



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT
PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Ridge to Reef: Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries			
Country(ies):	Cook Islands, FS Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	GEF Project ID ¹ :	5404
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	5221
Other Executing Partner(s):	SPC (SOPAC)	Submission Date:	19 Dec 2014
		Re-submission Date:	17 Feb 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration (Months)	60 months (components 4, 5) 48 months (components 1,2,3)
Name of parent program (if applicable): For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>	Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods	Agency Fee (\$):	928,571

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)
IW-1 Catalyze multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in transboundary surface/groundwater basins while considering climatic variability and change	1.2: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection	National and local policy and legal reforms adopted Types and technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments	GEFTF	6,081,790	55,849,205
IW-3 Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for ecosystem-based, joint management of transboundary water systems	3.2 On-the-ground modest actions implemented in water quality, quantity (including basins draining areas of melting ice), fisheries, and coastal habitat demonstrations for 'blue forests' to protect carbon 3.3 IW portfolio capacity and	National interministerial committees established Demo-scale local action implemented, including in basins with melting ice and to restore / protect coastal 'blue forests'	GEFTF	4,235,664	31,858,955

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	performance enhanced from active learning / KM / experience sharing	Active experience / sharing / learning in the IW portfolio			
Total Project Cost				10,317,454	87,708,160

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To test the mainstreaming of ‘ridge-to-reef’ (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co Financing (\$)
1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability	INV	<p>1.1: Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM and IWRM and CC adaptation</p> <p>1.2: National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM</p> <p>1.3: Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened ‘community to cabinet’ ICM/IWRM</p>	<p>1.1.1: 14 national pilot project area diagnostics based on R2R approach including: baseline environmental state and social data incorporating CC vulnerabilities; and local governance of water, land, forests and coasts reviewed</p> <p>1.1.2: 14 national pilot projects test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples, and building institutional linkages for integrated land, forest, water and coastal management</p> <p>1.2.1: Priority areas for replication in each of 14 participating PICs characterized in diagnostics for ICM/IWRM reforms, investments and CC adaptation in 14 PICs</p> <p>1.2.2: Methodology and procedures for characterizing island coastal areas for ICM investment developed</p> <p>1.3.1: Institutional relationships between national and community-based governance structures strengthened and formalized through national “Ridge to Reef” Inter-Ministry Committees in 14 Pacific SIDS</p> <p>1.3.2: 14 national private-sector and donor partnership forums for investment planning in priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions</p>	GEFTF	4,450,000	37,091,027
2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation	TA	<p>2.1: National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation</p> <p>2.2: Incentive structures for retention of local</p>	<p>2.1.1: Innovative post-graduate training program in ICM/IWRM and related CC adaptation delivered for project managers and participating stakeholders through partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes and technical support and mentoring program with results documented</p> <p>2.1.2: Capacity for civil society and community organization participation in ICM/IWRM and CC adaptation strengthened through direct involvement in implementation of demo activities with results documented</p> <p>2.2.1: National human capacity needs for ICM/IWRM implementation identified and competencies of national and local government</p>	GEFTF	1,650,000	15,497,255

		‘Ridge to Reef’ expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated	units for ICM/IWRM implementation benchmarked, tracked, and capacity building support secured with results documented 2.2.2: Existing Public Service Commission salary scales and required functional competencies of key ICM/IWRM personnel analyzed; appropriate guidelines and incentive structures explored to encourage retention skilled and experienced staff			
3. Mainstreaming Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks	TA	<p>3.1: National and regional strategic action framework for ICM/IWRM endorsed national and regionally</p> <p>3.2: Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and for CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs</p>	<p>3.1.1: National recommendations for 14 PICs for coastal policy, legal and budgetary reforms for ICM/IWRM for integration of land, water, forest, coastal management and CC adaptation compiled and documented with options for harmonization of governance frameworks</p> <p>3.1.2: Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action frameworks for 14 PICs on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans endorsed by leaders</p> <p>3.1.3: National ‘State of the Coasts’ reports for 14 PICs completed and launched to Pacific Leaders during National Coastal Summits (Yr. 3) in coordination with national R2R projects and demonstrated as national development planning tool, including guidelines for diagnostic analyses of coastal areas</p> <p>3.2.1: 14 national networks of national ICM/IWRM pilot project inter-ministry committees formed by building on existing IWRM committees and contributing to a common results framework at the project and program levels</p> <p>3.2.2: Periodic inter-ministry committee meetings in 14 PICs conducted and results documented, participation data assembled and reported to national decision-makers and regional forums</p> <p>3.2.3: Community leaders and local government from pilot projects networked via periodic national and regional round-table meetings complemented by community technical exchange visits</p> <p>3.2.4: Participatory techniques used to gauge learning and change in perception among inter-ministry committee members in 4 pilot PICs (sub-regional, mix of high island, atoll settings)</p>	GEFTF	1,125,000	10,471,118
4. Regional and National ‘Ridge to Reef’ Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and	TA	4.1: National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results for integrated multi-focal projects	<p>4.1.1: National and regional reporting templates developed based on national indicator sets and regional framework to facilitate annual results reporting and monitoring from 14 PICs</p> <p>4.1.2: Unified/harmonized multi-focal area results tracking approach and analytical tool developed and proposed to the GEF, its agencies and participating</p> <p>4.1.3: National planning exercises in 14 Pac</p>	GEFTF	1,000,000	8,283,818

Knowledge Management		<p>4.2: National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established</p>	<p>SIDS conducted with relevant ministries on embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting</p> <p>4.2.1: Regional ‘ridge to reef’ communications strategy developed and implemented and assistance provided to national R2R project including partnerships with national and regional media and educational</p> <p>4.2.2: Participation in IW:LEARN activities: conferences; preparation of at least 10 experience notes and inter-linked websites with combined allocation of 1% of GEF grant</p> <p>4.2.3: - Established Pacific R2R Network, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned etc.</p>			
5. Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination	TA	<p>5.1: Effective program coordination of national and regional R2R projects</p>	<p>5.1.1: Functioning overall program coordination unit with alignment of development worker positions contributing to coordinated effort among national R2R projects in year 1</p> <p>5.1.2: - Technical, operational, reporting and monitoring support provided to national R2R projects, as may be requested by PICs, to facilitate timely delivery of overall program goals</p> <p>5.1.3: Assistance provided to participating countries in the Pacific R2R network, harmonized reporting and monitoring and other regional and national and capacity building modules, among others</p> <p>5.1.4: Periodic planning and coordination workshops conducted for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network</p>	GEFTF	1,576,582	6,701,515
Sub-Total					9,801,582	78,044,733
Project management Cost (PMC) ³					515,872	9,663,427
Total project costs					10,317,454	87,708,160

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

<u>Sources of Co-financing</u>	<u>Name of Co-financier</u>	<u>Type of Co-financing Amount (\$)</u>		<u>Total Amount (\$)</u>
		<u>In-kind</u>	<u>Grant</u>	
<u>National Governments</u>	<u>Cook Islands</u>	815,736	860,000	1,675,736
	<u>FS Micronesia</u>	560,474	-	560,474
	<u>Fiji</u>	2,844,640	830,000	3,674,640
	<u>Kiribati</u>	733,197	6,588,600	7,321,797
	<u>Nauru</u>	798,275	650,000	1,448,275
	<u>Niue</u>	972,967	915,000	1,887,967
	<u>Palau</u>	510,000	600,000	1,110,000
	<u>PNG</u>	2,000,000	1,000,000	3,000,000
	<u>Marshall Is</u>	2,200,925	860,000	3,060,925
	<u>Samoa</u>	2,200,000	1,000,000	3,200,000
	<u>Solomon Is</u>	653,042	4,700,000	5,353,042
	<u>Tonga</u>	2,772,000	728,000	3,500,000
	<u>Tuvalu</u>	834,094	2,066,000	2,900,094
	<u>Vanuatu</u>	873,655	8,360,000	9,233,655
	<u>Sub-Total</u>	18,769,005	29,157,600	47,926,605
<u>-</u>	<u>Sub-Total</u>	18,769,005	29,157,600	47,926,605
<u>Multilateral Agencies</u>	<u>SPC/SOPAC</u>	470,525	31,011,030	31,481,555
<u>GEF Agency</u>	<u>UNDP</u>	8,300,000		8,300,000
<u>Total Co-financing</u>	<u>Total</u>	27,539,530	60,168,630	87,708,160

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF AGENCY	TYPE OF TRUST FUND	FOCAL AREA	Country Name/Global	(in \$)		
				Grant amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	International Waters	Global (all 14 PICs)	10,317,454	928,571	11,246,025
Total Grant Resources				10,317,454	928,571	11,246,025

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

COMPONENT	GRANT AMOUNT (\$)	COFINANCING (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	354,920	8,637,703	8,992,623
National/Local Consultants	210,000	5,071,500	5,281,500

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? (select)

Not Applicable

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

The R2R program has been designed to complement the implementation of relevant national priorities including the CBD National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan (NBSAP), UNFCCC NAPA, UNFCCC National Communications, REDD+ Policies, UNCCD National Action Plans, National Sustainable Development Strategies and other documents. For each country, the relevance of this program to the implementation of the various strategies under the relevant Conventions is described in Annex C of the GEF Council approved R2R Program Framework Document.

The Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the International Waters (IW) of the Pacific Islands (1997) developed a strategy for the integrated sustainable development and management of IW to address the priority concerns for PICs. The SAP proposed the need to address the root causes of degradation of IW through regionally consistent, country-driven targeted actions that integrate development and environment needs and promote good governance and improved knowledge approaches. Major regional investment and assistance programmes have been guided by a small number of regional strategies that were agreed to under the Pacific Plan, which for the water sector included: (1) the Wastewater Policy and Wastewater Framework for Action (2001); (2) the Pacific Regional Action Plan on Sustainable Water Management (2002); and (3) the Pacific Framework for Action on Drinking Water and Health (2005). In response to growing pressures on PICs water resources, the then Governing Council SOPAC called for a revision of the regional strategy and action plan to address urgent issues pertaining to the sustainable management of water resources and delivery of water and sanitation services. This revision is ongoing and timely coinciding with other significant changes in regional strategies.

The recent decision by Pacific Forum Leaders to graduate the Pacific Plan to a Framework for Pacific Regionalism with the primary objective of “sustainable development that combines economic social, and cultural development in ways that improve livelihoods and well-being and the use of the environment sustainably” will drive sectoral integration strategies. The regional agreement to integrate Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation into a Strategy for Disaster and Climate Resilient Development in the Pacific exemplifies this. The integration of water, land and coastal management through the proposed Ridge to Reef framework at national and regional levels is therefore in alignment with National and Regional Integration Strategy.

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

The approved PIF included reference to SCCF which is now excluded in this submission for CEO endorsement. UNDP intends to submit a separate proposal to SCCF to support the CC-A components of this regional project.

A.3 The GEF agency's comparative advantage:

NA

A.4 The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

NA

⁴ For questions A.1 – A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter ‘NA’ after the respective question

A.5 Incremental / Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The Project is squarely aimed at building an enabling environment at National level for linking IWRM with ICM into a new integrated R2R approach. Indeed the basis of the GEF Programmatic Approach is to gain synergies across GEF Focal Areas and Implementing Agencies. In an area as diverse and vast as the PICs, coordination and integration are key success factors. Leveraging National STAR project outcomes, building multi institutional coordination across multifocal areas and adoption of national ICM frameworks needs the resources of the proposed project. During the PPG consultations it became evident that whilst there was strong support for the role of the proposed project that the Programme coordination at both national and regional level would require significant resources. As STAP comments suggest, capacity needs to be improved despite the national inter-ministry functionality in most of the countries that undertook the IWRM planning. GEF Council recognized these in endorsing the Programmatic Approach and made additional funds available for coordination costs. Unfortunately these are no longer available and the Project has sought an increase in its funding to adequately resource this need. At a national level \$250,000 has been added to Component 1 budget and at the regional level \$176,582 has been added to Component 5 budget project management cost have also been increased to the allowable 5% of project budget an increase of \$64,725 resulting a total budget increase of \$491,307.

The PICs do not have the human resources and funding to establish two parallel groups---one for IWRM implementation and one for ICM. With the significant progress on IWRM in the previous IW project, the underlying intent was always to integrate these groups of people and IWRM issues/processes into coastal ICM for developing the new R2R approach rather than implementing separate IWRM and ICM plans that overlap on small islands. With the suggestion that marine spatial planning be added to ICM, this process of integration into one R2R framework is challenging but needs to be developed and tested for the future survival of island communities.

New relationships need to be cultivated for expanding IWRM to include coastal spatial management in this project. Pressure for unsustainable development at the coast is huge and will be addressed with capacity building, technical assistance and demonstration projects that build the confidence of officials and communities alike that benefits will accrue and be sustainable from this approach. Consequently, additional finance is included in component 1 to help introduce capacity building on and incorporation of marine spatial planning in ICM demos that will be introduced as an extension of and link to the existing IWRM approach to develop the Pacific version of R2R integrated management. With the small PPG funding, stress reduction indicators can only be set at pilot sites at the end of the first year of project implementation as details are finalized. There are just too many countries involved and PPG funding is less than one half the amount provided by GEF to the earlier successful IWRM project. There are project results frameworks for each country that were developed during the PPG and specific indicators will enhance these and be added to the framework by end of year one.

These pilot projects will help convince local stakeholders and officials that the new R2R integrated approach is appropriate and needed in the face of population increases, climatic disasters, and resource degradation and depletion. This strategy can have a high reward if the country officials and local governments buy into the ICM/MSP/IWRM R2R approach and mainstream it for financial and institutional sustainability into their national development planning frameworks. Additionally, national private sector forums will be tested to work with national inter-ministry committees and commercial organizations to assist the effort. Private sector support can be utilized to help build constituencies for institutional action nationally.

The STAP comments on overall coordination strategy were considered during the PPG and are addressed by this increase of funding in component 5 for the selected new approach/overall strategy to coordination (both STAR projects and regional project as well as IWRM and ICM) that would take place internally in each country through the national inter-ministry committees with tech assistance and supervision by SPC for mainstreaming into SPC cross-sector work for financial and institutional sustainability. Overall coordination is the responsibility of UNDP for the program and their over \$8 mil of in-kind co-financing is a testament to the importance of this R2R

programme and this regional project. Counterpart support will also assist with specific coordination, and as part of the mainstreaming of sustainability SPC sectors will follow the project to be ready to carry-on after completion. Internally, a cross-program SPC coordinating committee has been established to ensure this overall coordination is effective. This also provides the justification for the requested additional project grant of 5% at CEO endorsement.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

NA

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The recently completed United National Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the Pacific Region (2013-2017) provides the context for the R2R program. It recognized that the general challenge for the Pacific Island Countries (PICs) is to ensure the sustainable management of their terrestrial and marine natural resources and heritage, from the regional to the local level, and the adaptation of individuals, communities and states to climate and environmental change and natural hazards, as well as to be well prepared to respond to natural disaster events and population related consequences.

The R2R program supports introduction of integrated approaches to management of natural resources at the coasts as well as adjacent catchments through demonstration pilots, capacity building, and adoption and implementation of national and local policies, reforms, and budget commitments through national projects and one regional project. The concept of R2R management of ecosystems describes a comprehensive approach to managing activities of multiple sectors within a complete 'catchment' or 'watershed', from the ridge top down through to the ocean to ensure natural resource sustainability, biodiversity conservation, risk reduction and livelihood generation. For atolls and low islands, the entire island would be considered for this comprehensive integrated approach. While the terms ICM and IWRM may be new to some, the concepts of holistic management have been practiced throughout islands in the Pacific for many years and needs to be adjusted to the new economies, populations, and climatic realities.

The strategy for the program is built on addressing, and where achievable, overcoming the barriers listed above. The GEF STAR focal areas - Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Climate Change Mitigation - as well as Climate Change Adaptation, International Waters and SFM, provide a series of entry points for piloting the needed R2R approaches in the Pacific Islands to test their technical, operational and political viability. These measures that are aimed at: advancing IWRM in watershed management; promoting ICM and linking it with IWRM; introducing sustainable land and forest management policies and practices; payments for ecosystem services (PES); expanding terrestrial and marine protected areas (including through combinations of linked watersheds and coastal ecosystems); and incorporating these approaches into climate change adaptation measures (including through ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation, as appropriate) to reduce vulnerability and improve resilience. A focus on local capacity and expertise development along with knowledge tools and simplified indicator reporting to the GEF agencies in the complementary regional project makes this effort different from those preceding it and enables a better chance for success and sustainability. In sum, the proposed R2R multi-focal, multi-Trust Fund, multi-Agency Program encompasses an environmental management and cross sector economic paradigm that is ideally suited to the unique scale and climatic challenges of the PICs and is aimed to be sustained by a new generation of local expertise with the required capacity.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

This project will link directly into the very strong stakeholder relationships built by the GEF Pacific IWRMs Community to Cabinet and back approach. Functional participation by community and its leaders at local project

level and National Policy level have been established and are operational. These have been used to develop the Project Documents and National Pilot Projects. The focus on extending the diagnostic analysis to the coast and its characterization relies implicitly on local stakeholder's knowledge.

The primary stakeholders for the project are the 14 governments of the PICs (particularly institutions dealing with water, land and coastal management, environment, disaster Risk Management and Climate Change) and communities within the R2R pilot demonstration projects. The lessons learnt will however eventually benefit all SIDS globally. There will also be global benefits as the project will seek through innovative approaches to coordinate multifocal area approaches within a R2R framework and to use demonstrated local benefits to progress national level policy reform and action. As an integrated project private and public sectors will also participate and benefit and this will include tourism, agriculture, fisheries, health, environmental and other locally selected industries. The private sector partnerships will be developed at local level demonstration projects to develop a high level of involvement and collaboration with the private sector at the earliest stages of project development and implementation, based on supporting countries to identify where private sector engagement and support can occur.

The NGO community will have a significant stakeholder role in promoting awareness of water, land and coastal management and use issues and concerns, especially in demonstration project areas and in presenting the linkages both to social development and to sustainable, ecosystem-based management. NGO's have already been actively involved in partnering with National GEF Pacific IWRM demonstrations providing additional resources to local communities and facilitating the development of community leadership. IUCN is a partner of the GEF Pacific IWRM project in several demonstration projects and will play a still larger role in the proposed project. The NGO and CBOs will participate in the development of local demonstration projects and in the governance of these at both local and national levels. At the local/demonstration site level, the Project will focus on community involvement for watershed and coastal resource management, including ICM, and will also look at the capacity building requirements at this level. The communities and livelihoods will benefit from improvements in resource management and the sustainable maintenance of water quality, both with regard to their living environment as well as their health and welfare. Capturing traditional knowledge and practices will be important as an entry vehicle to addressing land ownership and rights to water, land and inshore marine resources.

This proposed regional project is intended to be the program support project for the Ridge-to-Reef program "Pacific Islands Ridge to Reef National Priorities - Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods". The project is expected to coordinate the implementation of the national R2R projects in terms of capacity building, knowledge management and harmonization of technical methodologies in integrated management of forest, land and water management. National level inter-ministerial committees will be the major vehicles for coordination at a National level and also funnel nationally acquired knowledge through to sub-regional and regional meetings. They will have an important role in monitoring UNEP's Regional project to promote forestry and protected area management in Fiji, Niue, Vanuatu and Samoa under GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability programme which will be still under implementation at the same time with this proposed project. Coordinating these along with the UNDP, UNEP and FAO National GEF System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) Pacific Projects will be a vital to the success of R2R as mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

The recently completed GEF/UNDP/UNEP GEF Pacific IWRM project has established close linkages with the GEF/UNDP/UNEP Implementing Integrated Water Resource and Wastewater Management in Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS and the recently completed GEF/UNDP/UNEP Integrating Watershed and Coastal Area Management (IWCAM) in the Small Island Development States (SIDS) of the Caribbean to reflect more than 30 SIDS globally. This project will maintain and grow these linkages. Coordination will occur during implementation with other related UNDP/GEF projects including Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC), Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) will done through UNDP's Asia and Pacific Regional Office.

The ADB/GEF Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase II) provides significant opportunities in piloting the integration of coastal and inshore management within the R2R approach and capturing those benefits will be important in the CTI Participating PICs. The Melanesian Spearhead Group's Annual Environment/Climate Change Ministers and Senior Officials Meeting enables high-level coordination and integration of these. The project will be implemented in close coordination with other regional projects that are also being executed by SOPAC/SPC, upon which this project builds on. Execution of the regional project through the SOPAC Division of SPC ensures the closest possible coordination of project and co-financed activities with other regional SPC work programmes, in Disaster Risk Management, Oceans and Islands, Water and Sanitation, Sustainable Land Use, Coastal Fisheries, Climate change and Education. The integration and coordination of these at a national level is through an agreed Joint Country Strategy Programme which is a periodically developed and agreed as integrated strategic action plans between each Member PICs and SPC. The annual Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA) meeting provides regional coordination and review. This process includes close coordination of project activities with the activities of other donor-funded projects.

Major Stakeholder Mapping

Stakeholder	Project Implementation Roles
<p>A. National Government Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cook Islands: Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning • FS Micronesia: Kosrae Island Resource Management Authority • Fiji: Land and Water Resource Management Division of the Ministry of Primary Industry • Kiribati: Ministry of Public Works and Utilities • Marshall Islands: The Republic of the Marshall Islands Environmental Protection Authority (RMIEPA) • Nauru: Ministry of Commerce, Industries and Resources (CIR) • Niue: Department of Environment • Palau: Office of Environmental Response and Coordination (OERC) • Papua New Guinea: Department of Environment and Conservation • Samoa: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment • Solomon Islands: Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Meteorology • Tonga: Ministry of Lands, Survey, Natural Resources and Environment • Tuvalu: Department of Environment - Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Environment • Vanuatu: Ministry for Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-Hazards, Environment, Energy and Disaster Management 	<p>National Implementing Partners of National Activities and Pilot Projects</p>
<p>B. NGOs</p> <p>International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)</p> <p>Pacific Islands News Association</p> <p>Live and Learn</p>	<p>National level programme partner and member of the Regional Science and Technology Committee</p> <p>Regional organisation representing the interests of media professionals in the Pacific region. It links radio, television, newspapers, magazines, online services, national associations and journalism schools in 23 Pacific Island will assist Project in coordination of R2R messaging at national level</p> <p>National Level Environmental Education and Awareness</p>

<p>Pacific Water & Wastes Association (PWA)</p> <p>Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (PIANGO).</p> <p>Pan Pacific and Southeast Asia Women's Association (PPSEAWA)</p> <p>Pacific Foundation for the Advancement of Women (PACFAW)</p> <p>Pacific Youth Council</p>	<p>The membership comprises Pacific Island water and wastewater utilities as well as international water authorities, private sector equipment and services supply companies, contractors and consultants assisting the project in coordinating National NGO participation in Pilot R2R Projects</p> <p>Regional network of National NGO focal points based in 22 Pacific Island countries and territories assisting the project in coordinating National NGO participation in Pilot R2R Projects</p> <p>Will assist the project to promote cooperation among the women of the Pacific region.</p> <p>Regional organisation that will assist the project in advocacy and coordination of activities for the advancement of women in the Pacific.</p> <p>Regional non-governmental youth organisation that will assist the project in advocacy and coordination of National Youth Councils across the Pacific region</p>
<p>C. Private Sector</p> <p>Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation (PIPSO)</p>	<p>The premier private sector representative body in the Pacific Islands region organisation that will assist the project in advocacy and coordination its members which is comprised of the national private sector organisations of the 14 Forum Pacific Island Countries</p> <p>Note: More specific listing of private sector stakeholders by country is in Annex 6.</p>
<p>D. Academic organizations:</p> <p>University of the South Pacific (USP)</p> <p>University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG)</p> <p>University of Guam</p> <p>University of Hawaii</p> <p>International Water Center (IWC)</p>	<p>Partners in projects capacity building component and resource for scientific and technical support.</p>
<p>E. GEF Agencies in the R2R Program:</p> <p>United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)</p> <p>Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)</p> <p>United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)</p>	<p>Project Implementing Agency and IA for National STAR R2R Projects for FSM, Tuvalu, Samoa, Tonga, Niue, Cook Islands, Vanuatu, Nauru, PNG, Fiji.</p> <p>IA for National STAR R2R Projects for Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Tonga</p> <p>IA for National STAR R2R Projects for Palau and Marshall Islands</p>
<p>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)</p> <p>United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)</p>	<p>Groundwater associated activities at a National Level</p> <p>National level partner in WASH associated Activities</p>
<p>F. Multilateral organizations</p> <p>Asian Development Bank</p> <p>World Bank</p> <p>European Union (EU)</p>	<p>IA for the Coral Triangle and National Level Infrastructure developments invited participant at Annual RSC</p> <p>IA for several regional Disaster Risk Management and Building Climate Change Resilience will continue cooperative partnership established in the IWRM Project</p> <p>Development partner for National Level Infrastructure developments invited participant at Annual RSC.</p>
<p>G. Pacific Regional Organisations</p>	

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	Cooperative partner in the joint Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Climate Change strategy. Invited participant at Annual RSC
---	--

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Agriculture and fisheries are the primary economic sectors in most PICs, and for many communities and countries these activities represent the sole source of income and exports (Table 3). Mining, forestry, textiles and tourism are also important regionally. A review of official development assistance (ODA) into the Pacific island countries portrays how heavily dependent many countries are on overseas support, with half of the fourteen countries receiving ODA exceeding 30% of their GDP. This support reflects in part the lack of capacity within countries exacerbated by the emigration of skilled islanders, but also the economic vulnerability of many of the islands.

Key regional economic indicators⁽¹⁾

Country	GDP per Capita US\$	GDP Growth (%) ⁽³⁾	ODA as %age of GDP (%) ⁽²⁾	Key Economic Sectors ⁽³⁾
Cook Islands	10 875	-1.2	4	Tourism, black pearls, offshore finance centre
Federated States of Micronesia	2 183	-2.9	49	Fisheries, tourism, copra
Fiji	3 499	0.2	2	Tourism, sugar, textiles
Kiribati	1 490	3.8	35	Copra, fisheries, agriculture
Marshall Islands	2 851	1.2	35	Copra, fisheries, tourism
Nauru	2 071	-0.1	113	Mining, coconuts
Niue	9 618	5.6	88	Tourism, handicrafts
Palau	8 423	2	14	Tourism, agriculture, fishing
Papua New Guinea	897	7	5	Agriculture, petroleum, mining, forestry, fisheries, copra, palm oil
Samoa	2 672	4.5	7	Fisheries, tourism, textiles, automotive parts
Solomon Islands	1 014	7.3	63	Forestry, fisheries, palm, copra, mining
Tonga	2 629	1.2	12	Agriculture, fisheries, tourism
Tuvalu	1 831	2.5	44	Fisheries, copra
Vanuatu	2 218	6.6	13	Tourism, agriculture, offshore financial centre, fisheries, forestry

Notes: (1) Data from the 2010 Pocket Statistical Summary unless otherwise stated (SPC 2010a⁴), (2) Data from Tracking governance and development in the Pacific (AusAID 2009⁶), (3) Business Advantage International (2010⁷)

Pacific island countries are amongst the most vulnerable in the world to natural disasters, in a region where disasters are becoming more intense and more frequent. Costs to the region associated with natural disasters in the 1990s alone were approximately US\$2.8 billion. The economic impacts are potentially a significant constraint to the growth of several countries, with the average economic impact of natural disasters in Samoa at 6.6% of GDP and Vanuatu at 4.4%, compared with global averages PICs at 1.2%. The costs associated with natural disasters are exacerbated by little or lack of attention paid by Pacific island governments to disaster risk management.

Critically, some of the Pacific countries at greatest risks to natural disasters are those that are the least developed to manage these risks. Four of the fourteen Pacific SIDS (Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and Vanuatu) are amongst the United Nations' least developed countries, reflecting low incomes, weak human assets (nutrition, health, school enrolment and adult literacy) and economic vulnerability.

The proposed project will create socio-economic benefits at regional, subregional, national and local levels through building the institutional and social capacity to halt the degradation of and rehabilitate ecosystem goods and services. The project will promote the mainstreaming of gender from Community to cabinet through the Ridge to Reef approach. The specific needs of the disadvantaged, women and men in the proposed pilot areas will be assessed and interventions will be targeted to enable the disadvantaged, women and men to participate in and benefit equally from these pilot activities. The education and training courses provided through the project will advocate the direct involvement of the disadvantaged, women and men, and will incorporate the provision of training in the development and harmonization of gender-balanced policy frameworks. Perhaps the greatest socioeconomic benefit will be occur through the adoption of sustainable management practices that reduce resource degradation, promote rehabilitation of productive ecosystems and optimize environmental services through the Ridge to Reef connectivity. Specifically the project will seek to improve livelihoods through project interventions.

While subsistence agriculture provides local food security, cash crops (such as sugar cane, banana and forest products) are exported in order to earn foreign exchange. Projected impacts of unregulated anthropogenic and climate-induced change are expected to affect local livelihood and a drop in competitiveness of cash crops. In particular, key future impacts are related to extended periods of drought and loss of soil fertility and degradation as a result of increased precipitation and loss of soil both of which will negatively impact on agriculture and food security. Improved land use practices will provide methodology that can be replicated to address these threats to food security

Coastal fisheries contribute significantly to GDP and rural poor livelihood on many of the Pacific Islands; consequently the socio-economic implications of the impact unregulated anthropogenic and climate induced change on fisheries are likely to exacerbate the decline of fish production and food security especially in rural areas. The project will pilot Ridge to Reef management of catchments this will optimize lagoonal water quality and fish productivity.

Increasingly serious degradation of the coastal environment and natural resources on which poor rural people depend through higher rates of erosion and coastal land loss are expected to continue in many Pacific Islands which will be compounded by Climate Change. Pacific Islands are shown to be mainly vulnerable to coastal flooding and decreased extent of coastal vegetated wetlands. Low-lying island states and atolls are likely to experience increased sea flooding, inundation and salinization as a direct consequence of sea level rise. In particular, estimated impacts of sea-level rise on Pacific Islands' coastal communities are quantified in 77,018 km of shoreline affected with direct costs of USD 1,419 million per year at sub-regional level associated to a 30-50 cm of sea-level rise. Livelihoods on Pacific Islands are directly dependent on ecosystem services. The Project will pilot preservation and or rehabilitation of natural coastal buffer systems and these can be scaled up and replicated across the region to improve resilience.

Water resources in Pacific Island are extremely vulnerable to unregulated anthropogenic changes and variations in climate because of their limited size, availability and geology and topography, especially in rainfall. Water stresses caused by such change will have serious impacts on the rural poor reliant on water resources for their livelihoods by managing water resources from Ridge to Reef water quality and aquifer recharge can be optimized and livelihoods improved.

Project Beneficiaries

The R2R Project will be working at local, national and regional levels. All project information and resources collated and developed will be disseminated through the Project's knowledge sharing networks for uptake by local, national and regional level beneficiaries. There are therefore two levels of beneficiaries those that directly participate with the Project through its national pilot projects and those that are part of the broader communication and engagement community. The estimated number of direct beneficiaries of the Project alone across 14 PICs is 197,000 however as the project will also be working closely with the National STAR Projects and these are still in the design stage under a regional R2R Programme Framework, the determination of the total number of direct and

indirect beneficiaries is not possible at this stage. Broadly, managers and policy makers from the public sector, NGOs and CBOs, the regional community of aquatic and land use practitioners, environment, natural resource and climate scientists and environmental engineers, natural resource economists and governance experts will benefit from the information as it will assist them in strengthening strategies and practices, as well as making a clearer case for ensuring development is contingent upon sustainable use of aquatic and land ecosystems and the conservation of ecosystem services.

Primary beneficiaries of the R2R Project Results will be those stakeholders directly engaged in R2R coastal assessment and planning, and on ground application of priority measures to improve coastal resilience and community well-being. The demonstration of the application of informed decision making in response to identified and prioritized risk will ensure the uptake of the results into Government plans, business practices and or community awareness and practices of the links between ecosystem health and services and sustainable resource use.

B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The Ridge to Reef multi-focal, multi-Trust Fund, multi-Agency Program encompasses an integrated cross sectoral environmental management approach that is ideally suited to the unique scale and climatic challenges of the PICs but also provides the most cost-effective delivery mechanism in a capacity challenged region. Through a cohesive programmatic approach, synergies with existing and emerging projects at regional, subregional, national and local levels can be achieved and a more cost-effective and expansive engagement with stakeholders assured. This management approach will also reduce duplication and overlap thereby increasing project value. The project will be able to coordinate delivery, reporting and lessons learned to more cost-effectively transfer knowledge inter and intra nationally improving project outcomes and reducing environmental stress.

The project builds on the local, national and regional structures of the recently completed GEF Pacific IWRM Project which established functional national Inter-ministerial committees, local demonstration project steering committees and project management units this project can build off these already established governance and management structures to be more cost-effective in its implementation through a more rapid project start and delivery. Another successful strategy of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project was the efficient use of the Annual Regional Steering Committee Meetings as noted in the that project's terminal evaluation "RSC meetings placed great emphasis on turning ProDoc ambitions into regional and country strategies and plans, including country demonstration logframes, and country and regional M&E, communication and engagement strategies. Subsequent RSC meetings were used to not only report on progress, but to enact responses to issues of timeliness where these arose. In many cases the RSC meetings were used to expedite the development of strategies and activities under closer PCU and regional peer scrutiny and assistance." The proposed project will adopt these cost-effective and efficient strategies.

The unique counterpart support provided through the project will be cost effective due to economies of scale as the SPC based project provides technical services to 14 dispersed PICs and an effective extension and support of a Pacific Ridge to Reef Network. This will provide the foundation for a cost-effective simplified shared system of reporting

The regional education programme will be cost-effective as the contact requirements will be met on the fringes of the regional and subregional meetings ensuring that participation becomes a marginal cost. At the national and local level, vocational training programme cost-effectiveness will be achieved through the sharing of the programmes across 14 PICs.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M& E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

Project start:

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- b) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- e) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held following the inception workshop. A total of two Board meetings should happen annually.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Quarterly progress reports must be entered into Atlas and should be aligned to achievements from Annual Work Plans. Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Quarterly reports should be submitted within the 15 days of the month following the end of every quarter
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

- Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).

- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP GEF will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP GEF and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of Project:

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project:

An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and Knowledge Sharing:

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. The project will participate in GEF IW portfolio learning via IW:LEARN, including participation in biennial GEF IW conferences, and allocation of a minimum of 1% of the project budget to portfolio learning activities.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and Visibility Requirements:

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP logo can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf

Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

M & E Workplan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Manager UNDP CO, UNDP GEF RTA 	Indicative cost: 161,000	Within first 2 months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by Project Manager Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP GEF RTA UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP GEF RTA 	Indicative cost: 40,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
	▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)		
Final Evaluation	▪ Project manager and team, ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF RTA ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost : 60,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ local consultant	None	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project manager and team	Indicative cost per year 12,000, i.e., 60,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF RTA (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 321,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	

This project forms part of an overall programmatic framework under which several separate associated country level activities will be implemented. When assistance and support services are provided from this Project to the associated country level activities, this document shall be the “Project Document” instrument referred to in: (i) the respective signed SBAs for the specific countries; or (ii) in the Supplemental Provisions attached to the Project Document in cases where the recipient country has not signed an SBA with UNDP, attached hereto and forming an integral part hereof.

This project will be implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community – SOPAC division - (“Implementing Partner”) in accordance with its financial regulations, rules, practices and procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. Where the financial governance of an Implementing Partner does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition, the financial governance of UNDP shall apply.

The responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP’s property in the Implementing Partner’s custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried; (b) assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.

The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999).

The list can be accessed via <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm> . This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter)

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE(mm/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Vaitoti TUPA	Director, Cook Islands National Environment Service	Cook Is.	APRIL 4, 2013
Mr. Andrew YATILMAN	Director, Office of Environment and Emergency Management	Fed. States of Micronesia	March 27, 2013
Mrs. Taina TAGICAKIBAU	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment	Fiji	March 27, 2013
Mrs. Nenenteiti Teariki RUATU	Deputy Director (Officer in Charge), Environment & Conservation Division, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development	Kiribati	April 5, 2013
Mr. Warwick HARRIS	Acting Director, Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC)	Marshall Is.	April 4, 2013
Mr. Russ KUN	Permanent Secretary, Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment	Nauru	March 25, 2013
Mr. Sione TONGATULE	Director, Department of Environment	Niue	March 26, 2013
Mr. Sebastian R. MARINO	National Environment Planner, Office of the Environmental Response and Coordination, Office of the President	Palau	April 4, 2013
Mr. Gunther JOKU	Acting Secretary, Department of Environment and Conservation	Papua New Guinea	April 2, 2013
Mr. Taulealeausumai Laavasa MALUA	Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Samoa	April 2, 2013
Mr. Joe HOROKOU	Director, Environment and Conservation Division, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology	Solomon Islands	April 4, 2013
Mr. Asipeli PALAKI	Secretary and CEO, Ministry of Lands, Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources	Tonga	April 5, 2013
Ms. Perpetua Election LATASI	Acting Director of Environment, Department of Environment	Tuvalu	April 5, 2013
Mr. Albert WILLIAMS	Director, Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources	Vanuatu	April 4, 2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator		19 Dec. 2014	Jose Erezo Padilla	+66 2 304 9100 ext. 2730	jose.padilla@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Title: Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries
UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: Outcome 2; Output 2.5 – Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems in line with international conventions and national legislation; Output 2.5.2
UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: Outcome 1; Output 1.4 – Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented: Output 1.4.2.
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: International Waters Strategic Objective 1; and Strategic Objective 3
Project Objective: To test the mainstreaming of ‘ridge-to-reef’ (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services
Objective Indicator: Extent of harmonization of sectoral governance frameworks for integrated ‘ridge to reef’ approaches achieved through national sustainable development planning
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Component 1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability <i>Outcomes:</i> 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network] 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments 1.3 Community leader roundtable networks established for strengthened ‘community to cabinet’ ICM/IWRM Component 2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation <i>Outcomes:</i> 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation 2.2 PIC knowledge on climate variability, coastal area planning in DRM, integrating ‘blue forest’ and coastal livelihoods consolidated and shared to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning 2.3 Incentive structures for retention of local ‘Ridge to Reef’ expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated Component 3. Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Planning <i>Outcomes:</i> 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs 3.3 Physical, natural, human and social capital built to strengthen island resilience to current and emerging anthropogenic threats and climate extremes Component 4. Regional and National ‘Ridge to Reef’ Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management <i>Outcomes:</i> 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects 4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established Component 5. Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination <i>Outcomes:</i> 5.1 Effective program coordination of national and regional R2R projects

**Gender specific indicators.*

Component 1 National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability

Outcome 1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]

Components	Outcomes	Indicator(s)	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability	1.1 Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM, IWRM and climate change adaptation [linked to national STAR projects via larger Pacific R2R network]	1.1.1 Number and quality of baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information incorporated in project area diagnostics	1.1.1 Baseline environmental and social data is unconsolidated	1.1.1 14 national pilot project area diagnostics based on R2R approach including: baseline environmental state and social data incorporating CC vulnerabilities; and local governance of water, land, forests and coasts reviewed	1.1.1 Pilot area diagnostic reports published online	1.1.1 Data and information required to conduct diagnostic analyses may not be shared by local government agencies
		1.1.2 Stress reduction and water, environmental and socioeconomic status indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal waste pollution reduction (N kg/yr.) • Pollution reduction to aquifers (kg/ha/yr.) • Area of restored habitat (ha) • Area of conserved/protected wetland • Area of catchment under improved management (ha) • Number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods • Status of mechanisms for PM&E Number and quality of demonstration projects that have incorporated	1.1.2 Limited community and cross-sectoral participation in the planning of coordinated investments and stress reduction efforts in land, forest, water and coastal management in PICs. <i>(Baseline for water, environmental and social economic status indicators for municipal waste pollution, pollution to aquifers, areas of restored habitat, area of conserved/protected wetland, area of catchment under improved management, and number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods, will be obtained at project start.)</i>	1.1.2 14 national pilot projects test methods for catalyzing local community action, utilizing and providing best practice examples, and building institutional linkages for integrated land, forest, water and coastal management, and resulting in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal waste pollution reduction of 5,775 kg N/yr. (6 sites) • Pollution reduction to aquifer of 23 kg N/ha/yr. (2 sites) • 6,838 ha of restored habitat (4 sites) • 290 ha of conserved/protected wetland (2 sites) • 25,860 ha of catchment under improved 	1.1.2 Reports of community and sectoral participation in the planning, execution, and monitoring and evaluation of pilot activities, including annual reports on effectiveness of stress reduction measures Project Implementation Reports, Mid-term and Terminal Evaluation Reports	1.1.2(a) Development pressures may result in adoption or revision of land-use policies by national or local governments which are incompatible with activities at pilot sites 1.1.2 (b) Challenges and costs associated with demonstrating environmental stress reduction benefits of technologies and management measures may constrain replication and upscaling 1.1.2 (c) Sufficient commitment from Pacific leaders to address gender issues and promote

Components	Outcomes	Indicator(s)	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		gender analysis as part of the community engagement plans		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> management (7 sites) • 30 charcoal producers (40 % of total) engaged in alternative charcoal production activities • Participatory monitoring and evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic status of coastal areas (9 sites) • 14 national pilot projects demonstrate gender responsive implementation and results • Direct national pilot project beneficiaries equitably shared 		mainstreaming.

Outcome 1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability (<i>cont.</i>)	1.2 National diagnostic analyses for ICM conducted for prioritizing and scaling-up key ICM/IWRM reforms and investments	1.2.1 By end of the project, number of diagnostic analyses conducted for priority coastal areas	1.2.1 Choice of sites for GEF and other donor investment in natural resource and environmental management does not adequately represent the range of biological, environmental and socio-economic conditions in PICs	1.2.1 14 diagnostic analysis for ICM/IWRM and CCA investments conducted to inform priority areas for scaling-up in each of 14 participating PICs	1.2.1 Diagnostic reports for priority coastal areas published	1.2.1 Data and information required to conduct site characterizations of coastal areas may not be shared by relevant sectoral agencies or other institutions
		1.2.2 Number and quality of ICM-IWRM investments incorporating baseline environmental state and socio-cultural information for the prioritization of investment sites	1.2.2 Lack of a scientifically sound and objective procedure for the selection of locations for investment in integrated natural resource and environmental management in PICs	1.2.2 Up to 14 ICM-IWRM investments utilizing methodology and procedures for characterizing island coastal areas for ICM investment developed by the project	1.2.2 Regional guidelines for characterizing and prioritizing coastal areas for ICM investment prepared	1.2.2 Engaging appropriate expertise to facilitate consensus on the selection of physical, biological and social variables to be used in characterization of PIC coastal areas

Outcome 1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened ‘community to cabinet’ ICM/IWRM

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1. National Demonstrations to Support R2R ICM/IWRM Approaches for Island Resilience and Sustainability (<i>cont.</i>)	1.3 Multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks established for strengthened ‘community to cabinet’ ICM/IWRM	1.3.1 Number of local leaders and local governments engagement/ participating in multi-stakeholder leader roundtable networks	1.3.1 Limited engagement of community-based governance mechanisms in national policy and planning	1.3.1 Institutional relationships between national and community-based governance structures strengthened and formalized through national “Ridge to Reef” Inter-Ministry Committees in 14 Pacific SIDS	1.3.1 Reports of multi-stakeholder leader network activities	1.3.1 Existing tensions between land-owners and government agencies may limit community leader participation
		1.3.2 Number of forums held to discuss opportunities for agreements on private sector and donor participation in PIC sustainable development	1.3.2 Low level mobilization of the private sector in environmental investment and planning in PICs	1.3.2 Up to 14 new national private-sector and donor partnership forums for investment planning in priority community-based ICM/IWRM actions	1.3.2 Reports of private sector and donor partnership forums	1.3.2 Limited private sector presence, or alignment of donor investment strategies with proposed actions, at priority R2R locations

Component 2 Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation

Outcome 2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation	2.1 National and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation built to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation	2.1.1 Number of PIC-based personnel with post-graduate training in R2R management. *Data will be gender disaggregated	2.1.1 Zero R2R post-graduate training courses available specific to the Pacific Region.	2.1.1 At least 10 people with post-graduate training in R2R management. *At least 5 people will be women At least 3 innovative post-graduate training programs for the Pacific Region in ICM/IWRM and related CC adaptation delivered for	2.1.1 Agreed curricula and materials for post-graduate training program published	2.1.1 Internationally recognized institute (or consortium) able to deliver a cost-effective post-graduate training course which is both accredited and regionally appropriate

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				project managers and participating stakeholders through partnership of internationally recognized educational institutes and technical support and mentoring program with results documented		
		2.1.2 Number of community stakeholders (i.e. catchment management committees, CSOs, etc.) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities	2.1.2 Limited national and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation constrains achievement of best practice in integrated management in PICs	2.1.2 At least 14 community stakeholder groups (i.e. Catchment management committees, CSOs, etc.) engaged in R2R planning and CC adaptation activities. *Number of trainings (including training on integrating gender into community level R2R and CC planning and implementation) conducted to build capacity for civil society and community organization participating in ICM/IWRM and CC adaptation strengthened through direct involvement in implementation of demo activities with results documented	2.1.2 Community training materials compiled and published online	2.1.2 Adequate resourcing from national STAR projects available to support STAR project stakeholder participation in training and capacity building activities

Outcome 2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local ‘Ridge to Reef’ expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
------------	----------	-----------	----------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
2. Island-based Investments in Human Capital and Knowledge to Strengthen National and Local Capacities for Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM approaches, incorporating CC adaptation (<i>cont.</i>)	2.2 Incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise and inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM initiated	2.2.1 Number of R2R personnel for which functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analyzed Number of studies completed identifying the national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/ tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation Number of capacity building support secured with results documented	2.2.1 Required functional competencies of national and local personnel for environment and natural resource management in PIC contexts undefined and untracked	2.2.1 Up to 14 R2R personnel identified, with functional competencies are benchmarked, tracked and analysed. At least one study completed identifying national human capacity needs for R2R (ICM/IWRM) implementation and benchmarking/tracking competencies of national and local government units for R2R implementation. Based on the study, at least 14 capacity building support provided with results documented.	2.2.1 Assessment of national and local government competencies and capacity development needs published	2.2.1 Securing advice and support from human resource specialist familiar with systems of government and barriers to sustainable development in PIC contexts
		2.2.2 Number of recommendations on practitioner retention internalized at national and local government levels	2.2.2 Retention of skilled and experienced practitioners in environment and natural resource management low, particularly in project-based investments, including limited dialogue on human capacity needs for cross-sectoral	2.2.2 At least 1 regional report with recommendations for R2R practitioner retention at national and local government levels completed. The report will analyse existing Public Service Commission salary scales and required functional competencies of key R2R (ICM/IWRM) personnel; appropriate guidelines and incentive structures for retention of local R2R expertise proposed.	2.2.2 Report of Public Service Commission employment conditions, ICM/IWRM human capacity needs, and recommended incentive structures published	2.2.2 Sufficient commitment from Pacific leaders to address human resourcing issues for natural resource and environmental management

Component 3 Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks

Outcome 3.1 National and regional strategic action frameworks for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
3. Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Frameworks	3.1 National and regional strategic action framework for ICM/IWRM endorsed nationally and regionally	3.1.1 Number of sectoral governance framework harmonised and strengthened through national and regional development frameworks	3.1.1 Constrained and inadequate sectoral planning and investment of natural and social systems in PICs	3.1.1 National recommendations for 14 PICs for coastal policy, legal and budgetary reforms for ICM/IWRM for integration of land, water, forest, coastal management and CC adaptation compiled and documented with options for harmonization of governance frameworks	3.1.1 14 national reviews of existing policies, laws, Executive Orders, Presidential Decrees, and departmental strategic plans relating to land, forest, water, and coastal management, including recommendations for the harmonization of governance frameworks published	3.1.1 Government agencies may be unwilling to participate in processes for the harmonization of policy and legislation
		3.1.2 Inter-ministerial agreements and strategic action framework for 14 PICs developed and submitted for endorsement on integration of land, water, forest and coastal management and capacity building in development of national ICM/IWRM reforms and investment plans	3.1.2 Lack of national and regional policy and plans to support the mainstreaming of R2R approaches in development planning	3.1.2 Agreements and strategic action frameworks for the 14 PICs endorsed by leaders	3.1.2 Endorsed National and Regional Strategic Action Frameworks published	3.1.2 Consultative processes will not elicit adequate stakeholder input and commitment of support from national networks to proposed priority strategic actions
		3.1.3 Number of demonstrable use of national 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports in national and regional action planning for R2R investment	3.1.3 Limited application of evidence-based approaches in PICs national development planning in the areas of: freshwater use and sanitation; wastewater	3.1.3 National 'State of the Coasts' or 'State of the Islands' reports for 14 PICs completed and launched to Pacific Leaders during National Coastal Summits (Yr. 3) in coordination with	3.1.3 Published 'State of the Coasts' reports	3.1.3 Strong and high-level government commitment is generated, sustained and willing to use 'State of Islands' reporting as an instrument for change

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			treatment and pollution control; land use and forestry practices; balancing coastal livelihoods and biodiversity conservation; hazard risk reduction; and climate variability and change	national R2R projects and demonstrated as national development planning tool, including guidelines for diagnostic analyses of coastal areas		

Outcome 3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
3. Mainstreaming of Ridge to Reef ICM/IWRM Approaches into National Development Planning (<i>cont.</i>)	3.2 Coordinated approaches for R2R integrated land, water, forest and coastal management and CC adaptation achieved in 14 PICs	3.2.1 Number of networks of national R2R pilot project inter-ministerial committees formed and linked to existing national IWRM committees	3.2.1 National IWRM task forces and local coordinating committees in 12 countries and a need exists for strengthened coordination of IWRM plan implementation within broader R2R frameworks	3.2.1 Up to 14 national networks of R2R (ICM/IWRM) national pilot project inter-ministry committees formed by building on existing IWRM committees and contributing to a common results framework at the project and program levels	3.2.1 Meeting reports of pilot project committees (joint management/planning decisions and participant lists)	3.2.1 Provincial and local governments may perceive IMC approach as being driven by central government
		3.2.2 Number of people participating in inter-ministry committee (IMC) meetings conducted including scope and uptake of joint management and planning decisions *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.2.2 Limited number and variety of stakeholders participating in national coordinating bodies to ensure community to Cabinet planning of investment in sustainable development of PICs	3.2.2 The number and variety of stakeholders participating in periodic IMC meetings in 14 PICs are doubled, with meeting results documented, participation data assembled and reported to national decision-makers and regional forums *50% of participants	3.2.2 Meeting reports of periodic national IMC meetings (joint management/planning decisions and participant lists), including annual IMC 'results' report to national leaders in 14 PICs and regional fora	3.2.2 Appropriately qualified national staff available to provide adequate Secretariat support to IMC work

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups		
		3.2.3 Number of networks established between community leaders and local government from pilot projects	3.2.3 Limited exchange between communities on best practices in environment and natural resource management	3.2.3 Community leaders and local government create at least 14 networks via national and regional round-table meetings complemented by community tech exchange visits	3.2.3 Reports of national and regional round-table meetings	3.2.3 Adequate cooperation is fostered among IW pilot project and national STAR project staff to build stakeholder confidence in benefits of integration
		3.2.4 Number of inter-ministry committee members meeting within the 4 pilot PICs that is engaged in learning and change in perception through participatory techniques *Participation data to be disaggregated by gender	3.3.4 Limited learning on effectiveness of investments in country-driven approaches to development assistance in PICs	3.2.4 At least 20 ICM members total from the 4 pilot PICs (sub-regional, mix of high island, atoll settings) gauge in learning, leading to change in perception through participatory techniques. *50% of participants will be women, youth, and/or from vulnerable groups	3.2.4 Report of the application of participatory techniques to gauge learning and change in perception among IMC members in 4 pilot PICs	3.2.4 R2R is accepted at the national level as a legitimate framework for a multi focal area approach to GEF investment for PIC sustainable development

Component 4 Regional and National ‘Ridge to Reef’ Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management

Outcome 4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
4. Regional and National ‘Ridge to Reef’ Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management	4.1 National and regional formulation and adoption of integrated and simplified results frameworks for integrated multi-focal projects	4.1.1 Number and quality of national and regional indicator sets with the proposed targets and outcomes of the R2R program	4.1.1 Calls from Pacific leaders for strengthened emphasis on results in the planning and financing of development in PICs	4.1.1 1 simple and integrated national and regional reporting templates developed based on national indicator sets and regional framework to facilitate annual results	4.1.1 Agreed national and regional reporting templates published online	4.1.1 (a) Design of national STAR projects include targets and related indicators aimed at achievement of R2R program goals and outcomes; (b) legal agreements between

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				reporting and monitoring from 14 PICs		national lead agencies and GEF implementing agencies for STAR projects include explicit requirement for project management units to meet R2R program reporting requirements
		4.1.2 Level of acceptance of the harmonized results tracking approach by the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	4.1.2 Lack of results tracking and reporting approach tested via GEF Pac IWRM project, including training of a cadre of national WatSan sector staff	4.1.2 1 unified/harmonized multi-focal area results tracking approach and analytical tool developed, endorsed, and proposed to the GEF, its agencies and participating countries	4.1.2 Regional results framework and analytical tool developed and accessible online for review and testing	4.1.2 Sustained commitment of senior government officials with oversight of IW and STAR projects to develop and test a harmonized results approach for GEF investment in PICs
		4.1.3 Number of National planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	4.1.3 An increasingly large myriad of national level reporting requirements for natural resource and environment agencies constrains the timely and accurate reporting of results of development assistance in PICs	4.1.3 Up to 14 national planning exercises in 14 Pac SIDS conducted with participants from relevant ministries with a mandate to embed R2R results frameworks into national systems for reporting, monitoring and budgeting	4.1.3 Reports of national planning exercises in 4 PICs on embedding R2R results frameworks into national systems	4.1.3 National planning and finance ministry staff are sufficiently well engaged in national planning exercises

Outcome 4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
------------	----------	-----------	----------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
4. Regional and National 'Ridge to Reef' Indicators for Reporting, Monitoring, Adaptive Management and Knowledge Management (<i>cont.</i>)	4.2 National and regional platforms for managing information and sharing of best practices and lessons learned in R2R established	4.2.1 Regional communications strategy developed and number of partnership with media and educational organizations	4.2.1 Absence of public-private partnership in support of communicating benefits of IWRM initiated via GEF Pac IWRM project	4.2.1 Regional 'ridge to reef' communications strategy developed and implemented and assistance provided to national R2R project including at least 10 partnerships with national and regional media and educational organizations	4.2.1 Approved communications strategy published	4.2.1 (a) Willingness of regional and national media outlets prepared to partner with R2R program implementation; and (b) adequate resourcing from national STAR projects to the development of media products required to effectively communicate the benefit of integrated R2R approaches
		4.2.2 Number of IW:LEARN experience notes published	4.2.2 Limited regional and global sharing of information on best practice and lessons learned from the GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability	4.2.2 Participation in IW:LEARN activities: conferences; preparation of at least 10 experience notes and inter-linked websites with combined allocation of 1% of GEF grant	4.2.2 Published experience notes	4.2.2 Retention of national and regional level staff required to resource the documentation of experiences and lessons learned as IW:LEARN experience notes
		4.2.3 Number of users, volume of content accessed, and online visibility of the 'Pacific R2R Network'	4.2.3 Need for media platforms and targeted communications in support of efforts to harness support for inter-ministerial coordination and policy and planning elements of the R2R program	4.2.3 Pacific R2R Network established with at least 100 users registered, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned, and results	4.2.3 Regional and national project portals, GIS and meta-databases, roster of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national projects, repository for best practice R2R technologies, lessons learned, and results portal accessible online via 'Pacific R2R Network'	4.2.3 Inter-connectivity in national and regional project offices is adequate to support the efficient online compilation and sharing of information and data

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				learned etc.		

Component 5 Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination

Outcome 5.1 Effective program coordination of national and regional R2R projects

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
5. Ridge-to-Reef Regional and National Coordination	5.1 Effective program coordination of national and regional R2R projects	5.1.1 Program coordination unit recruited and staff retained	5.1.1 No coordination unit and full time personnel established	5.1.1 Functioning overall R2R program coordination unit with alignment of development worker positions contributing to coordinated effort among national R2R projects (Year 1)	5.1.1 Terms of Reference and contracts for program coordination unit staff	5.1.1 Regional executing agency ability to recruit and retain appropriately qualified staff for program coordination unit
		5.1.2 Number of requests for regional-level support to national project delivery and management met by program coordination unit	5.1.2 Limited national level experience and capacity in delivery of large integrated natural resource and environment projects and programs	5.1.2 Technical, operational, reporting and monitoring Unit is operational to provide support to national R2R projects, as may be requested by PICs, to facilitate timely delivery of overall program goals. At least 14 requests per year are met effectively.	5.1.2 Outputs of in-country technical support missions Annual client (country) survey on regional R2R support quality	5.1.2 Adequate resourcing available to program coordination unit to meet support requests of national STAR projects
		5.1.3 Number of R2R staff trained resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing	5.1.3 Low-level familiarity with GEF minimum standards for results-based management, monitoring and evaluation, and financial and progress reporting requirements of GEF and its implementing agencies	5.1.3 At least 14 R2R staff are trained (in harmonized reporting and monitoring and other regional and national and capacity building modules, among others) resulting in effective results reporting and online information sharing.	5.1.3 Training modules for results reporting and online information sharing published online R2R Staff annual performance evaluation	5.1.3 IW pilot and STAR project are retained to enable the longer-term development and local exchange of national project management and reporting capacity

Components	Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		5.1.4 Volume and quality of information and data contributed by program stakeholders to online repositories	5.1.4 Existing GEF IWRM interactive website with a cadre of national project stakeholders trained in its operation	5.1.4 At least 4 quality information and/or data contributed/ updated per year (total of at last 16 throughout the project) to the online repository, as a result of support provided to PICs for the development and operation of the Pacific R2R Network and regional with national R2R web pages as a repository of information, documentation and for sharing best practices	5.1.4 Program stakeholder contributions of information and data published online	5.1.4 Internet connectivity in national and regional offices of program/project stakeholders adequate to support use of online training tools
		5.1.5 Number of planning and coordination workshops conducted for national projects teams to ensure timeliness and cost-effectiveness of IW pilot project and STAR project coordination, delivery and reporting	5.1.5 Limited sub-regional and regional coordination and planning workshops conducted in association with inter-governmental meetings for cost efficiency purposes	5.1.5 At least 4 (1 per year) planning and coordination workshops conducted for national project teams in the Pacific R2R network	5.1.5 Agenda, list of participants and minutes of planning and coordination workshops	5.1.5 National and regional organisations assign sufficient importance to engagement with planning and coordination initiatives of the project

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).

During the review of the International Waters PIF the following comments were received from the GEF Secretariat, STAP, and the GEF Council members. These comments have been taken into account during the PPG. And these are detailed below.

1. COMMENTS FROM THE GEF SECRETARIAT:

Comment

The project is aligned with the IW Focal area Results framework and will be among others be instrumental in implementing the National IWRM plans that are presently being finalised in the region.

Response

The project is consistent with the GEF-5 International Waters (IW) strategy which is focused on catalyzing the scaling up of collective action for freshwater basins, aquifers, and marine systems (including SIDS) in support of multiple MDGs as well as protecting the capacity of ‘blue forests’ to sequester carbon. Specifically the project is aligned with GEF 5 IW Objective 1: Catalyze multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in transboundary surface and groundwater basins (including SIDS) while considering climatic variability and change; and IW Objective 3: Support foundational capacity building and portfolio learning for joint, ecosystem-based management of trans-boundary water systems.

Additionally, all participating countries are eligible for GEF funding as a result of being Parties to at least one, if not all, of the following five GEF supported Conventions and their related Protocols: UN CBD; UN FCCC; UN POPs; UN CCD; Montreal Protocol. Additionally, the PICs are eligible for GEF support under the IW strategy, and with over 6000 islands and islets, a population of more than seven million and exclusive economic zones of over 5,000,000 km², the PICs clearly have priority eligibility under GEF IW. The project will coordinate nationally based multi-focal area investments whilst also preparing PICs for linking and scaling up IWRM to ICM. GEF has recognized that there is a need for reform and capacity building focusing on a more crosscutting approach to water, land and coastal resource management that captures the complementarities among GEF focal areas. Such approaches are necessary to ensure appropriate synergies among the work of the various sector agencies, between governments and communities, and the investments of development partners and donors in order to implement stress reduction measures at the scale required to build island sustainability and resilience. By building on the focus on integrated coastal area management in Agenda 21, WSSD, and Rio+20, the project also provides a first opportunity for Pacific Island countries to test innovative and integrated water-related solutions involving both ICM and IWRM to sustain livelihoods, reduce climate related risks, secure access to water and sanitation, and safeguard ecosystem function.

Comment

Is the project consistent with the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP? However, it will need to be completed at CEO endorsement with a complementarity assessment

Response

The R2R program has been designed to complement the implementation of relevant national priorities including the CBD National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan (NBSAP), UNFCCC NAPA, UNFCCC National Communications, REDD+ Policies, UNCCD National Action Plans, National Sustainable Development Strategies and other documents. For each country, the relevance of this program to the implementation of the various strategies under the relevant Conventions is described in Annex C of the GEF Council approved R2R Program Framework Document.

Comment

The framework will include indicators, including stress reduction, to be developed during the PPG. Financial sustainability aspects will be developed during PPG and elaborated upon at CEO endorsement. Role of private sector national partnership forums will be factored in.

Response

Refer the ProDoc Section 3 Project Results Framework for Indicators including Stress reduction Indicators. Financial sustainability is dealt with in the ProDoc Section 2.9.

Comment

Please elaborate at CEO endorsement on the socioeconomic benefits.

Response

Socioeconomic benefits are fully considered and described in 3.2. Beneficiaries are identified and the number of direct Project beneficiaries are estimated across the PICs. Given that part of the role of the Project is to technically backstop the National STAR Projects which are currently in various stages of PPG an expanded elaboration of the socioeconomic benefits is not possible at this stage.

2. COMMENTS FROM STAP

Comment

STAP advises that greater attention needs to be given in assessing existing capacity in the various countries to undertake the actions and to strengthen the links between planning and the implementation of a plan of action that produces the desired outcomes, given that both capacity and commitment range very considerably. The work to be undertaken would greatly benefit from a sustained process of monitoring and self-assessment that applies the approach termed "developmental evaluation" by Michael Quinn Patton (2011)

Response

Support for benchmarking, building and tracking capacity development is an integral part of the Ridge to Reef programme, with a focus on strengthening the capacities of countries to manage their priority environmental issues and contribute to global environmental benefits. It has also been identified by Pacific leaders as a priority concern and was reflected in the 1997 Strategic Action Programme. Over recent years the GEF has provided nine of Ridge to Reef participating countries with support to conduct a National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) of national capacity needs and to develop capacity action plans. These assessments and plans identified the need for capacity development to: improve the harmonization sectoral legislation and governance frameworks to support integrated management approaches; make timely and cost effective use of financial resources available to the environment and natural resource sectors; enhance research and monitoring capabilities, including strengthened national data and information systems; strengthen human resource capabilities and retain skilled practitioners; improve institutional coordination; and to enhance awareness of priority threats to national significantly coastal areas, particularly from the perspective of island vulnerabilities associated with disasters and climate extremes.

The Ridge to Reef approach in Pacific SIDS will address the abovementioned needs via a regionally coordinated programme of island-based investments in human capital. Specifically, this project will benchmark, build and establish systems for tracking national and local capacity for ICM and IWRM implementation to enable best practice in integrated land, water, forest and coastal management, which incorporates climate change adaptation considerations. It will also consolidate and share PICs knowledge on issues including, inter alia, climate variability and extreme weather events, coastal area planning in disaster risk management, and integrating blue forest and livelihood considerations to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning. Additionally, incentive structures for retention of local 'Ridge to Reef' expertise will be identified, and supporting inter-governmental dialogue on human resource needs for ICM/IWRM will be initiated.

Comment

Regarding the support proposed under Components 2 and 4, STAP advises that the present project on behalf of the Program, has the opportunity, at least for the cluster of 14 countries represented with the Program, to more broadly strengthen the scientific and technical linkages between the PICs, building upon the SOPAC mechanism and to consider how the Science, Technology and Resources Network (STAR) of SOPAC could build capacity to make operational a regional multidisciplinary network similar to the SIDSTAP concept, augmented with SOPAC-STAR support and in coordination with the University of the South Pacific.

Response

Coastal and marine spatial planning in PICs, including climate change adaptation, is currently constrained as a result of inadequate engagement of sectoral experience in: water security and wastewater management; coastal 'blue forests' and livelihoods; coastal hazards management; and disaster risk reduction. The project will facilitate the consolidation and sharing of sectoral knowledge and expertise via three key mechanisms. The first of these mechanisms includes the establishment and operation of a high-level scientific and technical body that serves as a forum for reconciling both sectorial and national interests and priorities, and which fosters the incorporation of sound science into decision-making and national and regional planning. This body, the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC), will draw on geoscience expertise of the Pacific Science, Technology and Resource Network as well as regional and national Universities, and act as a source of independent scientific and technical advice to policy-makers and planners. It will also foster regional co-operation in the integration of scientific knowledge and research outputs with management, policymaking, and planning.

The RSTC will also be responsible for ensuring that scientific and technical aspects of the R2R programme meet International standards. Specifically it will review the substantive activity of project component 1 to develop a regionally appropriate method and procedure for the characterization and prioritization of PICs coastal areas for R2R investment and the conduct of diagnostic analysis to identify needs for key reforms and investments in priority areas. The RSTC will also provide inputs to the design of curricula and training materials for the regional post-graduate training programme to be operated as part of this component, and will provide regional guidance to the national 'State of Coasts' reporting and harmonized results reporting to be undertaken as part of components 3 and 4, respectively. Additionally, the RSTC will lead the development of regionally appropriate knowledge tools to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning in PICs.

Comment

The GEF Pacific IWRM project (GEFID 2586) was reported as having tested application Payment for Ecosystem Services under its Component 3 (see PIF, section A.1.6), which is regarded in the present project as one of the baseline contributions to be applied to the coastal zone. STAP has not been able to find any references in the cited mid-term report on the GEF Pacific IWRM project to review the use of PES and would therefore wish to stress that advice on use of PES has been evolving (the concept of ecosystem services can be extended to take in "environmental" services). Therefore the proponents should carefully consider the current advice from STAP and publications from the GEF Secretariat to address appropriate entry points and reduce the threats to PES effectiveness e.g. (i) non-compliance; (ii) poor administrative selection; (iii) spatial demand spillovers; and particularly important, (iv) adverse self-selection. STAP would be pleased to discuss the design of the further application and development of PES in the combined IWRM/ICM extension.

Response

Innovative financing mechanisms and tools will be incorporated at National levels to build financial sustainability of demonstrated adaptations and livelihoods. These include new and emerging climate change mechanisms, and how these could be used to enhance synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions and increase the capacity of participating countries to identify and mobilize potential financial resources through climate change financing mechanisms. The project will seek to utilize tools to value coastal ecosystem conservation through blue carbon initiatives and to ensure long-term sustainability of coastal areas and green economic development whilst effectively mitigating climate change. Extending the payment for ecosystem services approach to coastal and

marine habitats is important for food security and tourism in PICs. However the points raised by STAP are well taken in regard to the latter and it is correct that aspirations to pilot PES in the pilot IWRM project unfortunately did not materialize. Within the GEF Pacific IWRM Project the threats identified above proved insurmountable within a project time scale, particularly in a region where in most instances no charges are made for water supply and the high degree of community resistance to such charges. Even discussion of the concept of payment for ecosystem services has proven to be politically charged and the R2R Project will need to carefully build widespread understanding of the concept and work with stakeholders to assess prospects for progressing even the testing of payments for ecosystem services.

Comment

STAP recognizes that the Ridge to Reef concept has become more popular and that in some ways it offers a more coherent framework for combining ICM and IWRM into one water flow linked whole. However, taken in isolation these management approaches, even considered under a Ridge to Reef label should also take account of spatial planning, which takes a strategic viewpoint and which is capable of resolving conflicting uses by spatially planning activities and determining different zones for different uses, or the need to balance development and conservation by spatially planning and zoning according to objectives (conservation, economic development, maintaining existing uses, etc.). For example, in the form of Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) as applied to the Convention on Biological Diversity, it is marine and coastal planning that is forward looking, participatory, iterative, and which includes environmental and socio-economic considerations; it is also management that is comprehensive, science-supported and area-based, and promotes sustainable development. STAP advises the program proponents to consider the guidance offered through the joint GEF/CBD publication on Marine Spatial Planning in order to maximize the potential of the ICM/IWRM approaches planned to resolve unsustainable trajectories for biodiversity, land and water use within the coastal zones and related catchments of the 14 countries concerned. At present one of the key deficits of the Program outlined in the parent PFD, although with more substance within the present PIF, is the absence of an overall strategy for assisting the countries with planning within the Ridge to Reef approach towards a realizable and sustainable future. Establishing climate change adaptation benefits

Response

In the outcome document of Rio+20, entitled “The Future We Want”, world leaders reaffirmed the importance of area-based conservation measures, including marine protected areas, as a tool for the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components. They noted Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, which states that by 2020, 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are to be conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures. It has been identified that much of the success in this effort from a biodiversity perspective will depend on the degree to which these protected areas are situated within a broader, multi-sectoral planning context. The GEF Council has identified that marine spatial planning represents an important step in improving collaboration amongst multiple users of the marine environment as a means to conserve marine and coastal biodiversity while at the same time addressing human needs, including livelihood considerations across coasts around estuaries and coral reefs, in near shore lagoon environments and blue forests, and on open oceans. In addressing such issues in PICs, the Ridge to Reef approach will apply a marine spatial planning approach for reconciling sectoral interests while balancing biodiversity considerations. The project strategy draws on recommendations and guidance on marine spatial planning promoted by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the GEF’s Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel.

Specifically, the project will develop regionally appropriate knowledge tools to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning in PICs. This will involve: the conduct of reviews and the consolidation of key scientific and technical matters relating to coastal and marine spatial planning in PICs; the preparation and publication of synthesis reports on climate variability in coastal systems, hazards and coastal area planning, ‘blue forests’ and livelihoods, spatial planning in coastal fisheries, water security and wastewater management, and land and marine tenure and use designation, including implications for coastal and marine spatial planning; and the

production of multi-media products to support national and regional uptake of regionally accumulated scientific knowledge in the application of coastal and marine spatial planning approaches. The project will also strengthen the networking of regional specialists and local practitioners via organization of a Regional Scientific Conference on coastal and marine spatial planning.

Comment

STAP requests that the following advice is carefully considered by the project proponents regarding Component 5. One of the lessons learnt from a related regional project on fisheries (GEF ID 2131 Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific Small Island Developing States) in the region, coordinated through the SPC, was that a regional delivery mechanism is not an appropriate channel for delivery of core institutional change at national level, particularly when requiring detailed scientific and technical advice, but is well-placed to manage the processes associated with the delivery of such services. Additionally, the terminal evaluation of the otherwise successful IWCAM project (GEF ID 1254) which is cited by the parent PFD, noted that there is a risk that a strong Project Coordination Unit may increase the risk of post-project failure to take over strong leadership within the host regional organization. The full Project brief should show how the PCU embedded within SOPAC will be transitioned over the life the Program in order to address this concern.

Response

These conclusions are at odds with the performance of the GEF Pacific IWRM project where the regional delivery mechanism was seen as an important attribute. The terminal evaluation reflected this as follows; “The role of the PCU in particular was praised by RSC members during interviews. Indeed the interviews suggested that there was a highly functional and rewarding relationship, based on mutual need and respect, in place throughout the life of the Project. It is the view of the TE evaluators that the PCU performed an exemplary and exceptionally role in guiding the IWRM Project to its ultimate success. The professional and personal skills and dedication of the some of the PCU staff was of such a high standard that we judge the Project would have struggled in their absence.”

The GEF Pacific IWRM project did make a point of embedding national project managers within the National executing agency and of being proactive in developing good working relationships with and between National Counterparts.

The project design incorporates a number of features that are clearly aimed at building the capacity needed for the high degree of country drivenness at the conclusion of the project. These include direct educational and training programmes, establishing mechanisms for the retention of key personnel, building a technical expert network that PICs can access as needed (Component 2). The experience of the GEF Pacific IWRM Project was that local results build an understanding of the need to do more (Component 1). Building substantive local and national levels of support through the community to cabinet approach also will also assist transition to country drivenness.

Comment

The parent Program document, in setting out reasons for a programmatic approach, over that of a project by project approach, appears not to be adding value regarding the setting of learning objectives for the suite of actions proposed, both to enable lessons for wider use within the GEF partnership and to share within a community of practice for the PICs. Indeed taking the parent Program as a case in point, there is almost nothing proposed within a monitoring and evaluation context that could be used to determine whether the Program, coordinated through this project, adds value beyond being a coordination mechanism. Please address this opportunity to add value to the project and its parent Program

Response

The STAP comment is pertinent particularly in light of the limited availability of information relating to the effectiveness of the GEF 4 Pacific Alliance for Sustainability programme. At the R2R project conceptualization stage, it was envisaged that Programme Coordination funding of US\$500,000 would be made available to support such assessment and learning. Unfortunately, the proponents were advised by the GEF Secretariat that this type of programme coordination support is no longer available. Recognizing the importance of being able to learn and

share experiences from the proposed Pacific programmatic approach, this submission requests an additional US\$509,890 to enable such support activities, in line with historical GEF allowance of up to 5% additional funding at time of CEO endorsement.

The GEF Pacific IWRM project tested a results tracking and reporting approach, which included the training of a cadre of national water and sanitation sector staff in results-based management of GEF supported initiatives, and which was showcased by the GEF Secretariat as a best practice in regional and national project management. The project will build on these achievements by developing a harmonized multi-focal area results framework and analytical tool for use in tracking the progress and results of individual projects and the overarching Ridge to Reef programme. This will involve the development of sets of process, stress reduction and environmental/socioeconomic status indicators, with related reporting templates, for quarterly and annual monitoring and evaluation. National planning exercises will also be conducted in selected PICs to explore the alignment of national indicator sets with convention reporting. Additionally, an online 'results' portal will be developed for Results-Based Management training, the online submission of routine reports, and the routine sharing of Ridge to Reef programme results, including the geospatial presentation of results linked to related initiatives of the GEF International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN) project. The latter will enable ease of access to programme results for evaluation purposes.

3. COMMENTS FROM THE GEF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Comment

Germany requests that the final project proposal clearly reflects the STAP recommendations. This includes in particular enhanced coordination and long-term sustainability through inter alia institutional internalization both at national and regional levels.

Response

As described above, the project document reflects the STAP recommendations. Regarding coordination and long-term sustainability via institutional internalization, the project will support the participating countries in the identification of nationally relevant coastal policy, legal and budgetary reforms for R2R integrated approaches in the 14 countries. This will include the formulation of recommendations for the harmonization of governance systems, i.e., (a) across sectors engaged in land, water, forest and coastal management, including climate change adaptation, and (b) between national government and local governance frameworks. This will involve review and analysis of existing relevant policies, laws, Executive Orders, Presidential Decrees, and departmental strategic plans, and local/municipal by-laws and regulations in 14 PICs. This will be supported via a parallel activity to strengthen evidence-based planning via the development of national State of the Coasts (SoC) reports, which build on the National Water, Sanitation and Climate Outlook reports generated through the Pacific IWRM initiative. The State of the Coast reporting will draw on information and data consolidated through the characterization and diagnostic analyses of priority coastal areas undertaken as part of project Outcome 1.2, and that generated as a result of R2R pilot activities and STAR projects.

The abovementioned parallel activities relating to the harmonization of governance frameworks and the strengthening of evidence-based planning will be used to inform the development of national inter-ministerially agreed Strategic Action Frameworks for ICM. These frameworks will complement the SoC reports, and will include the following key elements: statements of vision, goals, guiding principles, and priority areas of action for ICM; costed ~5 year action plan for ICM implementation, including actions to strengthen enabling environments, institutional frameworks, and management instruments; descriptions of the features and membership of national coordination mechanisms for ICM; and will be approved at the inter-ministerial level. The SoC and Strategic Action Frameworks will be developed through national consultations and launched during National Coastal Summits in Year 3 of the project. The national frameworks will be reflected in a regional Strategic Action Plan for ICM investment in the Pacific SIDS which will be developed in parallel to national activities.

Comment

Since the proposed project is parenting fourteen Pacific Island Countries (PICs), the consideration of a comprehensive marine and coastal spatial planning approach is requested at a regional scale and at on-the-ground intervention levels in order to balance environmental and socio-economic considerations, fostering a more integrated approach that can help to resolve conflicting natural resource uses and enhance ecosystem connectivity

Response

The project will consolidate and share PICs knowledge on issues including, inter alia, climate variability and extreme weather events, coastal area planning in disaster risk management, and integrating blue forest and livelihood considerations to support evidence-based coastal and marine spatial planning refer specifically to Activities 1.2.2.3 and 3.1.1.4.

The GEF Council has identified that marine spatial planning represents an important step in improving collaboration amongst multiple users of the marine environment as a means to conserve marine and coastal biodiversity while at the same time addressing human needs, including livelihood considerations across coasts around estuaries and coral reefs, in near shore lagoon environments and blue forests, and on open oceans. In addressing such issues in PICs, the Ridge to Reef approach will apply a marine spatial planning approach for reconciling sectoral interests while balancing biodiversity considerations. The project strategy draws on recommendations and guidance on marine spatial planning promoted by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel.

Comment

In relation to the (ecosystem-based) adaptation activities planned, it is requested that creating synergies between sub-national and national adaptation plans will be addressed. This could include consideration of measures to quantify and integrate ecosystem services when assessing and valuing EBA options. During the formulation of the project proposal, the implementing agencies and the executing partners should actively seek contact with on-going projects funded by the German Government in order to ensure synergies and complementarities and avoid duplication of efforts, as well as consult with concerned national and local authorities for improved coordination and cooperation.

Response

Component 2 will facilitate the consolidation and sharing of sectoral knowledge and expertise via three key mechanisms. The first of these mechanisms includes the establishment and operation of a high level scientific and technical body that serves as a forum for reconciling both sectoral and national interests and priorities, and which fosters the incorporation of sound science into decision-making and national and regional planning. This body, the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) Activity 5.1.4.2, will act as a source of independent scientific and technical advice to policy-makers and planners. It will also foster regional co-operation in the integration of scientific knowledge and research outputs with management, policymaking, and planning.

The RSTC will also review the substantive activity of project component 1 to develop a regionally appropriate method and procedure for the characterization and prioritization of PICs coastal areas for R2R investment and the conduct of diagnostic analysis to identify needs for key reforms and investments in priority areas. This diagnostic approach will ***“could include consideration of measures to quantify and integrate ecosystem services when assessing and valuing EBA options”***.

There are several catchall approaches built into the design that ensures that at regional, national and local levels stakeholders share project results and workplans. These mechanisms are extended to community through the proposed Community Leaders Roundtable whilst at National level the increasing consolidation of Inter-ministerial committees into a single National Sustainable Development through which all CC, DRM and ICM projects report (refer Outcome 3.2). At the regional level SPC has adopted a programmatic approach to Climate Adaptation Projects due to its cross cutting impacts. Already the region is developing a framework to bring Climate adaptation and DRM together into an integrated approach. The GEF Pacific IWRM project has

participated in this process and this will also be the case with the new R2R Project. The GEF Pacific IWRM project also ensured that related projects participated in the Annual Regional Steering Committee meetings and indeed encouraged such project to use the meetings to achieve synergies through improved coordination and cooperation. The same approach will be adopted for the R2R Project.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁸

1) PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 300,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. Technical review, field studies and preliminary studies	75,000	71,250	3,750
2. Institutional arrangements, M&E	100,000	94,990	5,010
3. Financial planning & co-financing investments	75,000	71,250	3,750
4. Validation workshop	50,000	47,510	2,490
Total	300,000	285,000	15,000

⁸ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

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

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

Not Applicable