



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEFTF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Resilient Islands, Resilient Communities			
Country(ies):	Kiribati	GEF Project ID:1	5551
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	623415
Other Executing Partner(s):	MELAD, MMFRD	Submission Date:	June 2016
		Resubmission Date:	17 October 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	MFA: BD-1, LD-3, IW-3 SFM-1	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	Pacific Ridge To Reef	Project Agency Fee (\$):	424,803

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	New protected areas (Three) and coverage (22 416 ha) of unprotected ecosystems.	GEFTF	1,653,900	5,050,000
LD-3	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities	Integrated land management plans developed and implemented (three)	GEFTF	1,770,098	6,000,000
IW-3	Outcome 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	Demo-scale local action implemented, including in basins with melting ice and to restore/ protect coastal “blue forests”	GEFTF	154,344	640,000
SFM-1	1.2: Good management practices applied in existing forests.	Forest area (232 ha) under sustainable management, separated by forest type	GEFTF	1,141,688	1,650,000
Total project costs				4,720,030	13,340,000

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.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Improve biodiversity conservation and landscape level management to enhance socio-environmental resilience to climate variability and change						
Project Component	TA/ INV	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1. Enabling environment for R2R conservation and sustainable use	TA	<p>1.1 Enabling environment improved for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources</p> <p>Indicators: - LD3 (tracking tool) Framework strengthening INRM score moved from 2 to 3 - LD3 (tracking tool) Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment score moved from 2 to 3</p>	<p>1.1.1 R2R concept mainstreamed into sectoral development priorities and policies with an emphasis on protecting and developing livelihoods (in at least 3 frameworks)</p> <p>1.1.2 National level coordination mechanism developed for cross-sectoral decision-making (including on PAs)</p> <p>1.1.3 Resilience and socio-ecological planning for national to island-level coordination mechanism on whole-of-Island based R2R conservation and sustainable-use strategies streamlined across national and islands levels</p> <p>1.1.4 National and island level environmental education, community outreach and extension program developed (at least nine schools and 30 communities targeted)</p>	GEFTF	723,500	1,942,000
2. Implementation of R2R conservation and sustainable use strategies	TA/ INV	<p>2.1 National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver SFM, LD, and BD benefits</p>	<p>2.1.1 R2R conservation and sustainable use strategies initiated in three islands in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems</p> <p>2.1.2 Expanded and complementary livelihoods developed and diversified as a part of the plans developed under Output 2.1.1 (at</p>	GEFTF	3,295,422	10,100,000

		- 23 746 hectares covered by integrated natural resource management (land and marine) practices in wider landscape	least 350 households involved) 2.1.3 R2R conservation and use strategies across land and sea implemented in at least three target islands (through the integrated plans) 2.1.4 At least three PAs established (where identified in Outputs 2.1.1)			
3: Lessons learning and sharing	TA	3.1 Project implementation based on results management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned	3.1.1 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan and system for the project established and operational 3.1.2 Project related 'knowledge' captured and shared	GEFTF	476,345	1,048,000
Subtotal					4,495,267	13,090,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³					224,763	250,000
Total project costs					4,720,030	13,340,000

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

Please include letters confirming co financing for the project with this form.

Sources of co-financing	Co-financier (source)	Type of co-financing	Amount of co-financing (\$)
Government	MELAD	In-kind	5 650 000
Government	MELAD	Cash	35 0 000
Government	MFMRD	In-kind	6 000 000
International Organization	University of Wollongong	Cash	378 000
International Organization	SPC	In-kind	152 000
International Organization	SPC	Cash	10 000
International Organization	FAO	In-kind	250 000
International Organization	FAO TCPs	Cash	550 000
Total Co-financing			13 340 000

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

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Funds	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	Grant Amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b)	Total (\$) c=a+b
FAO	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Kiribati	1,653,900	148,851	1,802,751
FAO	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Kiribati	1,770,098	159,309	1,929,407
FAO	GEF TF	International Waters	Global	154,344	13,891	168,235
FAO	GEF TF	Multi-focal Area (SFM)	Global	1,141,688	102,752	1,244,440
Total Grant Resources				4,720,030	424,803	5,144,833

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 (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project total (\$)
International consultants*	281,000		281,000
Local consultants*	231,400		231,400
Total	512,400		512,400

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

The overall project concept and objective has remained the same, but the three project components have been realigned to ensure a clearer results framework. The changes are outlined in the table below.

PIF	CEO Endorsement
Component 1 focused exclusively on strengthening of national network of PAs	Component 1 has been designed to primarily address policy, institutional and capacity gaps to improve both resource conservation and sustainable use
Component 2 focused on promoting sustainable and integrated landscape (coastal and land-use) management through feasibility assessments, preparation and implementation of management plans. The focus covered both mangrove areas and other island areas.	Primary focus of Component 2 unchanged, but it is more integrated and community centric to implement R2R and whole-of-island approach with greater community engagement / empowerment in project activities, management decision making processes and integrated land and marine management planning. The plans integrate efforts on sustainable use of land and coastal resources, PA network expansion and local livelihood diversification and improvement with an overall overture of community engagement and building community resilience to climate change impacts.

PIF	CEO Endorsement
Component 3 was designed to ensure results-based management of the project, capture project lessons and best practices and disseminate them	Component 3 has remained the same with linkages to the regional R2R programme strengthened including experience sharing with sites associated with GEF LDCF project.

A.1 National Strategies and Plans:

The project document highlights the project’s alignment to several national policies, legislation and plans. These include, but not limited to:

The **Kiribati Development Plan (KDP) 2012–2015** is the overarching national development plan detailing national priorities (GoK 2012c). The KDP is linked to the Millennium Development Goals, the Pacific Plan and the Mauritius Strategy for Small Island Developing States (BPoA+10). The KDP has six broad key policy areas (KPA). The project is aligned with KPA 2 on economic growth and poverty reduction and KPA 4 on environment which also incorporates climate change.

The project adheres to the guidance of the **Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2014-2023 (KJIP)**. As party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC; ratified in 1992). The Government sees the KJIP as its National Action Plan on climate change. The project is in specific alignment with a number of key strategies such as strengthening good governance, policies, strategies and legislation(1), increasing water and food security with integrated and sector-specific approaches and promoting healthy and resilient ecosystems (4), and delivering appropriate education, training and awareness programmes (7). The KJIP identifies the “Whole Island Approach” as a national priority; e.g., Develop and implement a program for community-based integrated vulnerability assessment, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management such as the Whole of Island Approach (WOI).

Kiribati’s National Adaptation Programme of Action (January 2007) highlights Kiribati’s vulnerability to climate change. It has noted the vulnerability of settlements, land and coastal areas to impacts of climate change due to the low lying nature of the atolls; and also the vulnerabilities of the fisheries sector; agriculture sector, water resources, physical assets, biodiversity and human health. This project will directly support priorities identified by the NAPA, including: Coral Reef Restoration, Monitoring and Stock; Agricultural Food Crops Development; and Coastal Zone Management and Resilience Enhancement for Adaptation. The NAPA notes that both marine and terrestrial sources of food security are important. The people of Kiribati depend very significantly upon marine resources for their household level food security while agriculture helps provide important food diversity.

The project is closely aligned with several platforms set forth in the **National Fisheries Policy (2013 – 2025)**. The project will particularly support the achievement of goals 2 – 5 as set out in this policy: 2. Protect and secure food security and sustainable livelihoods for I-Kiribati; 3. Ensure long-term conservation of fisheries and marine ecosystems; 4. Strengthen good governance with a particular focus on building the capacity of MFMRD to implement and support fisheries management, development, and monitoring, control and surveillance; and 5. Build climate change resilience for fisheries and marine resources in Kiribati. The policy also notes that lagoon and coastal fisheries currently provide sufficient protein for most I-Kiribati. The policy states that fisheries are under strain from population pressures compounded with climate change. The policy notes that the response to increasing lagoon fisheries pressure should be the management of overfishing in order to maintain sustainable levels.

The project is also in line with **the 2005 Kiribati National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (K-NBSAP) and its associated Action Plan for Implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity's Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA)**. The Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) report, completed as part of the PoWPA phase II Project and awaiting Cabinet approval, identifies 22 KBAs, 14 of which are currently afforded little or no protection at all. The project will establish at least three Protected Areas based on the priorities set out in the KBA report, after extensive consultations with communities in and around the proposed sites. The project will also strive to mitigate risks to key threatened / endangered species in Kiribati and their locations as well as linking to the implementation of the NBSAP objectives.

The project also directly addresses a number of key targets laid out in the draft **Kiribati Integrated Environmental Policy 2012-2022 (KIEP)**, including integration of conservation in public education curriculum, customary rights and tenure integrated into protected area management plans, and increase the number of protected areas and protected species under effective management.

The project will build on, and be in line with, the **2007 National Action Plan (NAP)** to address Land Degradation and Droughts. Further, land degradation is identified in the KIEP as a priority issue, especially in urban areas, where population pressure is putting unsustainable pressure on limited land resources, and foreshore areas.

SFM in Kiribati is focused on improving coverage and management of mangrove forests, through a range of tools and approaches including integrated coastal management, protected areas, and locally-managed areas. This is consistent with, and directly responds to the Environment Act 1999 (as amended 2007) and the natural resources management policy areas of the KIEP, and builds on work under Kiribati Action Program in phase II and III. Kiribati does not currently have a national forestry policy or strategy, but a policy specific to mangroves is reflected and integrated under the KIEP. Further, Kiribati has recently become a Party to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, and the project will assist the Government of Kiribati in meeting its requirements under that convention.

In addition, the proposal also highlights the links between the project and the following Aichi targets.

Relevant Aichi Target	Project Contribution
Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use	
<p>Target 6 By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.</p>	<p>This project specifically targets improved management of marine resources and will contribute to the sustainability of harvested resources in marine areas through facilitating the reduction of stressors and diversification of effort.</p>
<p>Target 7 By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.</p>	<p>This project specifically targets improved management of forestry resources including restoration through agroforestry initiatives.</p>
<p>Target 10 By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.</p>	<p>The project will support the conservation of reefs and sustainable use of coastal systems for at least three Pacific islands. The project's amplification effect will reduce human pressures on coastal systems in the pilot sites.</p>

Relevant Aichi Target	Project Contribution
Strategic Goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity	
Target 13 By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.	The project will support nurseries for cultivation of important indigenous plant species for forestry to support reforestation, preservation of culturally important species and sustainable agroforestry initiatives.
Strategic Goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services	
Target 14 By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	The project will support the maintenance of ecosystem services on land and at sea that are highly valuable to all I-Kiribati, including women and women headed households.

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities: No changes from PIF.

A.3 The GEF agency’s comparative advantage: No change from PIF.

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

Threats to Global Environment Values

Two of the major environmental and developmental problems faced by Kiribati are the continuing degradation of the island ecosystems and the impacts of the climate change. Factors contributing to these problems include: pollution of the lagoons, build-up of solid waste, depletion of water, pollution of water from salinity and waste products, depletion of inshore fisheries and coastal erosion. Marine life is also under threat from pollution and plastic wastes. The spread of invasive species and agricultural pests and diseases, could potentially have a significant impact on the economy of Kiribati. Waste oil and other chemicals contribute to pollution. Solid waste has become an increasing problem. Hazardous e-waste and bulky waste (of old vehicles) both need managed collection and shipment out of Kiribati. Population pressures have resulted in overcrowding that is putting stress on housing, land management, crucial public infrastructure and the natural environment including underground water reserves. Deteriorating water quality will also impact on people’s health. The high rate of population growth in South Tarawa is causing stress on water and sanitation services. The migration of more people to Kiritimati Island also puts pressure on the Government with regards to an increasing number of squatters and other land use issues.

Disconcertingly, behavioural attitudes towards the environment and limited enforcement of the Environment Act and other environmental-related legislation are also a major concern and compounded by a general lack of understanding among the population of the consequences of actions such as sand mining and over-fishing. However, in many cases, individuals have few alternatives and therefore fail to comply with existing legislation. This is an especially difficult situation given that unemployment rates are very high, especially of youth (54%) and school leavers, there is widespread poverty and hardship with over 21.8 per cent of the population under the basic needs poverty line.

Overexploitation of natural resources and habitat degradation

Given the extremely limited land availability, poor soil and intense periods of drought, domestic food production in Kiribati is limited. Accordingly, the population depends heavily on marine resources for their food, nutrition (and micronutrients) and livelihoods. At the same time, a significant part of the I-Kiribati also comes from imports, which constitutes an unreliable and often nutritionally poor source of food. Recent urban development and migration has also increased resource exploitation for commercial purposes (e.g. supplying dried fish to urban areas) in urban centres such as South Tarawa that has impacted even the distant rural communities. For example, many outer islands supply fish to Tarawa either through regular markets or grey/familial markets. Within this overall context, near shore shallow water habitats have degraded significantly including through drivers such as overexploitation of coastal resources in many of the islands. Though there are no clear statistics, anecdotal evidence indicates that coastal fisheries, a vital source of protein and nutrition, are severely impacted in many areas including the pilot sites.

In Kiribati, land and marine ecosystems are intrinsically linked. The poor state of coastal resources is also often connected with ongoing land degradation, pollution, and other related factors (ease of access, inappropriate use of technology, limited opportunities for alternative / innovative harvesting techniques). Removal of mangroves has resulted in a deterioration of coastal habitats (for example: mangroves are an integral part of nutrient recycling, act as nursery / grow out grounds for fish and shellfish populations) compromising ecosystem resilience. Fires and land clearing for planting of coconuts, encroachment of invasive species (such as *Pluchea spp.*) have severely degraded land in the country and specifically in the pilot sites. Given the limited land productivity, the accelerated degradation has further dented the opportunities to increase benefits from local food production through agroforestry initiatives. A key behavioural factor in resource depletion and habitat degradation is the lack of community ownership / engagement in management decision making processes and as a result limited empathy with consequences associated with poor farming and fishing practices. This, coupled with limited opportunities for livelihood diversification fuels the continued decline readily accessible natural resource areas.

Climate change

As an atoll nation and a least developed country, Kiribati is extremely vulnerable to climate change. The pattern of global climate change is expected to impact Kiribati in several ways. In the near and long term, the projections include high variability in rainfall patterns, sea surface temperature increase, sea level rise, and ocean acidification. These trends will affect the integrity of all the island ecosystems and also exacerbate the effects of natural disasters. Freshwater resources are already scarce making an increase in variability of rainfall from climate change a further difficulty for agriculture and agroforestry contributing to problems in terms of resilience. It is essential for the country to build resilience (of both ecosystems and local populations) to climate change impacts including climate variability. Furthermore, climate change is expected to directly affect fisheries through changes in abundance and availability of oceanic species such as tuna and associated species in the exclusive economic zone of Kiribati while coastal fisheries are expected to decline due to higher sea surface temperature, coral bleaching and other effects such as changes to habitats and natural mortality.

The Government of Kiribati is fully aware of their nation's tenuous situation and some progress is being made. However, significant conservation and sustainable resource utilization challenges remain. If the nation hopes to build social and ecological resilience in the face of climate change, tangible benefits could be derived through establishing and implementing an informed regulatory and decision making co-management framework to conserve coastal zone resources while at the same time allowing sustainable harvests of natural resources. The approach must be centred within communities through an ecosystem approach and reflect I-Kiribati's reliance upon limited island resources for survival. The strategic and informed management system would benefit from implementing a "whole island approach". To enhance resilience, the current unsustainable lagoon and near shore overexploitation practices require transitioning to more effectively regulated and informed access regimes. Similarly, critically important habitats and

species of highest ecological value need added protection and the country would benefit from taking steps to re-enforce their system of national, island-based protected areas.

Baseline Initiatives

GEF incremental investment will be firmly rooted in baseline investments in communities, their capacity development and participation in management and decision making processes through involvement in government programmes and activities aimed at improving sustainable use, conservation and management of marine and land resources, and increasing community resilience to climate change. Key Ministries associated with these processes include;

- a. Ministry of Environment Lands and Agriculture (MELAD)
- b. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD)
- c. Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA)

Ministry of Environment Lands and Agriculture (MELAD)

The MELAD is divided into three divisions; Land Management (LMD), Environment and Conservation (ECD), and Agriculture and Livestock (ALD). LMD works primarily to resolve land conflicts and enforce existing (often outdated) land use ordinances. ECD's work focuses on raising awareness on key environmental problems and issues including water and pollution, and supporting regulatory coherence under the KIEP. ECD's work on increasing knowledge and experience base for creating a national network of PAs, for improved conservation of biological resources of the country, would be leveraged for GEF incremental investment.

ALD, following up on the Agriculture and Livestock Department Development Strategy (2012-2015), carries out extension and support services through its agricultural assistants (extension officers). It covers a) pig and poultry breeding, multiplication and distribution support service b) development and conservation of locally adapted breeds of livestock c) agroforestry production systems trials (e.g. combining local chickens with trees/crops like coconuts, pandanus tree, etc., temporary pig pens under trees and ducks raised under tree crops). Previously, ALD has also carried out agroforestry activities based on combining coconuts, breadfruit, bananas and native figs with livestock. In terms of managing forest resources, ALD undertakes activities to preserve and manage native tree species, specifically Pandanus tree, and mangroves. The forest management and agroforestry activities carried out by ALD will be leveraged for the GEF incremental investment.

In addition to the above, PIPA is supported by MELAD and has a separate management unit established under a specific regulation mandated for the Phoenix Island Protected Area. PIPA establishment and management is governed by this regulation. The processes, guidelines, methodologies and capacity generated by the PIPA serve as a basis from which a national network of protected areas can be developed. Management is to be carried out according to a four-year management plan (currently under preparation). There is a management committee that consists mostly of representatives of government agencies and a trust fund that will provide ongoing support to PIPA. Research is supported by a number of international organizations that serve on the PIPA Scientific Advisory Committee coordinated by the New England Aquarium. PIPA has benefited from surveys conducted by research partners including data gathering on fisheries, currents, coral, carbon pathways, etc.

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD)

The MFMRD with its mandate for fisheries and marine resources governance and management in Kiribati, carries out extensive work on development and management of fisheries resources from 3 nm miles out to

the exclusive economic zone limit with Island Councils being responsible for the waters inside the 3 nm zone. MFMRD has five divisions: the Fisheries Division, the Resource Economics and Policy Division, the Mineral Resources Division, the Information Technology Division and the Accounts, Administration and Human Resources Division. In addition, the Kiribati Seafood Verification Agency (KSVA) sits within the Ministry and regulates and controls fish processing standards. With support from The Pacific Community (SPC) and AUSAID, all maritime boundaries in accordance with the provisions of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) have been declared and deposited with the UN including territorial seas baselines, outer limits and EEZs. This information can be used to assist with mapping and defining community based fishery management and conservation areas.

The Ministry is guided by the National Fisheries Policy (2013 – 2025). The responsibilities of the Fisheries Division including both the Oceanic and Coastal Fisheries Branches range from licensing services, training and extension services for fishers (through fisheries assistants), enforcement of fisheries regulations, carrying out of surveys and stock assessments which feed into the information services provided by the Ministry, and local fisheries development services as well as support for boat building and mechanical units. MFMRD is increasingly promoting community-based management and co-management of marine resources through externally funded programs. This will be an important base of experience for the expansion of co-management of resources in the marine environment. All these activities will be leveraged for GEF incremental investment.

Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA)

The MIA provides support to Island Councils in establishing governance arrangements in outer islands. This includes training on basic planning and management, support for the development of outer islands laws and regulations, and associated enforcement activities. MIA receives, appraises approved Island Council priority projects for Government or Donor funding and provides annual support grants to support their budget. MIA has a specialised Local Government Division that provides training support to Council Staff, Mayors and Councillors. These activities would be leveraged for GEF incremental investment, specifically on local level governance related activities (though we do not have an official Cofinancing letter).

Other key co-financing investments and contributions are as follows.

FAO- Technical Cooperation Programme (Strengthening capacity in integrated home gardening and food processing for enhanced food and nutrition security in Kiribati)

The project will run from March 2017 to February 2019. The project aims to increase local agriculture production of farm households and schools in Marakei, Maiana, Onotoa and Makini through the following four key outputs;

- a) *Agriculture & Livestock Department (ALD) support services strengthened.* Major focus will include upgrading of centralised Government nurseries supply of high quality planting materials; training for extension officers on improved sustainable integrated production and management technologies, and preparation of technical extension materials.
- b) *Capacity for families' home gardens and small livestock production enhanced.* Major focus will include conduct of farmer field school and pilot demonstrations with selected households on key aspects of home gardening and improve crops and fruit trees management; compost making and soil improvement practices; small scale poultry management and husbandry, and other climate smart farming practices.
- c) *Increased youth awareness on agriculture in schools.* Key activities will include revised school curriculum to include agriculture training, develop materials and strategy for delivery the trainings. Establishment of school garden pilot demonstration sites in 4 schools for training of students.

- d) *Improve nutrition awareness, food processing and preservation techniques developed:* This output will strengthen capacities for women on improve nutrition for households from home gardens, and enhance skills and knowledge on small scale food processing, preservation, and safe food handling, and cooking demonstrations.

The GEF project will leverage on all the about outputs. These outputs will form the key baseline for all agroforestry activities of the project (including awareness raising and capacity building for agroforestry, engagement of youth and women in livelihood improvement activities, establishment of gene bank of local species, improving extension services and establishment of agroforestry sites and value addition of products). The GEF project will build on these outputs and extend them to the project's pilot sites to ensure breaking down the barriers described below.

FAO Technical Cooperation Programme- Fish and food security in the outer islands of Kiribati – innovative techniques and co-management

The project is expected to run from 2020 to 2021. The project will focus on introducing innovative fishing techniques and co-management measures in the outer islands of Kiribati. The specifics of the project will be developed keeping in mind the complementarity with this GEF project.

University of Wollongong

The University of Wollongong through the Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security (ANCORS) has led implementation of an Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR) funded project 'Improving Community-based Fisheries Management in Pacific island countries' since 2012. The current phase ends in July 2017, and the project's second phase is about to be approved by ACIAR. This second phase will run for four years, building on lessons learned in community engagement in Kiribati. The Kiribati work forms a node in an ambitious three country project implemented in collaboration with the Pacific Community, WorldFish and national agencies. The project's overall objective is to develop and nurture the structures, processes and capacity to implement and sustain national programmes of Community-based Fisheries Management (CBFM). The project's key outputs in Kiribati include;

- a) Situation analysis and CBFM rollout plan
- b) Scaling out a national CBFM model
- c) Implementation of inshore resource management plans in selected islands
- d) Building capacity in national institutions to better manage coastal fisheries

These outputs are directly linked to and would be leveraged for the community-based marine management measures to be planned and implemented as a part of the integrated land and marine management plans.

The Pacific Community (SPC)

SPC is beginning the implementation of a New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID) funded project titled 'Improving fisheries food security and sustainable livelihoods for Pacific Island communities'. The project's objective is 'Food security and livelihoods in Pacific Island countries are improved through skilled staff and communities managing and enforcing robust policies and legislation for sustainable coastal fisheries and aquaculture'. The project's outputs include;

- a) New or revised national legislation for coastal fisheries and aquaculture is drafted / progressed
- b) New or revised sub-national legislation for coastal fisheries and aquaculture is drafted / progressed
- c) Capacity development, training, and mentoring to national and subnational levels in policies and management plans

- d) Awareness raising materials on fisheries rules, regulations and penalties are developed and disseminated

The GEF project's policy level work on mainstreaming a Ridge-to-Reef (R2R) approach is directly linked to the major outputs of the above project. The ground work carried out by the above project will be leveraged for carrying out the review and revision of other relevant policies under Component 1.

Barrier#1: Inadequate institutional framework and governance weaknesses

At present, in Kiribati, sectoral policies and plans are geared towards sustainable management of natural resources and improving climate resilience, but they adopt sectoral approaches and do not adequately incorporate the Whole-of-Island approach or R2R strategies, which is essential in terms of addressing the environmental challenges described above in an effective and holistic manner. This is also related to the fact that different ministries and line departments in the country often work in "silos" with very little sectoral coordination and integration. There is no cross sectoral coordination mechanism operating in the country. Lack of cross-sectoral coordination and mainstreaming of R2R approaches into sectoral policies and planning are significant institutional barriers.

Extensive research on vulnerability to climate change shows that it is the marginalized who suffer the impacts of changing environmental conditions. Managing natural resource systems with the added stresses associated with climate change poses a challenge for socio-ecological systems. And although not a panacea, community engagement is a means of reducing vulnerability to the natural hazards associated with climate change. Generally, natural resource utilization and conservation policies are prepared at the national level and implemented in a top-down fashion. Though the Island Councils are given certain responsibilities and they provide an avenue for outer island representation in national level processes, they are relatively new institutions and in the past engagement of local communities in planning processes have often been minimal and this has resulted in lack of true community ownership over resource conservation and management initiatives. This, coupled with the fact that the traditional governance systems and mechanisms have been breaking down, is a significant barrier to instituting long term environmental management. There have been funded initiatives (e.g. the ACIAR PacFish project described in section 1.2.2) to promote and implement community-based approaches in natural resource management, but more substantial efforts are essential to breakdown this governance barrier.

Barrier#2: Limited technical capacities and skills at all levels

MELAD's total staff is approximately: ECD (40 staff), Land (60 staff), and Agriculture (100+). Approximately thirty MELAD staff are located at Kiritimati (Christmas) Island. These total also includes MELAD's agricultural assistants (extension officers) located at approximately fifteen outer islands. While more than 80% have some level of professional training in environmental management, only seven staff currently hold masters degrees on environmental management. Two staff are currently pursuing doctorate level degrees. MFMRD has approximately 147 staff in total which includes MFMRD's fisheries assistants (extension officers) located at approximately fifteen outer islands. While 60% have some level of professional training in environment/fisheries-related management, only 6 staff currently hold masters degrees on environmental management and only one MFMRD staff possesses a doctorate level degree. While the overall numbers of trained government personnel is high, the limited number of suitably qualified technical staff with extensive field experience, their limited access to remote islands and communities, and limited availability to technology and equipment for monitoring and surveillance of resources is a key factor that constrains successful mitigation approaches.

At the same time, farming and fishing communities have a wealth of traditional knowledge gleaned over decades and based on a clear association and understanding of changes occurring on land and sea. However, top down management approaches seldom allow for communities and natural resource providers to interact with resource managers and participate in decision making processes. This inability to connect community

knowledge and experience with government resource managers and policy makers constrains the development of pragmatic management plans where ownership of decisions is shared and where there is a mutual respect for achieving successful outcomes from policy development and implementation.

Collectively, the considerable technical knowledge and capacity in areas related to marine and land resource conservation and management across government agencies and within communities has potential to be used in implementing effective management approaches. However, there are gaps in skills and opportunity to engage local stakeholders and promote community-driven approaches. Extension staff of both ministries, located in outer islands, lack technical capacities in key areas relevant to improving local level resource management and livelihood improvement. Extension staff of MELAD have knowledge gaps in tree crop re-planting, agroforestry combinations, and measures for assisted natural regeneration of forests. MFMRD's extension staff have knowledge gaps in value addition, co-management skills and post-harvest preservation techniques. With the capacity gaps at the local extension staff level, technical assistance provided to the local communities have been inadequate, this has resulted in gaps in technical skills of local communities to undertake agroforestry, forest management and marine management measures.

Barrier#3: Limited alternative livelihoods and economic opportunities

The need to create alternative livelihoods and new economic opportunities is a key priority for the government of Kiribati. It is driven by extremely high numbers of persons currently unemployed. The 2010 Population Census showed that overall, unemployment was 31 per cent while youth unemployment was 54 per cent (62% young women and 48 % young men). However, local communities in Kiribati, especially in outer islands, have few opportunities to diversify or improve their existing livelihoods especially in the outer islands given their remoteness and poorly linked to markets and support services. This aspect in combination with the above barriers result in increasing pressures being placed on natural resources in the near shore and resulting in over or unsustainable resource exploitation and habitat degradation, and increased vulnerability to climate change. While resources exist further offshore in deep water and could contribute towards effort reduction and recovery of near shore areas, limited access to technology, finance and training remain barriers. Under such conditions, the capacity of I-Kiribati to adapt, reorganize, and evolve into more resilient communities that are able to derive sustainable livelihoods from natural resource exploitation and being better prepared for future climate change impacts is in jeopardy.

A.5 Incremental reasoning

Under Component 1, GEF incremental financing of USD 723,500 will be invested to address the Barrier#1 'Inadequate institutional framework and governance weaknesses' and Barrier#2 'Limited technical capacities and skills at all levels' through a) mainstreaming of R2R strategies b) improving national level cross-sectoral coordination c) resilience and socio-cultural planning for streamlining across different level and scaling-up of R2R strategies, including development of a community participation model that would actively engage women and youth and d) improving environmental education, awareness through increased outreach and an extensive training programmes for extension officers and national level staff. This Component's efforts would be co-financed by a) NZAID funded SPC's work on policy development b) MELAD's work on increasing awareness for improved conservation and c) FAO's training activities, through the Technical Cooperation Programmes (TCPs), at community level.

Under Component 2, GEF incremental financing of USD 3,295,422 will be invested to carry out the piloting activities, this includes preparation of at least three island level R2R management plans and implementation of the plans (establishment of PAs, improved forestry, agroforestry and marine management activities). This component will partly address Barrier#1 'Inadequate institutional framework and governance weaknesses' through improved local level planning processes and support (community capacity development and training, including for women and youth) provided to community groups following up on the community-participation model and mainly address Barrier#3 'Limited alternative livelihoods and

economic opportunities' through the management plans (specifically, through identification and support to livelihood diversification and improvement opportunities and the provision of assistance to households to expand/adopt the livelihood activities). This component's co-financing would come from a) MELAD's work to expand agroforestry and forest regeneration activities, b) MFMRD's efforts to promote community-based management and co-management of marine resources, c) MIA's support to island councils, d) FAO's activities on community and household level activities related to home gardening, tree crop re-planting, and establishment of local nurseries and e) University of Wollongong's work on design and implementation of community-based fisheries management specifically development of a CBFM implementation model for Kiribati, preparation of inshore resource management plans and implementation of adaptive management.

Component 3 incremental resources of USD 476,345 will be used to ensure that a) the project implementation is effective and efficient, and is based on results-based management principles, and b) project findings and lessons learnt are captured and linked to the regional R2R programme. Major part of co-financing for this component would come as in-kind support from MELAD and MFMRD towards gathering of information for project monitoring and evaluation of results, and dissemination of information and lessons learnt.

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:

The risk analysis presented in the PIF remains valid and is further expanded below.

Risk Type	Probability (Likelihood/Impact) 1: Low 5: High	Mitigation
Logistics stymie project implementation capacity	Likelihood: 2 Impact: 3	Distances are great and logistics challenging in Kiribati. The project is designed specifically to be sure adequate resources are available and focused. Pilot sites were chosen based upon the ability to generate strong models for replication.
Sectoral barriers and siloed thinking within government ministries and agencies remain	Likelihood: 3 Impact: 4	The project approach is to create space for government ministries, local councils and community leaders to share information and experiences. A special "listening" session has been arranged for communities to participate in the PSC. Project staff will emphasize the merits of creating a common and unified vision and assist in taking steps towards achieving a common goals. Links between the R2R and other relevant projects (including the GEF LDCF project) will be strengthened. M&E will track and provide specific feedback on progress towards cross-sector cooperation and non-silo thinking.
Island Government and community level support is not sustained, including failure of communities to follow the new rules	Likelihood: 2 Impact: 3	Collaboration of local communities will be critical to achieving the objectives of the project, but the communities will need incentives to take ownership and participate in the resource management and biodiversity conservation activities. It may be difficult to reach agreement with all members of communities on management and enforcement measures. Extensive community consultations are built into every aspect of the project. Project sites will be selected, in large part, in places where communities demonstrate an interest and willingness to engage in project activities. Project ownership will be generated very early and economic incentives through livelihood diversification and improvement activities will be

Risk Type	Probability (Likelihood/Impact) 1: Low 5: High	Mitigation
		provided. The project is also working very closely with the MIA. The Ministry is responsible for supporting the activities of Island Councils.
Communities disengage from implementing management solutions	Likelihood: 3 Impact: 4	Community engagement in substantive project activities coupled with in-field vocational training coupled with providing a community voice in the project steering committee will provide both the means for (i) real community engagement in the project, and (ii) monitoring perceptions and benefits being derived by the project at the community level
Over exploited and heavily depleted zones expand and new fishing grounds are opened up without effective conservation and management measures	Likelihood: 2 Impact: 4	This risk stems through unsustainable activities creeping into the project sites through external actors. The approach to address this risk would be triple pronged, one, local ownership and engagement for local level monitoring and reporting, two, through engagement of Island Councils for immediate action on transgressions and three, through providing livelihood diversification pilots As mentioned above, ownership and engagement of local communities is an integral part of the project. Similarly, Island Councils are key partners in the project planning and implementation processes.
Government support, including sustainable financing, becomes inconsistent with long term project objectives	Likelihood: 3 Impact: 3	While MELAD and MFMRD have experience implementing GEF-financed and other projects, overall human resource capacity is generally low, particularly in the outer islands where government presence to look after environment management and protection, is nearly non-existent. Government budgets are fairly low, which could present problems if already low budgets are reduced due to changes in national budget allocations. Significant capacity-building activities, for government and stakeholders alike, are included in the project to address capacity gaps. Project management will closely monitor government budget allocations in order to flag and potential shortfalls as soon as possible, so that corrective measures can be taken as needed to ensure continued implementation of project activities
Climate change negatively impacts project outcomes	Likelihood: 2 Impact: 3	Sea level rise, storm surge, and variable rainfall patterns may cause communities to migrate to other areas, potentially disrupting community-led activities. The project is designed specifically to improve resilience to climate change. The likelihood of short-term impacts is low.

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed initiatives:

This project is part of the *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” (R2R Programme)*. The Regional R2R Programme will integrate and demonstrate climate resilient R2R in a holistic manner by building on the implementation of national

IWRM plans in pilot sites in each country and linking this to the upland resilience approaches together with enhanced ICM. The project will also serve a coordination function with the national R2R projects including the Kiribati R2R Project. Experiences and lessons learned will be shared with the other countries/projects participating in the programme through the UNDP R2R umbrella project. This will include linkages to regional knowledge portals, educational programs and collaborative regional meetings.

The project has been developed and will be implemented in close consultation with the “*Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change*” (UNDP/GEF LDCF) project. The five-year LDCF project is fully approved and has commenced implementation. The total project budget is approximately US\$ 4.5 million with an additional US\$ 7 million in co-financing. The objective is to build the adaptive capacity of vulnerable Kiribati communities to ensure food security under conditions of climate change. Under Component One, the project will assist Kiribati to address urgent institutional capacity building needs primarily on the national level. This will include helping to set in place an improved regulatory environment, strengthened institutional planning and policy frameworks, and generation of data required to support informed decision-making. Under Component Two, the project will assist Kiribati to address climate change vulnerabilities by implementing and demonstrating community-based adaptation measures.

By aligning these projects, the Government of Kiribati hopes to build conservation momentum and synergy across at least seven pilot sites. The UNDP/LDCF project will target the following pilot islands: South Tarawa, Abemama, Nonouti, and Maiana. The UNDP/LDCF and this project are designed to generate synergies, stay within the project absorptive capacity of Kiribati, and to spread benefits/impacts across a wider selection of outer islands. This coordinated approach has been fully vetted and supported by the Government Kiribati, UNDP, and FAO.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

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

The below sections describe how different stakeholders will be engaged in the project.

B.1.1 Project implementation and management arrangements

The Project Management structure will ensure the participation of key stakeholders during project planning, implementation and M&E through its decision-making structure: Project Steering Committee.

A multi-stakeholder Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established to guide and oversee implementation of the project. The PSC will meet at least twice a year and its specific responsibilities will be:

- a) Provide guidance to the Project Management Unit (PMU) to ensure project implementation is in accordance with the project document;
- b) Review and approve any proposed revisions to the project results framework and implementation arrangements;
- c) Review, amend (if appropriate) and endorse all Annual Work Plans and Budgets;
- d) Review project progress and achievement of planned results as presented in six-monthly Project Progress Reports, Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and Financial Reports;
- e) Ensure that co-financing support will be available on time;
- f) Advise on issues and problems arising during project implementation;
- g) Facilitate cooperation between all project partners and facilitate collaboration between the Project and other relevant programmes, projects and initiatives in the country;

- h) Review progress towards cross sectoral collaboration between ministries and communities and provide guidance on ways to strengthen cooperation and collaboration, and
- i) Approve ToR for midterm and final evaluations

The PSC will be chaired by MELAD, *a nominee from MELAD*, will serve as the Project Director and will be responsible for ensuring the PSC responsibilities are fulfilled. The Committee’s composition will include representation from the MELAD, MFMRD, MIA, FAO Lead Technical Officer or designate, UNDP/GEF LDCF project staff⁴, the GEF focal point, relevant Island Councils, partner organizations/projects, NGOs/CSOs, Ministry of Education, etc. The PSC may co-opt ad hoc representatives from the other partners from related projects, other relevant government departments, private sector etc. as may be necessary. The PSC will have the mandate and flexibility to establish site-specific management committees and appoint site coordinators.

FAO will provide support to MELAD in setting up the PMU and recruiting the needed staff for the PMU. The PMU will be located within MELAD and will have an important coordinating/ logistics role. Much of this project will be executed via Letters of Agreement (LoA) with national executing partners in government and civil society. This can be seen in Figure 4 above. LoA are a means to enable national partners to execute significant key elements (whole outputs or outcomes) of the project on a day-to-day basis. AS a result, day-to-day implementation will be done largely through partners. In this case, Kiribati’s Ministry of Environment, Lands, and Agriculture Development (MELAD) and Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD) are partners with whom FAO will elaborate LoA and transfer funds. It is possible that other partners will be considered by the project steering committee (PSC) such as the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the University of South Pacific.

For further details, please refer to Section 3.2 in the Project Document.

B.1.2 Stakeholder involvement plan

The below table provides an overview of how various stakeholders will be involved in project implementation:

Stakeholder	Role/Relevance
Government	
Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development (MELAD)	Main executing partner. MELAD is responsible for National Environment, Lands and Agriculture and through the Environment and Conservation Division (ECD) is the political Focal Point of the GEF through the Secretary and the Director of ECD is the Operational Focal Point. This agency is responsible for environment, lands and agricultural policy development, implementation and monitoring/evaluation. The Environment Act 1999 as amended in 2007 provides the legislative basis for the exercise of MELAD’s environmental functions.
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD)	Main executing partner. MFMRD is responsible for National Marine and Fisheries policies development, implementation and monitoring and

⁴ A reciprocal relationship with the LDCF will be requested to ensure effective collaboration and cooperation across the GEF projects

Stakeholder	Role/Relevance
	<p>evaluation. Through the Fisheries Act 2010, MFMRD is tasked to promote sustainable management of fisheries and the development and use of fisheries resources for the benefit of Kiribati including the recovery of fees that reflect the value of resource and, to protect the fish stocks and marine environment of Kiribati. Based on this Act, the Kiribati National Fisheries Policy 2013-2025 has been developed with aims that portray short to medium and long-term strategic objectives that will enhance responsible fisheries with emphasis on the need to support, improve and sustain the peoples' livelihood, food security and sustainable economic growth.</p>
Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA)	<p>Key partner in implementation.</p> <p>The MIA is responsible for Local Government and outer island development and manages the Local Government Act that governs the Island Councils functions and operations. MIA provides link between Government and other organizations with the Island Councils through its Local Government Division and its staff including the Island Council Clerk, Island Project Officer and the Treasurer serving the Island Councils. MIA will act as a key link between the project and the Island Councils.</p>
Ministry of Finance and Economic Development	<p>Key government stakeholder in implementation.</p> <p>The Ministry of Finance and Economic Development is responsible for national planning and budgeting. Funds for the project will be disbursed to PMU through the Kiribati Fiduciary Steering Unit established within the Ministry to handle large project funds and following Government Financial Regulations and Procedures.</p>
Ministry for Education	<p>Key government partner in implementation.</p> <p>The Ministry for Education has an important national role for education and to promote and relevant curricula work to assist. It is responsible for preschool, primary, secondary, tertiary and also runs a teachers' training institution where teachers are trained to become teachers at both primary and secondary school levels.</p>
Island Councils	<p>Key partner in implementation</p> <p>Island Councils are responsible for the development, administration and management of their island affairs assisted by Government through the MIA. Their involvement is important to ensure facilitation role for any undertaking or project. The Local Government Act governs functions and operations. Island Councils have individual by-laws that largely guide their business and operation. They oversee, lay out rules and procedures for how domestic affairs, business operators and licensing, development are managed. Island councils have discretionary power through issuing licenses for business development and setting prices and charges such as bus fares (KILGA 2013), fish sales prices in the local market.</p>
Ministry of Communication, Transport and Tourism Development	<p>Key government partner in implementation.</p> <p>The Tourism Division of the Ministry of Communication, Transport and Tourism Development monitors tourism-based fishery projects. The Ministry is responsible for international</p>

Stakeholder	Role/Relevance
	and local shipping policies and laws as well as aviation. Under the Kiribati Development Plan (2012 - 2015), Government aims to improve communication infrastructure on the outer islands to encourage eco-tourism.
Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KNEG)	<p>Key government partner in implementation.</p> <p>The development of the KJIP led to the establishment of a Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KNEG), encompassing experts from core and line ministries, NGOs, the Kiribati Chamber of Commerce and Industries and other non-state actors. Acts as a coordination mechanism for climate change and disaster risk management initiatives.</p> <p>It plays an overall steering function for the design, implementation and monitoring of climate change and disaster risk management initiatives and also form sub-steering groups for sector-specific measures or integrated approaches targeting outer islands and community level (such as the Whole of Island Approach - WOI). It is the entry point for new initiatives.</p>
<i>International Development Organizations</i>	
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)	Co-financing partner as explained above
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	Executing partner.
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	UNDP is the implementing agency for a LDCF project in Kiribati. Strong coordination with the project will ensure maximum synergy.
<i>Civil Society (NGO's, etc.)</i>	
Kiribati Climate Action Network	KIRICAN is an NGO doing community activities to promote awareness on Climate Change and has worked with the '350' Climate Action Network. Youth largely comprise membership of the Kiribati Climate Action Network. KIRICAN will be a key partner in outreach and awareness raising activities.
Kiribati National Council of Churches	Kiribati is a deeply religious country and the Churches of different denominations and church groups under them at community level are active in community planning and implementation. They will also be involved in relevant awareness raising and implementation actions.
Church-based Women Organizations	Church-based Women Groups are very active organizations in the communities and through which important messages can be effectively transmitted. They provide marketing assistance to their Women Members in Outer Islands. They will play a key role in engagement of women in the project.
Aia mwaea ainen Kiribati (AMAK)	AMAK is the umbrella Women Organization for Kiribati and provides training support to its members, serves as a link between Government and its Women Organization members, coordination role for relevant programs. It exists to promote the interest of women enabling and empowering them. Key partner at national level providing inputs and insights into gender issues relevant to the project.

Stakeholder	Role/Relevance
Live & Learn	Live & Learn is heavily involved with community mainly on agriculture for food security issues carrying out enabling and practical training programs. They have on-going activities on Outer Islands (Abaiang) and in Tarawa. The organization has lately expanded to include health related initiatives such as composting toilets.
<i>Academic and Scientific Organizations</i>	
University of Wollongong	Cofinancing partner
University of the South Pacific (USP) Centre	USP Centre is an academic institution operating university extension services for academic students. It also has vocational training programs for non-academic students. Key partner in education and curriculum related project activities.
<i>Local and Indigenous Communities</i>	
Village Elders and Leaders	At community level for each Island, there is a communal leadership system that strongly recognizes the powerful authority of ‘unimane’ (village male elders) who are the supreme authority for village level matters for the wellbeing of the members of the village. Most villages located on islands are led either by a group of village elders from amongst whom a Chairman is selected. The elders committee is a respected body on the Island whose decision is often respected. Their involvement through consultation throughout implementation is important to reinforce the support that village Councillor reps and the Mayor for the project.
Local communities	Main beneficiaries of the project and primary partners on the ground for the successful implementation of the project.
<i>Private Sector</i>	
Kiribati Coconut Products	The business provides Training on Virgin Coconut Oil (VCO) processing, and marketing services for VCO from outer islands in Tarawa. The business has established contact producers of the VCO on a number of the Outer Islands that supply the domestic market in Tarawa. VCO is experiencing a growing interest and market in Tarawa - all that is produced are consumed locally. It has great potential for niche international markets.
Kiribati Fish Limited (KFL)	KFL is a joint venture of Foreign Company and Government of Kiribati that fish and buys fish from local fishermen in Tarawa to process and export tuna loins mainly. The Company currently also serves the domestic market and has potential for an outlet for Outer Island fresh fish and other marine products. Whilst it currently selects the type of fish it buys, there is potential to market other types of fish through the Company.

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 environmental benefits (GEFTF/ NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/ SCCF).

The socioeconomic benefits will be mainly delivered at local levels through Component 2. The livelihood diversification and improvement activities will directly benefit the targeted households and communities. Sustainable management of natural resources, including marine and land resources, is expected to lead to recovery / rehabilitation of marine resources leading to sustainable utilization of aquatic, forest and non-forest resources. This will contribute to better food security at local level including through expanded and complementary livelihood activities. As noted in the project’s results framework, community members are expected to be jointly responsible for and involved in decision making related to project activities at the project sites. This is expected to also lead to stronger social cohesion and learning/ sharing between different

sites – thereby further strengthening social capital of involved communities within both the R2R and LDCF projects. The project will also endeavour to ensure active participation of youth and women in a spectrum of project funded activities including data collection, trainings, workshops and consultations, especially through the involvement of women and youth centric organizations (e.g. AMAK, KIRICAN) and groups. This will include participation in agroforestry development activities.

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

Alternative scenarios were considered from the point of view of cost-effectiveness during project design. The relatively small investment is targeted to catalyse a substantial course change. This project will result in the creation of a modern system of protected, multiuse areas and the placement of several islands under a new management system based upon achieving climate change resilience and delivering global environmental benefits. The project's limited investment will help to create capacity and decision-making pathways that enable local governments to use revenues to make pro-conservation pro-sustainable use investments rather than ill-advised and unsustainable short-term investments. This catalytic effect coupled with the objective of sustainability makes the GEF investment highly cost-effective. The project's cost-effectiveness will be further strengthened through coordination with other efforts, including the UNDP/LDCF project. Kiribati is a relatively small country with limited absorptive capacity. This complimentary approach will assist to build institutional and human resource capacity efficiently. The approach will also strengthen cost-effectiveness by providing a mechanism for up scaling and sustainability. Further examples of cost-effectiveness included involving local island communities as an integral part of PA and ecosystem-based management. This is more cost effective than only government led protected areas management and creates a strong participatory component. Also, nesting PA management within existing institutional context and within the context of whole island or R2R approach creates efficiencies in terms of monitoring, assessment management and effectiveness.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN

The monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving the results and objectives of the project will be based on targets and indicators in the Project Results Framework. Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow FAO and GEF policies and guidelines for monitoring and evaluation. The monitoring and evaluation system will also facilitate learning and replication of the project's results and lessons in relation to the integrated management of natural resources.

Oversight and monitoring responsibilities

The monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities specifically described in the Monitoring and Evaluation table (see Table below) will be undertaken through: (i) day-to-day monitoring and project progress supervision missions (PMU); (ii) technical monitoring of indicators (PMU, CTA and NPC in coordination with partners); (iii) mid-term evaluation/review and final evaluation (independent consultants and FAO Evaluation Office); and (v) monitoring and supervision missions (FAO).

At the beginning of the implementation of the GEF project, the PMU will establish a system to monitor the project's progress. Participatory mechanisms and methodologies to support the monitoring and evaluation of performance indicators and outputs will be developed. During the project inception workshop, the tasks of monitoring and evaluation will include: (i) presentation and explanation (if needed) of the project's Results Framework with all project stakeholders; (ii) review of monitoring and evaluation indicators and their baselines; (iii) preparation of draft clauses that will be required for inclusion in consultant contracts, to ensure compliance with the monitoring and evaluation reporting functions (if applicable); and (iv) clarification of the division of monitoring and evaluation tasks among the different stakeholders in the

project. An M&E Expert will prepare a draft monitoring and evaluation matrix that will be discussed and agreed upon by all stakeholders during the inception workshop. The **M&E matrix** will be a management tool for the CTA, NPC, and the Project Partners to: i) bi-annually monitor the achievement of output indicators; ii) annually monitor the achievement of outcome indicators; iii) clearly define responsibilities and verification means; iv) select a method to process the indicators and data.

The **M&E Plan** will be prepared by the M&E Expert within the first two months of the PY1 (after establishing the project baselines) and validated with the PSC. The M&E Plan will include: i) the updated results framework, with clear indicators per year; ii) updated baseline, if needed, and selected tools for data collection (including sample definition); iii) narrative of the monitoring strategy, including roles and responsibilities for data collection and processing, reporting flows, monitoring matrix, and brief analysis of who, when and how will each indicator be measured. Responsibility of project activities may or may not coincide with data collection responsibility; iv) updated implementation arrangements, if needed; v) inclusion of the tracking tool indicators, data collection and monitoring strategy to be included in the mid-term review and final evaluation; vi) calendar of evaluation workshops, including self-evaluation techniques.

The day-to-day monitoring of the project's implementation will be the responsibility of the CTA and NPC and will be driven by the preparation and implementation of an AWP/B followed up through six-monthly PPRs. The preparation of the AWP/B and six-monthly PPRs will represent the product of a unified planning process between main project stakeholders. As tools for results-based-management (RBM), the AWP/B will identify the actions proposed for the coming project year and provide the necessary details on output and outcome targets to be achieved, and the PPRs will report on the monitoring of the implementation of actions and the achievement of output and outcome targets. Specific inputs to the AWP/B and the PPRs will be prepared based on participatory planning and progress review with all stakeholders and coordinated and facilitated through project planning and progress review workshops. These contributions will be consolidated by the NPC in the draft AWP/B and the PPRs, and checked by the CTA.

An annual project progress review and planning meeting should be held with the participation of the project partners to finalize the AWP/B and the PPRs. Once finalized, the AWP/B and the PPRs will be submitted to the FAO LTO for technical clearance, and to the Project Steering Committee for revision and approval. The AWP/B will be developed in a manner consistent with the Project Results Framework to ensure adequate fulfilment and monitoring of project outputs and outcomes.

Following the approval of the Project, the PY1 AWP/B will be adjusted (either reduced or expanded in time) to synchronize it with the annual reporting calendar. In subsequent years, the AWP/Bs will follow an annual preparation and reporting cycle as specified in below.

Indicators and sources of information

In order to monitor the outputs and outcomes of the project, including contributions to global environmental benefits, a set of indicators is set out in the Project Results Framework. The Project Results Framework indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. Following FAO monitoring procedures and progress reporting formats, data collected will be sufficiently detailed that can track specific outputs and outcomes, and flag project risks early on. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis, and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis, if possible, or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations.

Project output and outcome indicators have been designed to monitor both biophysical and socioeconomic impacts. The main sources of information to support the M&E plan include: i) participatory project monitoring systems; ii) participatory workshops to review progress with stakeholders and beneficiaries; iii) in-situ monitoring of the implementation; iv) progress reports prepared by the NPC and CTA with input

from the in-country partners, project specialists and other stakeholders; v) consultancy reports; vi) training reports; vii) mid-term evaluation/review and final evaluation; viii) financial reports and budget reviews; ix) PIRs prepared by the FAO LTO; and x) FAO-supervised mission reports.

Reporting schedule

Specific reports that will be prepared under the monitoring and evaluation program are: (i) Project inception report; (ii) Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B); (iii) Project Progress Reports (PPRs); (iv) Annual Project Implementation Review (PIR); (v) Technical reports; (vi) Co-financing reports; and (vii) Terminal Report. In addition, the GEF tracking tools for land degradation, biodiversity and SFM will be completed and will be used to compare progress with the baseline established during the preparation of the project.

Project Inception Report. After FAO internal approval of the project, a baseline study will be organized to establish the socioeconomic and biophysical baseline following which an inception workshop will be held. Immediately after the workshop, the NPC will prepare a project inception report in consultation with the CTA and other project partners. The report will include a narrative on the institutional roles and responsibilities and coordinating action of project partners, progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. It will also include a detailed first year AWP/B and the M&E Matrix. The draft inception report will be circulated to FAO and the PSC for review and comments before its finalization, no later than three months after project start-up. The report will be cleared by the FAO BH, LTO and the FAO/GEF Coordination Unit. The BH will upload it in FPMIS.

Annual Work Plan and Budget(s) (AWP/Bs). The CTA and NPC will present a draft AWP/B to the PSC no later than 10 December of each year. The AWP/B should include detailed activities to be implemented by project outcomes and outputs and divided into monthly timeframes and targets and milestone dates for output and outcome indicators to be achieved during the year. A detailed project budget for the activities to be implemented during the year should also be included together with all monitoring and supervision activities required during the year. The FAO Sub-regional Office in Samoa will circulate the draft AWP/B to the FAO Project Task Force and will consolidate and submit FAO comments. The AWP/B will be reviewed by the PSC and the PMU will incorporate any comments. The final AWP/B will be sent to the PSC for approval and to FAO for final no-objection. The BH will upload the AWP/Bs in FPMIS.

Project Progress Reports (PPR). PPRs will be prepared by the PMU based on the systematic monitoring of output and outcome indicators identified in the project's Results Framework (Annex 1). The PPRs are used to identify constraints, problems or bottlenecks that impede timely implementation and take appropriate remedial action. PPRs will be prepared based on the systematic monitoring of output and outcome indicators identified in the Project Results Framework (Appendix 1), AWP/B and M&E Plan. The Budget Holder has the responsibility to coordinate the preparation and finalization of the PPR. Each semester the CTA with support from NPC will prepare a draft PPR, and will collect and consolidate any comments from the FAO PTF. The NPC will submit the final PPRs to the BH office every six months, prior to 10 June (covering the period between January and June) and before 10 December (covering the period between July and December). The July-December report should be accompanied by the updated AWP/B for the following Project Year (PY) for review and no-objection by the FAO PTF. After LTO, BH and FLO clearance, the FLO will ensure that project progress reports are uploaded in FPMIS in a timely manner.

Annual Project Implementation Review (PIR). The BH (in collaboration with the PMU and the LTO) will prepare an annual PIR covering the period July (the previous year) through June (current year) to be submitted to the FLO for review and approval no later than (check each year with FAO GEF Coordination Unit but roughly end June/early July each year). The FAO GEF Coordination Unit will submit the PIR to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office as part of the Annual Monitoring Review report of the FAO-GEF portfolio. PIRs will be uploaded on the FPMIS by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit.

Key milestones for the PIR process:

- *Early July*: the LTOs submit the draft PIRs (after consultations with BHs, project teams) to the FAO GEF Coordination Unit (faogef@fao.org , copying respective GEF Unit officer) for initial review;
- *Mid July*: FAO GEF Coordination Unit responsible officers review main elements of PIR and discuss with LTO as required;
- *Early/mid-August*: FAO GEF Coordination Unit prepares and finalizes the FAO Summary Tables and sends to the GEF Secretariat by (date is communicated each year by the GEF Secretariat through the FAO GEF Unit);
- *September/October*: PIRs are finalized. PIRs carefully and thoroughly reviewed by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit and discussed with the LTOs for final review and clearance;
- *Mid November*: (date to be confirmed by the GEF): the FAO GEF Coordination Unit submits the final PIR reports -cleared by the LTU and approved by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit- to the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Independent Evaluation Office.

Technical reports. Technical reports will be prepared by national, international consultants (partner organizations under LOAs) as part of project outputs and to document and share project outcomes and lessons learned. The drafts of any technical reports must be submitted by the PMU to the BH who will share it with the LTO. The LTO will be responsible for ensuring appropriate technical review and clearance of said report. The BH will upload the final cleared reports onto the FPMIS. Copies of the technical reports will be distributed to project partners and the Project Steering Committee as appropriate.

Co-financing reports. The BH, with support from the PMU, will be responsible for collecting the required information and reporting on co-financing as indicated in the Project Document/CEO Request. The PMU will compile the information received from the executing partners and transmit it in a timely manner to the LTO and BH. The report, which covers the period 1 July through 30 June, is to be submitted on or before 31 July and will be incorporated into the annual PIR. The format and tables to report on co-financing can be found in the PIR.

GEF Tracking Tools. In compliance with GEF policies and procedures, tracking tools should be sent to the GEF Secretariat in three stages: (i) with the project approval document by the GEF Executive Director; (ii) with the mid-term evaluation/review of the project; and (iii) with the final evaluation of the project. The TT will be uploaded in FPMIS by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit. The TT are developed by the Project Design Specialist, in close collaboration with the FAO Project Task Force. They are filled in by the PMU and made available for the mid-term review and again for the final evaluation.

Terminal Report. Within two months before the end date of the project, and one month before the Final Evaluation, the PMU will submit to the BH and LTO a draft Terminal Report. The main purpose of the Terminal Report is to give guidance at ministerial or senior government level on the policy decisions required for the follow-up of the project, and to provide the donor with information on how the funds were utilized. The Terminal Report is accordingly a concise account of the main products, results, conclusions and recommendations of the project, without unnecessary background, narrative or technical details. The target readership consists of persons who are not necessarily technical specialists but who need to understand the policy implications of technical findings and needs for insuring sustainability of project results.

Monitoring and Evaluation summary

Table below summarizes the main monitoring and evaluation reports, parties responsible for their publication and time frames.

Summary of main monitoring and evaluation activities

M&E Activity	Responsible parties	Time frame/ Periodicity	Budget
Inception workshop	NPC; CTA; FAO SAP (with support from the LTO, and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit)	Within two months of project start up	USD 12 500
Project Inception report	NPC, CTA, Expert M&E and FAO SAP with clearance by the LTO, BH and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after the workshop	-
Field-based impact monitoring	NPC; CTA; project partners, local organizations	Continuous	USD 94 500 (9% of the Project Coordinator's and CTA's time)
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	NPC/CTA; FAO (FAO SAP, LTO). FAO-GEF Coordination Unit may participate in the visits if needed.	Annual, or as needed	FAO visits will be borne by GEF agency fees Project Coordination visits shall be borne by the project's travel budget
Project Progress Reports (PPRs)	BH with support from NPC/CTA, with stakeholder contributions and other participating institutions	Six-monthly	USD 36 750 (3.5% of the Project Coordinator's and CTA's time)
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	BH (in collaboration with the PCU and the LTO) Approved and submitted to GEF by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Annual	FAO staff time financed through GEF agency fees. PCU time covered by the project budget.
Co-financing reports	BH with support from PCU and input from other co-financiers	Annual	USD 10 500 (1% the Project Coordinator's and CTA's time)
Technical reports	NPC/CTA, FAO (LTO, FAO SAP)	As needed	-
Mid-term review (MTR)	MTR: FAO SAP, External consultant, in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	Midway through the project implementation period	USD 45 000 by an external consultancy
Final evaluation	External consultant, FAO Independent Evaluation Unit in consultation with the project team, including	At the end of the project	USD 60 000 by an external consultancy. FAO staff time and travel costs will be

M&E Activity	Responsible parties	Time frame/ Periodicity	Budget
	the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others		financed by GEF agency fees
Terminal Report	NPC; FAO (FAO SAP, LTO, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, TCS Reporting Unit)	Two months prior to the end of the project.	USD 12 500
Total budget			USD 271 750

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)
(Mrs.) Taouea REIHER	Ag. Director, Environment and Conservation Division (ECD)	MELAD	02/08/2017

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	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Mr Daniel Gustafson Deputy Director-General (Programmes) and Officer-in-Charge, Investment Centre Division		17 October 2017	Eriko Hibi Sub Regional Coordinator, FAO Sub- regional Office for the Pacific	00 685 22127	Eriko.hibi@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin FAO GEF Coordinator Email: jeffrey.griffin@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 5478			Sameer Karki FAO,GEF Coordination Unit		Sameer.karki@fao.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK



Results
Framework-24Feb.xl

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).



FAO Kiribati
Resilient Islands 555

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 150,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To Date/Committed</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Professional salaries	9,000	0	9,000
Consultants	66,600	28,778	37,822
Contracts	0	23,506	- 23,506
Travel	65,720	7,994	57,726
Workshops	8,680	1,770	6,910
GOE	0	213	-213
Total	150,000	62,261	87,739

The unspent PPG funds will utilized in the inception phase to build the project socioeconomic and biophysical baseline.

⁵ 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.