med	Med	Med	<p>The current global health crisis associated with COVID 19 has the potential to redirect the attention and resources of the Government of Vanuatu and other stakeholders towards this challenge and affect the overall operations of the project. As of October 2020, Vanuatu remains Covid-free. Travel within Vanuatu remains unaffected. Travel to Vanuatu by outside experts, the Chief Technical Advisor (if not currently in Solomon Islands) and other consultants will be difficult for the foreseeable future. Efforts will be made to mitigate this through prioritising local consultants, hiring local liaisons for outside consultants, and utilising virtual meetings..</p> <p>The project has integrated adaptive management instruments into its design and will apply these instruments to adapt as necessary to this risk. The inception workshop will be used to review the results framework and project timeline to determine if there is a need to make any adjustments due to operational challenges, funding, stakeholder involvement and partnerships as a result of the global health situation. The quarterly and annual reporting and review process will also be used to assure the project is able to adapt in a timely means.</p> <p>In addition, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be reviewed and finalized at project inception. As necessary, adjustments to the means and timing of engagement will be made to assure that relevant stakeholder groups are able to be represented and participate in key consultation and decision-making processes. The knowledge management and communication strategy and associated activities proposed for knowledge management at the landscape, cross-landscape, national and regional levels will also be developed taking into consideration</p>	

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The execution of the project will be under the responsibility of Ministry of Climate Change Adaptation (MCCA), Meteorology & Geo-Hazards, Energy, Environment and National Disaster Management, through the Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation (DEPC). A National Project Board (NPB), chaired by the Ministry of Climate Change Adaptation will be responsible for guiding the project implementation, advising the National Project Manager and the PMU when needed, and validating reports. A Project Steering Committees (PSC) chaired by DEPC will be established in support of the NPB. IUCN is the implementing agency for the project and will support the Ministry of Climate Change Adaptation to ensure execution of administrative and financial matters and will assist in key technical and scientific issues. Its role will also be to consolidate results, directly facilitate workshops and the convening of key stakeholders (consistent with its comparative advantage in capacity building), and secure financial resources to complement project activities.

Details and a diagram of the institutional arrangements for project implementation are noted in Section 19 of the Project Document.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The project aim to improve progress towards an ecologically representative network of protected areas and related natural resources, will also deliver improved socio-economic and territorial resilience of communities in Vanuatu that depend on these natural resources. Particular interventions to increase socio-economic benefits include those under Output 3.2 with capacity building on income generating activities for PA tourism actors, and Output 3.3 with a best practice livelihoods and income toolkit combined with peer to peer cross visits and training, plus community enterprise training covering financial literacy, business plans and bookkeeping.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user- friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites,

guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

The project will be producing reports on ecological field surveys and socioeconomic surveys of the 60 CCAs and depositing these with DEPC. It is anticipated that they will be made available on the DEPC website and its associated online GIS system (<https://environment.gov.vu>). A workshop and associated communications will share the results of the surveys. The tools and process guidelines for PA establishment and management will be printed and deposited with DEPC. They will be printed and distributed to stakeholders throughout the project's implementation provinces and sites. The project will culminate in a series of peer-to-peer trainings between PA community stakeholders who will share lessons learned and best practices with their counterparts from other PA s and sites. The results of the tourism studies will be shared through national and local dialogues with local tourism industry stakeholders. The outreach and communications component of the project will be depositing materials with the DEPC for archiving and distribution to other stakehodlers inside and outside of government.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

Vanuatu has a policy framework which places protected areas as a key mechanism for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The project is fully consistent with this framework and uses the Government 2020 targets. The NEPIP 2016-2030, the NSDP 2030 and National Ocean Policy all strongly encourage the creation and maintenance of conservation and protected area networks throughout the country and recommend that they be supported at the local, provincial and national levels. Protected areas, through the concept of nature-based solutions, also contribute directly to community resilience, contributing to adaptation to climate change objectives.

These national level strategies have set ambitious targets for 2030, as set out in the NBSAP, which the project will support, including at least 15% of natural forest and 10% of wetland areas conserved through effective community and government management measures, 90% of community management committees complying with their CCA reporting obligations to DEPC and. by 2020, ten registered CCAs in Vanuatu. The conservation areas management strategy within the NBSAP proposes an expansion of a representative network of protected areas, improving protected area management effectiveness and developing sustainable financing mechanisms. The NBSAP also mentions the need to consider different status for protected areas.

ECARE will mainly build on NBSAP achievements, setting up an overarching framework for conservation in Vanuatu providing:

- ? More visibility to protected areas and conservation effort in Vanuatu.

- ? A significant increase of the geographic distribution of Vanuatu biodiversity heritage and knowledge through socio-economic and ecological surveying and monitoring of key biodiversity areas

- ? A better concentration and targeting of governmental conservation effort on nationally most relevant protected areas.

In this view, ECARE will provide crucial support for NBSAP implementation;

Taking into account the existing and necessary alignment between sectoral policies, we will examine here the relations and consistency between ECARE and NBSAP's objectives and focus areas. Nevertheless, ECARE achievements will contribute to the objectives pursued by other strategies and policies such as adaptation to climate change, disaster risk reduction, IUU and Ocean Policy. ECARE is also in line with the MACBIO project and uses the SUMAs as proxies for marine KBAs.

The project will directly contribute to Vanuatu's ability to implement the NBSAP and to meet its reporting obligations, using information that will be collected during the roll-out of the project. Similarly, lessons learnt - especially from the capacity building activities - should inform the NCSA process and further needs. Future NPFE should also benefit from the knowledge acquired during the implementation of the project through the monitoring, evaluation and capitalization processes (including Tracking Tools).

NBSAP STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	ECARE CONTRIBUTION AND ALIGNMENT
STRATEGIC AREA 1: CONSERVATION AREA MANAGEMENT	
Objective CA1a	Very high level of contribution and alignment
<p>To carry out marine, terrestrial and inland waters biodiversity rapid assessment, inventories and threat identification, gap analyses and prioritization to guide the development of a national representative network of CAs.</p>	<p>The project fully contributes to the main elements of the action plan. In particular, output 1.2 will allow the development and enhancement of tools and processes for registration of all conservation areas in Vanuatu, leading to a validated prioritized list according to their conservation objectives. These priorities will contribute to the development of a national representative network of CAs.</p> <p>2.1 where field surveys and community consultations are to be conducted to collect, compile, analyse and validate critical baseline data on existing, proposed and new CAs which will feed into output 1.2.</p>
Objective CA1b	High level of contribution and alignment
<p>To develop and apply an implementation plan to meet Vanuatu's CA targets in terrestrial, marine and inland waters protected</p>	<p>ECARE project, especially through the output 1.2. and 2.1. will provide useful data to develop priority biodiversity areas maps, description of Vanuatu's environment and develop typologies of terrestrial and marine protected areas</p>
Objective CA2a	Moderate contribution and alignment
<p>Develop a national information system, database and monitoring framework for Vanuatu's CAs to assess the management effectiveness of CAs, and promote adaptive management.</p>	<p>The data provided by Field Surveys, (output 1.2.) will be integrated into Vanuatu's data management systems (eg under the INFORM project) which will also manage data related to monitoring of management effectiveness implemented using tools enhanced and developed during the project (output 1.2). The PAAG and other awareness activities will reinforce the capacity of learning and adaptive management.</p>
Objective CA2b	High level of contribution and alignment
<p>To develop context specific co-management plans, recognising both informal and formal CA sites at national, provincial and local level.</p>	<p>Output 1.2 will update and improve guidelines for the development of management plans for each CCA and PA. Part of capacity building activities will focus on management plan development not only for capacity building, but also for implementation (output 2.3.). Monitoring and evaluation of PA management will be supported by adapted tools developed under the output 1.2. The full involvement in all project activities of relevant departments of Central administration, decentralized authorities at the Provincial and Area Council level, and communities will contribute to developing joint awareness and alignment between all the stakeholders, providing new opportunities for co-management arrangements. The field survey operations will also include the identification of co-management good practice</p>

NBSAP STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	ECARE CONTRIBUTION AND ALIGNMENT
Objective CA2c Very high level of contribution and alignment	
To maintain the integrity of PA networks by ensuring they are recognised and supported by other sectors including in the National Sustainable Development Plan and other government policies and frameworks.	The project will contribute to the integration of the national systems of PA at all levels. At the community and Area Council level, field survey activities (output 1.3) involve decentralized stakeholders jointly with the communities. At the same time, output 1.2 will provide clear guidelines for the integration of PA management plans into provincial and Area Councils land use and development planning. At the central level, all relevant departments will be fully involved in the activities of Component 1 and 2. Finally, Protected Areas Advisory Group (PAAG) will strongly reinforce the flow of information to all the stakeholders at all levels. The awareness campaign carried out under output 2.4. will especially target staff of other Ministries, central and decentralised administration.
Objective CA3 Moderate contribution and alignment	
To establish sustainable financing mechanisms to support the establishment, management and long-term effectiveness of protected areas.	Through component 3, the project will provide a detailed overview of the financial requirements for running a national systems of PAs, including identification of potential governmental and other resources that to needs mobilisation to support and improve the establishment and effective management of a national PAs (Output 3.1). The project will also, work jointly with the Ministry of Tourism; identify measures to limit adverse effects of tourism on biodiversity (output 3.2.).
Objective CA4 Very high level of contribution and alignment	
To develop and collate best practice guidelines and disseminate among local and national conservation area sites.	Through output 1.2., the project will help identify existing good practices at the level of CCAs. The objective of the output 2.3 is the development of a capacity building approach based on the concrete replication of good practices where the trainers are community ?champions? working on replicating their practices in other communities. The PAAG will also contribute to the development of the necessary network of stakeholders to ensure sharing and dissemination of good practice. This networking approach, with the support of IUCN regional office, will also address the regional level through projects such as BIOPAMA and networks including the Pacific Island Roundtable for Nature Conservation and IUCN Regional Conservation Forums.
STRATEGIC AREA 2: FOREST AND INLAND WATERS ECOSYSTEMS CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT	
Objective FIW1 High level of contribution and alignment	

NBSAP STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	ECARE CONTRIBUTION AND ALIGNMENT
The forest and inland waters ecosystem are managed in an integrated and sustainable manner to maintain the ecosystem functions of forest and inland waters and contribute to local and national economies and social well-being.	Field survey activities (output 2.1.) contributes to improving and updating information on status of forest and inland waters biodiversity and identify the root causes of major threats to forest and inland waters ecosystems. The awareness campaign on PAs (output 2.4), and capacity building and implementation support for PA tools as well as Output 2.3 where capacities of the various level of governance and management improved to support and manage the implementation of the PA tools. Additionally, outputs 3.2 and 3.3 cements this alignment as sustainable financing and local livelihoods are critical to effective management, and integration of PAs into local and national economies.
Objective FIW2	Moderate contribution and alignment
Establishment of effective forest and inland waters conservation in important biodiversity areas with effective sustainable financing to support management in the long term.	All the activities of ECARE project will contribute to this objective, including possibility for international designation of the most relevant protected areas with regards to KBAs and SUMAs.
STRATEGIC AREA 3: COASTAL AND MARINE ECOSYSTEMS CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT (CME)	
Objective CME1	Very high level of contribution and alignment
Improve understanding and status of coastal and marine ecosystems through research, resource assessments, threat identification and mitigation and information management	All the activities and outputs of the project are fully consistent and in synergy with this objective and its sub-objectives. ECARE will also give added-value to MACBIO achievements, and relay its messages for awareness.
Objective CME2	Moderate contribution and alignment
Scale up successes in sustainable fisheries management in customary fishing grounds including use of locally managed marine areas tools (e.g. <i>tabus</i>) and put in place supportive enabling mechanisms.	ECARE output 2.3 will support the dissemination and replication of good practices, including Community Based Area Management (CBAM), and coastal rehabilitation in post disaster/climate change affected areas.
Objective CME3	Moderate contribution and alignment
Improve management of Vanuatu's marine resources within the EEZ	ECARE component 1 will bring a strong contribution to this component through the designation of coastal and inshore MPAs. With component 2, ECARE will contribute to awareness at all level regarding conservation and management of EEZ marine resources. Biological information issued from field survey operations will also contribute for building national marine data infrastructure.

NBSAP STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	ECARE CONTRIBUTION AND ALIGNMENT
STRATEGIC AREA 4: SPECIES MANAGEMENT	
ECARE will contribute globally to this strategic area improving conservation condition of most protected areas in Vanuatu. Threatened, endangered and endemic species taken into account in the selection of PAs through KBAs and SUMAs developed. Information on threatened, endangered, and endemic species integrated to all the training packages.	
STRATEGIC AREA 5: MANAGEMENT OF INVASIVE Alien SPECIES (MIAS)	
ECARE will contribute globally to this strategic area improving conservation condition of most of the protected areas in Vanuatu, and taking into account invasive species in the characterization/Categorisation framework developed for field survey operations. Information on invasive species integrated to all the training packages and into the school awareness program.	
STRATEGIC AREA 6: MAINSTREAMING BIODIVERSITY ACROSS SECTORS AND SOCIETY (MB)	
Objective EEM1a	Very high level of contribution and alignment
Ensure environment and related policy frameworks are in place	ECARE's contribution to this objective will mainly relate to output 1.1., updating, revising and developing legal and policy frameworks for Vanuatu. The information and awareness outreach programme developed for output 2.4. also contributes to the sub-objectives MB 1.2., MB 1.3, MB 1.5.

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the proposed project will be conducted in accordance with established IUCN and GEF procedures/guidelines. The Ministry of Climate Change / DEPC with the support of IUCN will be in charge of the ongoing M&E of the project throughout the implementation period and will ensure it meets the obligations of the Ministry regarding GEF. The standard M&E reports and procedures required for all IUCN/GEF projects will apply to the M&E plan for the proposed project, including the following elements in the table below.

M&E activities, timeframe and responsibilities

M&E activity	Description	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
-------------------------	--------------------	------------------	--------------------	----------------------------

M&E activity	Description	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
Inception Workshop and Report	The Inception Workshop gathering the stakeholders involved in the project, and resulting Inception Report, provide the occasions and means to finalize preparations for the implementation of the proposed project, involving the formulation of the first annual work plan, the detailing of stakeholder roles and responsibilities, and that of reporting and monitoring requirements. Considering the consultation process at PPG, only minor adjustments are expected.	Within the first two months of project start up. Will be undertaken at the national and provincial scales.	PMU Ministry CC CTA IUCN ORO	US\$ 15,000
Baseline study	The project logical framework ? particularly the reference level of the SMART indicators ? will be fine-tuned where necessary.	At project inception.	PMU Ministry CC CTA IUCN ORO	None
Strategic Result Framework	The Project Results Framework presented in section 2 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. Measurements of means of verification for project progress on output and implementation will be made throughout the implementation period.	Data collected continuously in order to have the required quantitative and qualitative data on the progress against each indicator prior to Annual Project Reports and to the definition of annual work plans.	PMU Ministry CC CTA	None
Quarterly Progress Report	Each quarter, the PMU will prepare a summary of the project?s substantive and technical progress towards achieving its objectives. The summaries will be reviewed and cleared before being sent to the IUCN Regional Program Coordinator.	Quarterly	PMU Ministry CC CTA IUCN ORO	None

M&E activity	Description	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
Annual Project Report (APR)	The APR covers performance assessments on project outputs and outcomes, major achievements, evidence of success, constraints, lessons learned and recommendations as well as an overall rating of the project. The APR will be prepared by the Project Coordinator after consultation with the relevant stakeholders, and will be submitted to IUCN.	Annually	PMU CTA IUCN ORO	None
Tripartite Review (TPR) (Steering committee)	The TPR members will meet twice a year to assess the progress of the project and make decisions on recommendations to improve the design and implementation of the project in order to achieve the expected results.	Twice a year	PMU CTA IUCN ORO	None
Mid-term review workshop and report	A mid-term review workshop gathering the stakeholders involved in the project, and resulting Mid-term Report, provide the occasions and means to review the implementation of the project, involving the possible revision of the remaining annual work plans, and deliverables.	End of Year 2 or Beginning of Year 3	PMU Ministry CC CTA IUCN ORO	US\$ 15,000
Independent External Evaluation at mid-term	A mid-term project evaluation will be conducted during the third implementation year, focusing on relevance; performance (effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness); issues requiring decisions and actions; and initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.	At the mid-point of project implementation.	IUCN ORO	US\$ 40,000
Independent External Evaluation at termination of the project	A final evaluation, which occurs three months prior to the final TPR meeting, focuses on the same issues as the mid-term evaluation but also covers impact, sustainability, and follow-through recommendations, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals.	At least three months before the end of project implementation.	IUCN ORO	US\$ 50,000

M&E activity	Description	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
Terminal Project Report	A Terminal Project Report will be prepared for the terminal meeting.	On completion of the terminal evaluation.	PMU Ministry CC CTA IUCN ORO	None
Budget revisions	Project budget revisions will reflect the final expenditures for the preceding year, to enable the preparation of a realistic plan for the provision of inputs for the current year. It is expected that significant revisions will be cleared with the IUCN/GEF Coordinator for consistency with the GEF principle of incremental and GEF eligibility criteria before being approved.	At least every year and as necessary during the course of the project	PMU Administration and Finance Officer Ministry CC CTA IUCN ORO	None
Audits	A financial audit will be undertaken every year. The PMU will develop and implement a strategy to address audit recommendations after each audit.	Annually	PMU Administration and Finance Officer IUCN ORO	Budgeted under PMC (US\$ 40,000)
TOTAL indicative COST				US\$ 120,000

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Sheila Aggarwal-Khan	5/29/2019	Andrew Foran		andrew.foran@iucn.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project Results Framework					
Objective/Outcome/Output	Indicators	Baseline	End of project targets	Source of verification	Assumptions / Risks
<p>The project objective is to improve systems and capacity at all levels (community, provincial, national) to achieve a representative, effective and expanded protected areas network in Vanuatu with a focus on 3 provinces (Sanma, Malampa, Shefa) to ensure healthy ecosystems and viable livelihoods for local communities.</p>	<p>1. Terrestrial protected areas created - hectares</p>	0	10,000	Government documents	<p>No major natural event linked with weather events, volcanism or seismic such as Cyclone Pam (2015)</p> <p>Continuity of political commitment already expressed in Environment and Ocean policies</p>
	<p>2. Marine protected areas created - hectares</p>	0	25,000		
<p>Component 1. VANUATU FRAMEWORK AND STRATEGY FOR REGISTERING PAs</p>					
<p>Outcome 1. Protected area policies, guidelines and knowledge developed and improved</p>	<p>a. PA policy and legal review</p> <p>b. Updated PA policy</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p>	<p>a. 1</p> <p>b. 1</p>	<p>a. Review document as submitted to DEPC</p>	<p>Assumptions: Communities associated with proposed CCAs have had some level of engagement previously</p> <p>Risk: Land ownership issues may make some high priority sites difficult to register</p>

<p>Output 1.1. An updated legal framework and policy for PAs in Vanuatu covering terrestrial, coastal and offshore areas.</p>	<p>a. Policy and legal review report</p> <p>b. Updated policy framework</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p>	<p>a. 1</p> <p>b. 1</p>	<p>a. Review document as submitted to DEPC</p> <p>b. Workshop report</p>	<p>Assumption: Political support at national and provincial levels is high for amending PA categories list</p> <p>Risk: Changing priorities of the government may delay action on this point</p>
<p>Output 1.2. Tools and process guidelines for PA designation, management planning and effectiveness, and for integration in Area Council development plans, are enhanced and developed.</p>	<p>a. Guidelines for socioeconomic and gender equity in CCAs</p> <p>b. Management plan development guidelines adapted for community use</p> <p>c. Positive community feedback on guidelines</p> <p>d. Area Councils adopt PA guidelines into planning process</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p> <p>c. 0</p> <p>d. absent</p>	<p>a. 1</p> <p>b. 1</p> <p>c. 80%</p> <p>d. present</p>	<p>a. Guideline documents as submitted to DEPC</p> <p>b. Workshop report</p>	<p>Assumption: Existing tools from the region can be adapted to the Vanuatu context with adequate consultation with Vanuatu stakeholders</p> <p>Risk: Too many guidelines will overwhelm stakeholders at all levels without adequate training and outreach</p>

Component 2. Protected Area Planning, Building, and Communications					
<p>Outcome 2. Expanded protected area network in Vanuatu</p>	<p>Hectares of PAs created (terrestrial and marine)</p> <p>Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector (CO2e tons)</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>a. 10,000 ha (forest and coastal) (2%)</p> <p>b. 25,000 ha (coastal and marine)</p> <p>c. 64,809</p>	<p>Designation papers submitted to DEPC</p>	<p>Assumption: Field surveys will be conducted in a timely fashion, allowing the management plans to be based on sound data.</p> <p>Risk: Management plan development triggers land disputes around CCA areas and slows progress.</p>
<p>Output 2.1. Socioeconomic and Ecological Field surveys of priority existing and proposed PAs conducted and new national PA categories validated.</p>	<p>a. Project CCA list</p> <p>b. FPIC documents signed by appropriate community leaders</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p>	<p>a. 1</p> <p>b. 5</p>	<p>a. List of sites to be surveyed submitted to DEPC</p> <p>b. FPIC documents submitted to DEPC</p>	<p>Assumption: Access to priority sites will be granted after proper FPIC engagement</p>

	<p>c. Socio-economic survey report summaries and baselines</p> <p>d. Ecological survey report summaries and baselines</p> <p>e. Number of community consultation sessions specifically engaging women</p> <p>f. Number of NiVanuatu scientists and students engaged in surveys</p>	<p>c. 0</p> <p>d. 0</p> <p>e. 0</p> <p>f. 0</p>	<p>c. 5</p> <p>d. 5</p> <p>e.5</p> <p>f. >10</p>	<p>c. Survey report summary documents submitted to DEPC</p> <p>d. Survey report summary documents submitted to DEPC</p>	<p>Risk: Weather and natural disaster may delay field surveys requiring a reprioritisation of sites or diverted government support</p>
<p>Output 2.2. Community owned and endorsed PA Management plans and designation documentation for priority PAs submitted</p>	<p>a. Number of management plans</p> <p>b. Number of consultations engaging women and/or vulnerable people</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p>	<p>a. >5</p> <p>b. 10</p>	<p>Management plans as submitted to DEPC</p>	<p>Assumption: Based on sound community engagement protocols and FPIC process, communities will be positively inclined to managing resources and CCAs</p>

	<p>c. Percentage of community members consulted on management plan</p> <p>d. Percentage of consulted community members agreeing to management plan</p>	<p>c. 0</p> <p>d. 0</p>	<p>c. 75</p> <p>d. 75</p>	<p>Consultation reports</p>	<p>Risk: Communities may change their mind and decide not to declare CCAs as protected areas, requiring the project to move to other areas down the priority list.</p>
<p>Output 2.3. Capacity and support for PA tools built</p>	<p>a. Number of people attending trainings</p> <p>b. Percentage of participants reporting satisfaction with training</p> <p>c. Average percentage increase in capacity</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p> <p>c. 0</p>	<p>a. 500</p> <p>b. 80</p> <p>c. 10</p>	<p>a. Training workshop reports</p> <p>b. Workshop surveys</p> <p>c. Pre/Post workshop assessments</p>	<p>Assumption: Participants identified for training will come from many levels of stakeholders including communities, women, and youth.</p> <p>Risk: Government participants will not be available due to other commitments and the lack of potential training candidates in government</p>
<p>Output 2.4. Awareness and understanding of PAs increased at community and national level</p>	<p>a. Number of awareness materials distributed</p>	<p>a. 0</p>	<p>a. 500</p>	<p>a. Copies of awareness materials</p>	<p>Assumption: Previous protected area campaigns and messaging can be built upon</p>

	<p>b. Percentage increase in protected area awareness in targeted communities</p> <p>c. Percentage increase in protected area awareness on Area Councils</p>	<p>b. 0</p> <p>c. 0</p>	<p>b. 20</p> <p>c. 50</p>	<p>b. Pre/post awareness event/campaign surveys</p> <p>c. Pre/post awareness event/campaign surveys</p>	<p>Risk: Some communities may have previously had poor experiences with protected areas and need additional communication techniques to overcome</p>
Component 3. Financial Sustainability of Pas					
Outcome 3: Improved financial sustainability options for protected areas	<p>Funding gap for management of protect areas system (Number of PAs with increased income)</p> <p>Improved capacity for tourism operators to sustainably market protected area products (Tourism operators understanding)</p> <p>Community enterprises prepared to generate income related to PAs</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>10</p> <p>40%</p> <p>20</p>	<p>Receipts and records of PA management bodies</p>	<p>Assumption: Data on costs of running PAs will be forthcoming from government agencies and field visits</p> <p>Risk: Without proper protocols in place, communities may think that the project will be paying for running of protected areas</p>

<p>Output 3.1 Costs of running national PA network assessed</p>	<p>a. Number of national assessments</p> <p>b. Number of Ministerial staff who understand PA-running costs</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p>	<p>a.1</p> <p>b. 20</p>	<p>Report submitted to DEPC</p> <p>Workshop report</p>	<p>Assumption: Government will provide access to associated government costs</p> <p>Risk: Costs for running offshore MPAs may not be able to be estimated at this time because of unknown technologies or deep sea boat availability but costs in other jurisdictions can be used.</p>
<p>Output 3.2 PA-related tourism in selected PAs supporting local community and kastomary owners</p>	<p>a. Number of tourism impact assessments</p> <p>b. Number of tourism income generation assessments</p> <p>c. Number of PA related tourism operators capacity improved</p> <p>d. Percentage increase of tourism operators? understanding of protected areas</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p> <p>c. 0</p> <p>d. 0</p>	<p>a. 1</p> <p>b. 1</p> <p>c. 20</p> <p>d. 40</p>	<p>a. Report submitted to DEPC</p> <p>b. Report submitted to DEPC</p> <p>c. Report submitted to DEPC</p>	<p>Assumption: Tourism operators will be willing to work with consultants to understand operations</p> <p>Risk: Tourism operators may not be willing to share revenue and expenses information</p>

<p>Output 3.3. Protected area-oriented sustainable community livelihoods developed.</p>	<p>a. Number of livelihood toolkits developed</p> <p>b. Number of PA related community enterprises capacity improved disaggregated for male and female owned</p> <p>c. Number of people joining cross visits disaggregated by male/female</p> <p>d. Number of people attending trainings</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p> <p>c. 0</p> <p>d. 0</p>	<p>a. 6</p> <p>b. 10/10</p> <p>c. 30/30</p> <p>d. 240</p>	<p>a. Toolkits developed</p> <p>b. Report submitted to DEPC</p> <p>c. Cross visit reports</p> <p>d. Training reports</p>	<p>Assumption: There are some community activities that can be shared across the network and community members are interested to share their lessons.</p> <p>Risk: Community members may be unavailable for travel to other sites.</p>
Project Management Costs					
Outcome 4. Project is effectively and efficiently managed					
<p>4.1. Project management team established and functional.</p>	<p>a. Number of project manager hired</p> <p>b. Number of project officer hired</p> <p>c. Number of administrative and finance officer hired</p>	<p>a. 0</p> <p>b. 0</p> <p>c. 0</p>	<p>a. 1</p> <p>b. 1</p> <p>c. 1</p>	<p>Annual project audit reports</p> <p>Mid-term and final evaluations</p>	<p>A: Efficiency of the PMU</p> <p>R: Delays in work plan through procurement plans validation and disbursements</p>

4. Project is effectively and efficiently managed	a. Number of evaluations carried out	a. 0	a. 6	Annual project audit reports	A: Efficiency of the PMU
	b. Number of audits carried out	b. 0		b.4	Mid-term and final evaluations reports

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Questions	Date	GEF Sec	Date	IUCN response
1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	7/12/2019	No, please address the following: - Alignment with GEF strategy on PA expansion - The GEF-6 strategy on support for PA expansion requires that new PAs be KBAs or other sites of global biodiversity importance. Particularly because the project moved to a more terrestrial focus, there needs to be stronger justification of the importance of these sites globally and not just at a national level. While we understand that not every site has been selected yet, perhaps some of the known sites of highest importance and their values can be described. We understand that marine KBAs have not been completed for Vanuatu, but there needs to be better justification and explanation of the sites involved.	August 2020	The project focus has shifted from a national system of protected areas to be more community-based protected area management oriented. The project will focus on expanding community-based PAs and associated communities on 4 main islands in 3 provinces (Sanma, Malakula, Shefa). These areas were selected due to the KBAs present and associated coastal Special and Unique Marine Areas (SUMAs) as well as the capacity of these islands to support expanded protected areas.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

No, there are a number of issues that need to be addressed in the project design and description.

- Top down protected area approach - As mentioned in the STAP review, this project appears to have a very top down, traditional approach to protected area system management. The project will spend significant resources on classifications, categories and policies that don't appear to yield tangible biodiversity benefits while communities have been protecting these places successfully already. For example, the management plans are described not as being developed by the community with the support of outsiders but rather outsiders consulting the community. Yet, won't any sort of management plan be implemented by the communities themselves? Given the remoteness and customary land title this project seems like it should be fundamentally about CBNRM and supporting the communities in doing it.

- **Threats** - Despite an extensive background documentation, there is a limited description of the threats to biodiversity in the document. It is unclear how the threats outlined (e.g. agricultural expansion) will be addressed by the activities of this project.

- **Livelihoods** - This section has not been given enough attention. Tourism is only 20% of GDP and is likely concentrated in a few areas. While we understand that fairly small amounts of increased income in absolute dollars could be quite significant, this section needs to be expanded and thought through better. How will these livelihoods be tied to environmental sustainability? At the same time, if a more community based natural

Top-down approach: The project has been significantly re-oriented to focus on provincial level activities and expansion of protected areas by supporting Vanuatu's decentralisation process through the newly established Area Councils. Communities and Area Councils will select, nominate, and formalise the protected areas that have already been identified through the national consultation process in the NBSAP. The process of establishing national PA categories has been eliminated in the project and biodiversity and resource use surveys will be limited to the selected provinces and islands. The budget has been realigned to sit the majority of funds Components 2 and 3 which focus on provincial and community activities.

Threats: the threat analysis and barrier analysis has been expanded. We have included a table that links the barrier analysis to the project components and outputs.

Livelihoods: The project has 3 outputs for financial sustainability for PAs. Two of the outputs focus on livelihoods. Before the Covid-19 pandemic, tourism was 20% of Vanuatu's GDP. Noting that that STAP recommended for greater engagement with the tourism industry. This is one of the largest sectors in Vanuatu and Vanuatu has developed a comprehensive and robust post-Covid sustainable tourism recovery plan. This project will feed into that plan by building capacity of communities and tourism operators to capitalize on PAs and identify tourism products within their PAs

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		No, we questions spending so much money on component 1 relative to the others.		The budget has been realigned to have the majority of funds spent in Components 2 and 3. Component 1: \$235,780 Component 2: \$1,480,906 Component 3: \$618,951
. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		We would like to see other revisions before assessing this.		Noted
5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		Yes		Noted.
6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		No, please include an estimated number of beneficiaries.		Based on the 2016 Post-TC Pam mini-census for selected provinces and Area Councils: Total 97,563 Male 49,664 Female 47,899 Percent female 49
7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?		NA		

<p>8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?</p>		<p>No, we would like to see this project discuss opportunities for collaboration in the region. In particular, the GEF-6 IUCN project in the Solomons would be a logical collaborator. Also, UNDP GEF-6 projects in PNG and one on LMMAs in Fiji would also have similar issues around community management of PAs. PNG in particular is similar in that the sites are of national importance but managed by traditional landholders.</p> <p>Also, without the stakeholder information it's hard to know the involvement of the Departments of Fisheries and Tourism who would be logical partners to implement especially when trying to achieve financial sustainability.</p>	<p>We have included a cross visit to a GEF6 Solomon Islands EREPA site in the project. We will also plan to arrange virtual learning calls between the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu GEF projects. PNG, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu are all introducing IUCN Green List standards to their protected area portfolios under the BIOPAMA project which is co-financing the project.</p>
<p>10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?</p>		<p>Not sufficient. It would be good to reflect on how this project can help inform a wider discussion on how to support CBNRM and community PAs in the Pacific and else where.</p>	<p>The knowledge management and communications chapter has been expanded and elaborated.</p> <p>The project will share data with the Pacific Islands Protected Area Portal, hosted by SPREP. Coastal protected areas will engage with LMMA to share lessons. Through IUCN, opportunities to participate in regional workshops will include sessions to include learnings from this project and other national and regional protected area projects. Lastly, the project will host an annual webinar, supported by IUCN, to share lessons and learnings from the project.</p>

<p>11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from: GEFSEC</p>		<p>Yes</p>		
<p>STAP</p>		<p>No, a number of the comments provided by STAP have not be addressed. Most concerning is the apparent lack of support of community-based management. While we understand the goal is to create national level PAs, these areas will still be managed by the same communities.</p>		<p>Comments from the STAP have been addressed in depth in a formal response document included below.</p>

GEF Council

19 December 2017

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

? review output 1.1.1-1.1.3. Output 1.1.3. Management effectiveness assessments? should precede and inform outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2.

? Section 5 describes coordination challenges under the given capacity of government and mentions options. We suggest to specify these in the final proposal, including the strengthening of the Government's capacity, e.g. through seconded staff.

? Furthermore, we suggest reviewing the description of the allocation of resources to the different components. While the project is well aligned with the Focal Area Strategies, the allocation of resources is inconsistent and should be adjusted or made more transparent; Table A, e.g. describes the largest amount of resource dedicated to BD-1 Program 1, while Table B assigns the largest amount of resources to component 3, which corresponds to BD-1 Program 2.

In addition, Germany requests to review the proposal with regard to the following two issues:

? For successful implementation, it is crucial to coordinate the planned outputs and activities with previous and ongoing efforts, in order not to duplicate work or conflict with established national

Management effectiveness assessments ? These will not be conducted under the ProDoc as the project will focus on new protected area registration.

Government capacity is addressed at several points of the project, including Outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 2.3. This will focus on the Department of Environment, Ministry of Fisheries, Ministry of Forestry and the provincial Area Councils.

The budget allocations have all been adjusted based on GEF Secretariat and STAP comments as a major revision of the project.

The Marine Spatial Planning that was funded by the German Government has been removed from the project during major revisions.

The co-financing has been confirmed in the ProDoc process.

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit. It may be helpful to have a discussion about this project.		
GEF 6 ECARE Vanuatu				
STAP Comments		IUCN Response as per ProDoc (October 2020)		
<i>STAP notes that the actual protected areas to be targeted by this project are never identified</i>		The revised ProDoc limits the geography of the project to 4 islands in 3 provinces. Within these areas, the CCAs identified in the NBSAP will be canvassed, surveyed and selected for the formalisation process.		
<p>Apart from generalities about the status of biodiversity of Vanuatu, no information is provided to justify where protected areas are needed and what habitats should be protected.</p> <p>Of particular importance, STAP notes that most conservation takes place in Indigenous and Community Protected Areas (ICCAs) whereas the project appears to be focused on developing a much more standard (old fashioned) State protected area agency. In terms of actual implementation, STAP is concerned with the project delivery mechanism.</p>		<p>The selection of focal PAs will be based on the recently developed NBSAP and provincial prioritisation of existing CCAs as well as an expert workshop process that will emphasize biodiversity values and representation of habitats and ecosystems.</p> <p>The project has undergone major revisions. Activities and outputs at the national level have been eliminated or reduced. The objective of formalizing CCAs fits with the NBSAP and the national government's objectives. There is an emphasis on building PA capacity with selected communities on 4 islands in 3 provinces while working within Vanuatu's relatively new decentralisation process of devolving governance to sub-provincial Area Councils that have representation from traditional Chiefs, religious institutions and women's groups.</p>		

From the description, it is clear that most of the biodiversity in Vanuatu is currently protected through ICCAs/communities, which appear to be doing quite well; however, the project focuses largely on activities to be implemented by some central protected area agency, which is never described. This is a critical alternative that needs to be carefully justified. STAP also notes that the problem definition is weak and confusing. There is considerable emphasis on Vanuatu's bottom-up progress, but no analysis of what central protected area capacity is already in place (e.g. number of PAs, staffing, budget), or what is needed (roles, gaps) and why. In addition, the importance of the land and resource to communities is mentioned several times, yet the synergies and tradeoffs with investments in protected areas (whether these are state PAs or ICCAs, is never clarified) are not assessed.

STAP notes that one of the major issues discussed is the fact that people are increasingly moving inland due to increased infrastructure and development, as well as large scale agriculture along the coastline. Yet, the proposed expansion of protected areas is focused on marine protected areas and coastal zones ? hopefully not at the expense of other critical habitats that could be under increased threat due to population growth and shifting migration patterns

Related to this, the project does not provide sufficient information about the global environmental benefits (GEBs) that would accrue as a result. The PIF states that it is not possible or desirable to identify GEBs using only external criteria (which STAP agrees with). However, surely there is some knowledge about how the interaction between local players and GEBs will play out?

STAP agrees with project proponents that locally designed management effectiveness tools are invaluable, but is concerned that this is presented more as the job of technocrats than as a participatory process

The revised ProDoc focuses entirely on kastomary and community-oriented PAs rather than the large offshore PAs as first proposed in the PIF. This is to reflect the need for major revisions and the decentralised nature of land management in Vanuatu and the amount of project resources that will need to go towards building the support of community and customary owners.

Capacity for management will be built at all levels of management including customary owners, Area Councils, and national agencies (Output 2.3 and Output 3.3). The ProDoc has put more resources into community engagement through consultations and participatory processes in management plan development (Output 2.2) and community capacity building (Output 3.3).

As noted above, the selection of CCAs to engage on has been determined by the provincial NBSAP prioritisation and will be further prioritised based on community consultations in priority provinces and a full FPIC process. Inland and coastal areas will be considered based on the province and island considered and the socio-economic and cultural context.

Based on GEF-6 Focal Area Strategies the project has determined GEBs of 10,000 ha of new terrestrial protected areas and 25,000 ha of new coastal and marine protected areas to be declared. These will be concentrated in and around KBAs and Special and Unique Marine Areas.

The revised ProDoc has identified several participatory processes for contributing to, and validating, processes and guidelines for PA declaration and management (Output 1.2., 2.1, 2.2, and 3.3)

<p>Mutually agreed performance metrics provide an excellent foundation for a "learning organization", cross- scale stakeholder participation, and peer review. However, this kind of approach is never mentioned. Given the community flavor of Vanuatu's protected areas (ICCAs), surely a much more imaginative approach is needed? The PIF proposes building an old-fashioned protected area agency in a country with a weak state but strong communities. Why not build a representative community organization with the same goals? And, perhaps also strengthen the Vanuatu NGO Association to provide technical advice.</p>	<p>The ProDoc discusses the inherent difficulties of balancing the needs of the local communities with the aspirations of the national government. All the arrangements of the national government are built on the <i>kastom</i> principal and cannot function without the agreement of communities. The ProDoc has been revised to balance the engagement with national government and local communities with engaged of communities explicit in Outputs 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 3.3. Central to this concept and critical to this project is engagement with the newly formed Area Councils that represent Vanuatu's new approach to decentralization.</p> <p>The Vanuatu Cultural Centre is one of the stakeholders of the project and a possible coordination mechanism of CCAs. However, given that <i>kastom</i> and culture are enshrined in the constitution and part of the government, there is low risk to keep this aspect within the government. The Area Councils, which include representation from local chiefs and religious leaders are also major stakeholders of the project. These are included in the ProDoc. The project will also form the foundations of a network of CCAs by conducting cross visits of community enterprises between CCAs.</p>
<p>To improve the project, STAP suggests that consideration is given to community and/or NGO associations. As an example, project proponents can look to the Namibia Association of CBNRM Support Providers (NACSO, 2015). Similarly, the Namibian Management Orientated Monitoring System (MOMS) provides an effective model for community monitoring that proved stronger than standard PA Agency monitoring. (Cassidy, 2007). Zimbabwe's previous Natural Resource Board is a possible model for a civic and democratic conservation structure (Child, 2015).</p>	<p>The development of a community PA association was considered but determined that without a long-term funding mechanism, would collapse after this project. The project focuses on some fundamental processes of PA establishment, but includes several cross-visit exercises between communities that can be the precursor to an association. It also includes consultation and capacity building for Area Councils that are part of the <i>kastomary</i> governance structures and include local chiefs and religious leaders. In the absence of a new body or association, the Area Councils can serve as an important conduit for PA establishment, livelihoods and sustainability.</p>
<p>STAP notes that until these issues (i.e. the situation analysis and theory of change) are clarified, it is difficult to judge the efficacy of the activities (outputs) listed.</p>	<p>The theory of change has been adjusted. The three components now reflect a better flow of (1) developing a framework for PAs and filling knowledge gaps; (2) designating PAs and building capacity and awareness; (3) building financial sustainability of PAs at national and local levels.</p>

<p>On this note, there are currently 19 outputs, 8 outcomes and 4 components. The PIF suggests that the protected area network consists largely of ICCAs, yet Component 2 focuses on improving the financial sustainability of Vanuatu's PA Network though Outcome 2.1 increased government revenue. The PIF fails to be clear about what is being done.</p> <p>Barrier #3 (page 10) discusses the need to identify fully all of the costs involved in establishing and maintaining a protected area network; however, this analysis should also include potential direct and indirect benefits that can be derived from increased tourism that would result from well-managed protected areas.</p> <p>For example, research in Brazil reveals that every dollar invested in the PA system produced \$7 in national economic benefits (Souza, 2016). Similar analysis for Vanuatu could bolster efforts by this project to make an economic case for increased support for improved PA management and investments in infrastructure.</p>	<p>Component 2 has been moved to Component 3 and expanded upon. It is understood that additional government funding is unlikely and removed from the ProDoc.</p> <p>An analysis of PA costs forms the foundation of the national governments understanding of needs and budget requirements for managing PAs (Output 3.1).</p> <p>Recognizing the role of tourism in the Vanuatu economy, Output 3.2 will assess the impact of tourism and tourism plans on PAs and assess potential income generating activities from tourism. It will also train tourism operator in PA best practices and awareness.</p> <p>Output 3.3 will identify several community-based enterprises within our bordering PAs and conduct cross-site visits to develop peer-to-peer networks between PA communities. The project will also conduct basic entrepreneurial training for community enterprises.</p>
<p>The section on stakeholders would be greatly improved with a table listing each of the proposed stakeholder groups and their role in ECARE going forward. STAP is encouraged by the emphasis on working with local communities and customary landowners, since 98% of land is communal/customary tenure (Scheyvens and Russell, 2013). Given the important role of tourism in Vanuatu which is the primary economic sector in Vanuatu and generating approximately 20% of GDP and directly employing 11,000 people (Scheyvens and Russell, 2013), it will also be particularly important to engage this sector during the stakeholder analysis and in the development of marine spatial plans. Such planning should seek to strengthen the resilience of the tourism industry by incorporating climate change adaptation policies given Vanuatu's vulnerabilities (Klint et al., 2011)</p>	<p>This will be conducted as part of the inception phase of the project.</p> <p>The tourism sector is now a major output of Component 3.</p>
<p>On a more positive note, STAP is encouraged that this project uses a "Thinking and Working Politically" (TWP) approach which emphasizes political dynamics to improve overall impact. STAP agrees that this is innovative and is also encouraged that this project will strive to use local knowledge to inform ways of working. STAP is also pleased to see that data generated by this project will be provided using 'open access' to promote transparency and easy sharing of information.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Overall, STAP feels that this project needs a much stronger justification in terms of what is being protected, and why the project is proposing a centralized mechanism to do so, rather than building on what sounds like considerable progress in decentralized management	The PrA1:B13oDoc discusses the inherent difficulties of balancing the needs of the local communities with the aspirations of the national government. All the arrangements of the national government are built on the kastomprincipal and cannot function without the agreement of communities. The ProDoc has been revised to balance the engagement with national government and local communities with engaged of communities explicit in Outputs 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 3.3.
--	---

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 109,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1.1. Consultants -staff input	65,863	69,855	
1.2 Consultants - expenses	21,457	-	17464
2.1. Inception and validation workshops	12,680	29,667	-
4.1 Agency fee ORO	4,500	4,500	-
Agency fee HQ Corporate	2,500	2,500	-
Agency fee GEF Coordination unit	2,000	2,000	-
Total	109,000	108,522	17,464

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

See attached

ANNEX F: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

See attached

ANNEX G: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Budget Summary

Budget summary

Details		TOTAL BUDGET	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Ensuring resilient ecosystems and representative protected areas in the Vanuatu.		2,450,459	403,970	746,613	802,894	376,782
Component COMPONENT 1. VANUATU FRAMEWORK AND STRATEGY FOR REGISTERING PAs		235,780	187,340	48,240	0	0
Outcome Outcome .1. Protected area policies and guidelines developed and improved						
Output Output 1.1. An updated legal framework and policy for PAs in Vanuatu covering terrestrial, coastal and offshore areas.						
Activity 1.1.1 Review of PA legal frameworks, categories and relevant sectoral legislations		115,180	115,180	0	0	0
Output Output 1.2. Tools and process guidelines for PA designation, management planning and effectiveness, and for integration in Area Council development plans, are enhanced and developed.						
Activity 1.2.1 Process guidelines and templates for PA designation reviewed and developed		42,200	42,200	0	0	0
Activity 1.2.2 PA governance assessment, management planning and monitoring effectiveness monitoring methodologies		16,080	16,080	24,120	0	0
Activity 1.2.3 Guidelines developed for integration of PA and natural resources management within Area Councils		40,200	16,080	24,120	0	0
TOTAL Component 1		235,780	187,340	48,240	0	0
Details		TOTAL BUDGET	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Component COMPONENT 2 – PA MANAGEMENT PLANNING, CAPACITY BUILDING AND COMMUNICATION		1,360,906	174,808	607,334	489,174	139,694
Outcome Outcome .2. Expanded protected area network in Vanuatu						
Output Output 2.1. Identification of strategic new surveys of priority existing and proposed PAs conducted and new national PA established						
Activity 2.1.1 Identify project target sites		189,310	79,655	109,655	0	0
Activity 2.1.2 Undertake field surveys		340,330	0	270,165	270,165	0
Output Output 2.2. Community owned and endorsed PA Management plans and designation documentation for priority PAs submitted						
Activity 2.2.1 Support completion of management plans and related designation documentation		174,445	-	66,629	66,629	41,187
Output Output 2.3. Capacity building and support for PA tools implemented						
Activity 2.3.1 Capacity building for PA Management Plans and management effectiveness monitoring methodology		234,310	45,125	90,125	45,125	45,125
Activity 2.3.2 Integration of PA and natural resources management into Area Councils Development Plans		67,605	-	55,555	17,027	17,027
Output Output 2.4. Awareness and understanding of PAs increased at community and national level						
Activity 2.4.1 Implement PA outreach and communications plan		154,700	47,025	37,225	37,225	33,225
TOTAL Component 2		1,360,906	174,808	607,334	489,174	139,694
Details		TOTAL BUDGET	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Component COMPONENT 3 – FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY OF PROTECTED AREAS		618,951	0	66,619	389,320	212,012
Outcome Outcome .3. Improved financial sustainability options for protected areas						
Output Output 3.1 Costs of running national PA network assessed						
Activity 3.1.1 Assessment and operational and budget recommendations at both CCA and national/MPA levels		82,655	0	0	82,655	0
Output Output 3.2 PA-related tourism in selected PAs supporting local community and customary owners						
Activity 3.2.1 Assessment of tourism PA impacts and PATourism income generating activities and value chains		9,500	0	0	9,500	0
Activity 3.2.2 Training for tourism operators and nature guides		30,000	0	0	25,000	25,000
Activity 3.2.3 Developing entrance fees, voluntary PA fees or other suitable financing scheme for selected PAs		25,000	0	0	12,500	12,500
Output Output 3.3. Protected area-oriented sustainable community livelihoods developed						
Activity 3.3.1 Review and collate existing PA related income and livelihood activities to develop a livelihoods toolkit		125,635	0	66,619	66,619	0
Activity 3.3.2 Livelihoods assessment and livelihoods planning		121,525	0	0	44,513	77,012
Activity 3.3.3 Community enterprise training		198,600	0	0	98,300	98,300
TOTAL Component 3		618,951	0	66,619	389,320	212,012
Details		TOTAL BUDGET	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Component Component 4 - M&E and Knowledge Management		120,000	15,000	0	35,000	30,000
Output Output 4.1 Monitoring and evaluation						
Activity 4.1.1 Mid-term evaluation		40,000	0	0	40,000	0
Activity 4.1.2 Terminal evaluation		30,000	0	0	0	30,000
Output Output 4.2 Knowledge management						
Activity 4.2.1. Inception and periodic workshops		30,000	15,000	0	15,000	0
TOTAL Component 4		120,000	15,000	0	35,000	30,000
Details		TOTAL BUDGET	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Component Project Management Costs		114,622	41,622	24,400	24,400	24,200
Outcome OUTCOME 4. Project is effectively and efficiently managed						
Output 4.1. Project management team established and functional.						
Activity 4.1.1. Appoint the project management unit		36,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Activity 4.1.2. Procure office equipment		9,222	9,222	-	-	-
Output 4.2. Project evaluation and audit mission carried out						
Activity 4.2.2. Annual audits		49,600	18,400	10,400	10,400	10,400
TOTAL Project management cost		114,622	41,622	24,400	24,400	24,200

We are unable to upload further images to the portal. Please see the attached Budget excel file (ECARE_BUDGET20092021.xlsx) or image (ECARE_BUDGET20092021.jpg)