PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)
PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZED
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEFTF

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project Title:	Reimaanlok – Looking to the Future: Strengthening natural resource management in atoll communities in the Republic of Marshall Islands employing integrated approaches (RMI R2R)		
Country(ies):	Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI)	GEF Project ID:[1]	5544
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	5685
Other Executing Partner(s):	Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination, RMI	Submission Date (UNEP): Resubmission Date (UNDP):	13 June 2014 16 July 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-Focal Area	Project Duration (Months)	60
Name of parent program (if applicable): For SFM/REDD+ ☐	Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities - Integrated Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood	Agency Fee ($):	353,519

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK[2]:

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-Financing ($)
BD 1	GEFTF	3,048,336	950,000
BD 2	GEFTF	725,000	2,175,000
IW-3	GEFTF	154,645	375,000
Total Project Cost		3,927,981	3,500,000

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: ***To sustain atoll biodiversity and livelihoods by building community and ecosystem resilience to threats and degrading influences through integrated management of terrestrial and coastal resources***

Project Component	TA / INV	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Financing ($)	Indicative Cofinancing ($)
1. Expanding and Sustaining RMI Protected Areas Network	TA	1.1 Conservation areas delineated, declared and efforts sustained in up to 5 priority atolls to meet Reimaanlok targets and contributing to the Micronesia Challenge and Aichi targets BD, IW	1.1.1 Marine and terrestrial biodiversity and socioeconomic surveys conducted in up to 5 atolls to assess status and threats and serve as a guide in the delineation of conservation areas and spatial planning (BD) 1.1.2 Conservation areas delineated following Reimaanlok guidelines: Type I (subsistence non-commercial use) and Type II (high level of protection) areas; coarse-scale, fine-scale and species conservation targets; land-sea interactions (BD)	GEFTF	2,681,900	1,100,000

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
[2] Refer to the reference attached on the Focal Area Results Framework when filling up the table in item A.

			1.1.3 Over-arching resource management framework that addresses fisheries, conservation and coastal zone management formulated and tested in up to 5 priority atolls; framework is refined from lessons learned for replication in other atolls (BD, IW) 1.1.4 Integrated management plans developed and implemented in up to 5 atolls following the over-arching resource management framework balancing livelihood consideration; costs of management plan implementation over 10-year periods estimated (BD) 1.1.5 Pollution of coastal waters contained in up to 2 atolls to minimize negative impacts on adjacent marine conservation areas (IW) 1.1.6 Sustainable financing mechanisms from internal and external sources put in place to further build up the RMI sub-account in the Micronesia Challenge Trust in order to meet the costs of implementing the National Conservation Area Plan (BD)			
2. Improved Governance for Integrated Atoll Management	TA	2.1 Supportive policies, institutions and communities in place to ensure successful implementation of the Reimaanlok vision BD	2.1.1 Updated Reimaanlok that was completed in 2008 building on assessment to be done during PPG; updated review of legislative framework conducted to identify policy gaps in support of the project objectives; policy agenda formulated and implemented (BD) 2.1.2 Delineated responsibilities of various government agencies, NGOs and communities to facilitate implementation of Reimaanlok; agreed organization arrangements formally adopted through appropriate policy instrument (CMAC[3]) (BD) 2.1.3 Strengthened atoll-level management structures recognizing traditional ownership of resources (land, coastal, etc.) and local-national arrangements to enable communities take ownership and leadership in the formulation and subsequent implementation of integrated resource management plans (BD)	GEFTF	625,000	1,875,000

[3] CMAC – Coastal Management Advisory Council consists of MIMRA – MI Marine Resources Agency; RMIEPA – RMI Environmental Protection Agency; CMI – College of Marshall Islands; MIVA – MI Visitors Authority; OEPPC – Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination; MICS – MI Conservation Society; MRD – Ministry of Resources and Development; MoIA – Ministry of Internal Affairs; HPO – Historical Preservation Office; WUTMI – Women United Together MI; IOM – Internal Office of Migration; and USP – University of the South Pacific.

			2.1.4 Capacity building on integrated approaches for conservation and livelihoods benefitting key national government agencies, community leaders and residents in all 25 atolls in the entire country; participation by key project stakeholders in regional training programs conducted by the Pacific R2R program support project (BD)			
3. Knowledge Management	TA	3.1 Accessible data and information systems and improved linkages and collaboration with regional initiatives to support adaptive management of the biodiversity in RMI BD	3.1.1 GIS-based management information system (MIS) developed under the Reimaanlok project improved and maintained to serve as an accessible repository for all spatial biodiversity and resource management information to aid in policy formulation, enforcement, monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management (BD) 3.1.2 Local and traditional knowledge documented and compiled in the MIS for easy access and preserved for inputs in the development of integrated management plans (BD) 3.1.3 Support for expansion / continuation of education and awareness programs at the local and national levels, e.g., RARE Pride campaign for local leaders, 'Just Act Natural' initiative; complementary awareness programs implemented using various forms of media to mobilize support for conservation and livelihoods (BD) 3.1.4 Coordination established with the Pacific R2R program – regional program support project and other national R2R projects – in terms on monitoring and evaluation and south-south collaboration (BD)	GEFTF	425,000	250,000
Sub-Total					3,731,900	3,225,000
Project Management Cost				GEFTF	196,081	275,000
Total Project Costs					3,927,981	3,500,000

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, ($)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount ($)
National Government	Office of Environment Planning and Policy Coordination	In-kind	200,000
		Grant	500,000
	Ministry of Resources and Development (all divisions)	In-kind	300,000
		Grant	100,000
	Environmental Protection Agency	In-kind	100,000
		Grant	100,000
	Office of the President (Minister in Assistance Office)	In-kind	100,000

	College of Marshall Islands	In-kind	200,000
	MI Marine Resources Authority/Coastal Management Advisory Council	In-kind	200,000
		Grant	200,000
	State-Owned Enterprises (e.g., Majuro Water and Sewerage Company)	In-kind	500,000
Local Governments	MI Mayors' Association (MIMA) and Local Government Units (LGUs)		100,000
NGO	Protected Area Network Fund (PAN-F)	Grant	200,000
	MI Conservation Society	In-kind	100,000
	Women United Together MI (WUTMI)	In-kind	100,000
Private Sector	Micronesia Conservation Trust	Grant	300,000
	Waan Aelon in Majel (WAM)	In-kind	100,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	100,000
	TOTAL		3,500,000

D. INDICATIVE TRUST FUND RESOURCES ($) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF AGENCY	TYPE OF TRUST FUND	FOCAL AREA	Country name/Global	Grant amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)[2]	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	RMI	1,696,676	152,701	1,849,377
UNDP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	RMI	397,658	35,789	433,447
UNDP	GEF TF	Climate Change	RMI	1,679,002	151,110	1,830,112
UNDP	GEFTF	International Waters	Global	154,645	13,919	168,564
Total Grant Resources				3,927,981	353,519	4,281,500

[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

[2] Please indicate fees related to this project as well as PPGs for which no Agency fee has been requested already.

E. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)[4]

Please check on the appropriate box for PPG as needed for the project according to the GEF Project Grants:

	Amount Requested ($)	Agency Fee for PPG ($)[5]
▪ (up to) $150k for projects up to & including $6 million	_____150,000_____	_____13,500_____

PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES) FOR MFA AND/OR MTF PROJECT ONLY

TRUST FUND	GEF AGENCY	FOCAL AREA	Country Name/Global	(in $)		
				PPG (a)	**Agency Fee** (b)	**Total** c = a + b
GEF TF	UNDP	Biodiversity	RMI	64,792	5,831	70,623
GEF TF	UNDP	Land Degradation	RMI	15,186	1,367	16,553
GEF TF	UNDP	Climate Change	RMI	64,117	5,771	69,888
GEF TF	UNDP	IW	Global	5,905	531	6,436
Total PPG Amount				150,000	13,500	163,500

MFA: Multi-focal area projects; MTF: Multi-Trust Fund projects.

[4] On an exceptional basis, PPG amount may differ upon detailed discussion and justification with the GEFSEC.

[5] PPG fee percentage follows the percentage of the GEF Project Grant amount requested.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION[6]

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW:

A.1. Project Description

The Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI) consists of 5 low-lying islands and 29 coral atolls, respectively 4 and 22 of which are inhabited. The total of 1,225 islands and 870 reef systems is scattered over 2.1 million sq km of the Central Pacific. Mean elevation is less than 2 meters and land area is small at 182 sq km. It has a vast maritime jurisdiction with more 6500 sq km of lagoon and more than 2 million sq km of Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). RMI has some of the healthiest and robust coral reefs globally with high species diversity with more than 1,000 fishes, 360 corals, 2,500 invertebrates, 5 sea turtles and 27 marine mammals. On land in 4 atolls are home to globally important nesting seabird populations. Most atolls are dominated by agroforest, beach forest and savanna. In some of the uninhabited northern atolls can be found a rare natural semi-arid forest.

Approximately two-thirds of the population of 70,983[7] people reside in the main urban centres on the atolls of Majuro and Kwajalein (Ebeye) with nearby islands of Jaluit and Wotje described as peri-urban. As a Small Island Developing State (SIDS), RMI has a very strong dependence on natural resources and biodiversity – not only for food and income, but the relationship with the islands forms the basis of its culture and society which it has developed in harmony over thousands of years. To sustain this nation-defining natural resource base, RMI adopted Reimaanlok – the National Conservation Area Plan – in 2008. This project willl support the implementation of this roadmap to contribute to the overarching goal of a sustainable and resilient nation. This document is in support of the Micronesia Challenge goals of effective conservation of at least 30% of the nearshore marine resources and 20% of the terrestrial resources by 2020 across Micronesia that includes the Repbulic of the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of Palau.

A.1.1) The global environmental problems, root causes and barriers

Typical of small island ecosystems around the world, the harmony between nature and people in the Marshall Islands is being threatened in a number of fronts. First, traditional conservation and management practices such as the *mo* or site restrictions, species and seasonal harvesting restrictions that are linked to land ownership and extended family lineages are governed by the *Iroij* (chiefs), are slowly being eroded. Many landowners, leaders and workers have moved to more developed atolls risking loss of these traditional knowledge and management practices. Second, there is increasing commercial fishing pressure on reef and lagoon resources targeting reef fish, sharks, turtles, groupers and sea cucumbers for local and export markets. Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing does not only concern the EEZ but also impacts on nearshore fisheries with fishing companies approaching local communities to trade goods in exchange for giant clams, lobsters, coconut crabs, sea cucumbers and shark fins. Third, is worsening urban development and pollution particularly in Majuro and Ebeye that increased demands for food, fish, firewood, water and building materials. Nearshore mining of corals and reclamation to meet demand for settlement areas have increased coastal erosion. Pollution of beaches has increased morbidity among the human population and also threatened marine life. Fourth, climate change related events such as rising ocean temperature and ocean acidification is increasing the incidence of coral bleaching and limiting coral growth.

The root causes of the above problems are anthropogenic which are exacerbated by the limited development options typical of SIDS like RMI. However, addressing these problems RMI is faced with some obstacles including limited information about biodiversity, human resource capacity and institutions, scant financial resources and geographic challenges. The low level of scientific study about the natural environment in RMI prevents a more directed planning and prioritization in terms of biodiversity conservation. More information is needed to support science-based decision making. The population of over 70,000 presents challenges relative to the land area and the necessary critical mass of skilled people to manage this geographically spread-out and isolated country. The government has made progress in building national capacity particularly those related to

[6] Part II should not be longer than 5 pages.
[7] Estimate as of 2014: http://www.worldatlas.com/webimage/countrys/oceania/mh.htm

implementing Reimaanlok through the Coastal Management Advisory Council (CMAC) which has been active over the past decade in atoll biodiversity protection, conservation and integrated resource management. Budgetary sources for implementing the Reimaanlok appear limited as the Compact and Trust Fund prioritizes health, education and infrastructure outlays. An alternative financing mechanism for natural resource management has been developed in 2010 with the Sustainable Finance Plan that called for doubling of government contributions and raising $13 million endowment fund to achieve the Micronesia Challenge goals.

A.1.2 The baseline scenario and any associated baseline

Several national and regional initiatives provide the basis for this project. The Micronesia Challenge (MC) announced in 2006 is a shared commitment of the three northern Pacific Island Countries of the Federated States of Micronesia, Republic of Marshall Islands and the Republic of Palau and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands to effectively conserve at least 30% of the near-shore marine resources and 20% of the terrestrial resources across Micronesia by 2020. This ambitious challenge far exceeds current goals set by international conventions and treaties, which call for countries to conserve 10% of terrestrial and marine resources by 2010 and 2012 respectively. The challenge also emphasizes the need for Micronesian leaders to work together at the regional level to confront environmental and sustainable development issues, in a rapidly changing world.

Presented in 2008, the Reimaanlok – The National Conservation Area Plan for the Marshall Islands follows from RMI's National Biodiversity Report in 2000 and in support of the MC – is the cornerstone for this project. This was developed by RMI in November 2006 to July 2007 with financial support from Australia and technical support from the Centre for Environmental Management. The report identified atolls that have already initiated some level of conservation covered by nominal legal protection to local ordinance but not by national legislation. RMI has set up a Local Resource Committee and initiated the development of conservation management plans in a number of atolls. Legislating the Protected Areas Network legislation is now being discussed and once adopted, it is expected to accelerate implementation of concrete on-the-ground conservation efforts. Some baseline marine biological survey data has been done albeit scattered and not compiled systematically.

Due to limitations on knowledge about biodiversity endowments and status in RMI, the Plan did not attempt to identify specific sites for conservation areas, but rather develops the principles, process and guidelines for the design, establishment and management of conservation areas that are fully owned, led and endorsed by local communities based on their needs, values and cultural heritage. The task of this project is to operationalize these principles, process and guidelines.

In the past 10 years, RMI has been the recipient of a number of GEF investments, among other donors, upon which the project will build on. The most notable is the Micronesia Challenge that is envisaged to provide a lasting source of income to carry on the Protected Areas Network (PAN) of the three Micronesia countries, including RMI. As of 2013[8], capitalization of the RMI sub-account stands at over $2.0 million. The amount is still a long way from the target of $13 million.

Additional discussions about the baseline are in section A.1.3.

A.1.3) the proposed alternative scenario, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project and; A.1.4) Incremental cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF/SCCF and co-financing:

Component 1: Expanding and Sustaining RMI Protected Areas Network

This component will focus on the implementation of RMI's commitment to its protected area network (PAN) and thus contribute to Reimaanlok, the Micronesia Challenge and Aichi targets. Since the declaration of the MC in 2006, RMI has made substantial progress with its PAN. As of June 2013, it has reached 16% of the 20% terrestrial

[8] RMI Report to the Third International Conference on SIDS.

target. For nearshore marine areas (mean sea level to 100 m depth), RMI has reached 18% of its 30% commitment. In sustainable financing, RMI has progressed well with its MC Endowment Fund at $2.95 million.

The incremental value of the GEF investments in this component include the following:

a) Build on completed though limited biodiversity baseline survey data by undertaking additional surveys to assess the status of biodiversity in terrestrial and nearshore marine ecossytems as basis for planning and management;
b) Implement integrated and participatory approaches in biodiversity management at the atoll level, taking into account conservation, subsistence (food) and livelihoods to secure commitments in the Reimaanlok, MC and Aichi targets;
c) Ensure impacts through the formulation and implementation of management plans with community leadership; and
d) Contribute to sustainability by furthering sustainable financing mechanisms for biodiversity conservation within and outside the MC Endowment Fund

The project will work in up to 5 priority atolls to test and demonstrate the integrated atoll-wide framework and set the stage for replication in other places. The selection of atolls is based on a list of criteria to be developed during project preparation. The status of conservation and protection of atolls in RMI is in Table 1.

Component 2: Improved Governance for Integrated Atoll Management

This component will provide the supportive governance framework to fully implement the Reimaanlok. Review of this national conservation policy by the government is ongoing and the results will be taken into account during project design and/or project implementation. If review is not completed during PPG, the project will support this during implementation.

The organization arrangements for implementation of Reimaanlok (referred to as the project) is outlined in the policy document. A National Project Team consisting of members from CMAC is responsible for facilitating the setup of the project, facilitation of management planning and providing overall support. CMAC may be called upon to provide specialist resources, technical, fundraising assistance or any other advice. Work in the atolls will be done through the Community Management Planning Committee that consists of representatives of different community stakeholder groups and is responsible for the development of atoll resource management plans with the assistance of the National Project Team. It is also tasked to report back to the community.

The incremental value of GEF investments in this component include the following:

a) Support the review and/or updating of Reimaanlok, if necessary during project implementation;
b) Supporting and building on existing institutional arrangements for the implementation of Reimaanlok, it will clarify the responsibilities of the different national agencies and do the same at the local level with the objective of improving efficiency and ownership at the community level; and
c) Building capacities of national and local stakeholders towards integrated approaches through appropriate training, with a paramount focus on conservation and livelihoods.

Component 3: Knowledge Management

The scope of the outputs in this component is fully consistent with Reimaanlok, which emphasized the collection of local and traditional knowledge. The biophysical and socioeconomic surveys conducted in 2006-2007 have already been organized into a conservation-oriented GIS, although this system would require further development into which all information so far collected and will be generated by the project will be organized.

Table 1. Status of Terrestrial and Marine Biodiversity Conservation in Major Atolls in RMI

Atoll	Total Area* (ha)		Type of Protection and Management	Status as of 2008	Status as of July 2015
	Land	Nearshore			
Ailinginae	310	16,123	Type II	Currently protected by ordinance. Management plan in preparation by local government and landowners for nomination to World Heritage list.	Ailininae - they are all under one submission for consideration as a World Heritage site
Ailuk	641	24,681	Type I	Management plan in preparation as part of MIMRA's community-based fisheries management.	Ailuk's management plan is entirely marine right now, but they want to add on terrestrial
Arno	1,388	44,485	Type I	Management plan developed and local government ordinances drafted. Not yet fully implemented.	Arno was up to Step 5 with many meetings and drafted ordinance; progress unknown at this time
Bikini	638	73,671	Type II	Currently protected by ordinance. Management plan in preparation for nomination to World Heritage list.	Bikini is an outlier in the sense that they are self-sufficient
Jaluit	1,177	90,219	Type I and II	Management plan developed and local government ordinances drafted. Not yet fully implemented.	Jaluit has not officially started the Reimaanlok process due to lack of local government involvement at the outset and throughout
Likiep	943	49,172	Type I	Management plan developed and local government ordinances drafted. Not yet fully implemented.	Likiep has a management plan, ordinance has limited scope which has to be expanded
Mili	1,240	88,506	Type II	Management plan drafted but not yet implemented	Mili went with Kilom/MICS to Step 3 but has faltered due to community suspicion of assets being stored in Kilom's family's home.
Rongelap	740	112,630	Type I	Currently protected by ordinance	Currently protected by ordinance
Rongerik	159	20,431	Type I	Currently protected by ordinance	Rongerik - they are all under one submission for consideration as a World Heritage site
Total	7,236	519,918			

*The numbers refer to the total area of the atoll and not the conserved areas.
Source: Marshall Islands Conservation GIS, MIMRA & MICS
Type 1: Subsistence non-commercial use (IUCN Category VI); Type II: High level of protection (IUCN Category 1b)

RMI has also initiated a number of campaigns which will be continued and expanded by the project. Two notable initiatives are the RARE Pride campaign which supported the training of local conservation leaders to build grassroots support for conservation through the use of a charismatic flagship species. This activity will be undertaken in conjunction with Output 2.1.4 on capacity building. "Just Act Natural" is an initiative of a local NGO and the MI World Heritage Project to establish a conservation theater program run by the youth. This will be supported by the project.

The incremental value of GEF investments in this component is related to the implementation of activities already identified in Reimaanlok, as described in the preceding paragraph, which will strengthen the achievement of global environmental benefits by the project.

A.1.5) Global environmental benefits (GEFTF, NPIF) and adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

Global benefits

The Marshall Islands contain some of the most diverse and pristine ecosystems in the world. Biodiversity in terrestrial and marine ecosystems are essential to the culture, economy and livelihoods of the Marshallese people. In recent years, however, these resources are increasingly put under pressure due to rapid development and growth, increasing population pressure and unsustainable harvesting of resources. It is remarkable that despite its limited natural resource base, RMI together with FSM and Palau, has committed back in 2006 to effectively conserve at least 30% of the nearshore marine resources and 20% of the terrestrial resources by 2020. Subsequently in 2008, it has formulated its National Conservation Area Plan (Reimaanlok) which outlines the guidelines and principles on how to achieve the ambitious targets. This project fostering integrated approaches at the atoll level are primarily in support of the national and regional targets on conservation and to sustain the efforts towards lasting impacts to preserve biodiversity and therefore the Marshallese culture, economy and livelihoods.

A.1.6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

Innovation:

This project is primarily about the implementation of RMI's National Conservation Area Plan. As mentioned in section A.1.2, due to limitations on knowledge about biodiversity endowments and status in RMI, the Plan did not attempt to identify specific sites for conservation areas, but rather develops the principles, process and guidelines for the design, establishment and management of conservation areas that are fully owned, led and endorsed by local communities based on their needs, values and cultural heritage. The task of this project is to operationalize these principles, process and guidelines. Innovation will be in the application of integrated approaches which is at the heart of the Pacific R2R program which this project is part of. The planning unit is the entire atoll and applying the principles of spatial planning that is driven by the communities, it is expected that the process of implementing integrated management plans will be more effective and efficient in realizing the goals of sustainable use or conservation.

Sustainability:

This project will fully support conservation efforts in RMI as embodied in its national policies and programs. Sustainability of these efforts will be achieved by putting in place a supportive governance framework in terms of policies, legislation, institutions at the local and national level and capacity building of key stakeholders in government and in local communities. These will be delivered in component 2. Sustainable financing mechanisms will be supported by the project to further build up the RMI sub-account in the Micronesia Challenge Trust to ensure that project activities will be sustained even after completion of the project (Output 1.1.6).

Potential for scaling up:

The project will work primarily in up to 5 atolls. The integrated natural resource management framework and all the tools and approaches to be employed in the project will be refined for subsequent implementation in other atolls. RMI internal resources, including MC Trust and future GEF replenishments could support such scaling up.

A.2 Stakeholders. Identify key stakeholders (including civil society organizations, indigenous people, gender groups, and others as relevant) and describe how they will be engaged in project preparation:

Agency	Description	Role
Coastal Management Advisory Council, CMAC	Inter-governmental & NGO group led by MIMRA	Community-based coastal and fishery management, preservation of natural heritage; advisory support from CMAC and technical support from CMAC members
College of the Marshall Islands, CMI	Autonomous community college (WASC Accredited)	Marine science, cultural preservation, teacher education, research, vocational training, grants.
Republic of the Marshall Islands Environmental Protection Authority, RMIEPA	Independent government agency	Protection of the environment and sustainable resources management; regulations, enforcement and compliance
Historic Preservation Office, HPO	Government agency	Protection and preservation of tangible and intangible cultural properties
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority, MIMRA	Government agency	Generate awareness of the local people about marine resources, conduct surveys and projects for collecting information on marine resources
Marshall Islands Visitors Authority, MIVA	Government agency	Facilitate private sector support and engagement in tourism, promote sustainable tourism, solid waste management
Ministry of Finance	Government Agency	Oversees financial transactions; disburses funds
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Government agency	Oversee relationships with foreign governments
Ministry of Internal Affairs	Government agency	Oversee local governments, coordinate with land owners, process ordinances with Attorney General
Ministry of Resources and Development, MRD	Government agency	Promotion and assist in the development of agriculture, energy, trade and investment
Ministry of Education	Government agency	Oversees K-12 school education, and coordinates with CMI, USP, NTC, Land Grant, PREL and LGUs
National Training Council, NTC	Government agency	Multicultural expertise, environmental protection/climate impact services
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning Coordination, OEPPC	Government agency	Policy advice to President and Cabinet on MEAs, under the Rio-conventions (UNCCD, UNFCCC, UNCBD); GEF focal point; and planning for climate resilient sustainable development.
The Council of *Iroij*	Government agency	12 tribal chiefs who advise the Presidential Cabinet and review legislation affecting customary law or traditional practice, including land tenure
Marshall Islands Chamber of Commerce, MICOC	Private sector	Facilitate private sector support and engagement
Marshall Islands Conservation Society, MICS	NGO	Raise environmental awareness, build capacity for marine conservation, sustainable use of resources and protection of biodiversity and to strengthen cultural practices
Marshall Islands Mayors Association MIMA	NGO	Assists 24 local governments, elected officials, and leading ladies, supported by Ministry of IA, etc.
Pacific Island Marine Protected Area Community, PIMPAC	NOAA-supported network and collaboration between site based managers, NGOs, local communities, government and territorial agencies	Enhance the effective use and management of managed and protected areas. RMI has participated since PIMPAC inception.
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, SPREP	Regional intergovernmental organization	Protection and sustainable development of the Pacific region's environment

Secretariat of the Pacific Community, SPC	Regional intergovernmental organization	Regional technical support on agriculture, fisheries, energy, education, etc.
The Nature Conservancy, TNC	International conservation NGO	Conservation technical assistance
Conservation International	International conservation NGO	Endowment contribution ($1M), conservation technical assistance.
WUTMI	NGO	Support and strengthen Marshallese women
WAM	NGP	Youth, vocational and life skills through canoe building program

A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):

Risk	Level	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Limited pool of qualified individuals to lead or carry out projects activities.	M	Focus on capacity development to build human resource pool; explore national and international recruitment; agree on realistic timetables for implementation due to potential delays in recruitment; back-stopping and recruiting through CMAC agencies; utilize technical advisors and counterparts.
Weak coordination among project partners; government partners are overloaded.	L	CMAC, interagency committees created and meet regularly; senior staff participating; workplan endorsed by CSO, Cabinet; foster strong ownership of the project by mainstreaming project objectives into government process.
Poor communications and limited travel to outer atolls; limited coordination with atoll leaders	M	Budget for and purchase cell phones (where service) or SSB/HF radio with antenna. Use ship when airlines down. Consult with atoll leaders through use of mobile and other communications if face-to-face meetings are limited
Weak enforcement of laws	L	Assess and address reasons why specific laws are not respected or enforced. Include issues of enforcement in education and awareness campaigns
Limited understanding of natural ecosystems and their services	M	Biodiversity surveys to be conducted to assess status and improve understanding; College of Marshall Islands could be a partner in these surveys
Climate change events hinders implementation and limits impacts of projects	M	Collaborate with other national and regional projects on improving resilience to climate change and to mitigate the negative impacts on biodiversity conservation. The strengthening of the MI Protected Areas Network is envisioned to improve resilience of the natural ecosystems to climate change.
Relatively higher costs of project implementation in an geographically spread-out country	M	Plan for higher costs. Explore more cost-efficient partnerships with other projects and stakeholders through joint undertaking of activities

L= Low; M=Medium; H= High

A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF financed and other initiatives:

The project will build on and consolidate GEF investments through national and regional projects, particularly those related to biodiversity conservation and the R2R program. Of particular relevance here are a number of ongoing GEF-PAS projects, including the Micronesia Challenge and the Regional Pacific Invasive Species project both being implemented by UNEP. As mentioned above, stronger coordination with MC (the UNEP-GEF project) and the Micronesia Trust would be pursued during project design, particularly those activities relating to sustainable financing.

The Pacific Regional R2R program and the national R2R projects within the program and the regional program support project will be key collaborators in the RMI R2R project. Coordination with the regional project is through program reporting and regional training activities. With respect to the national R2R project, collaboration will be

through information sharing in the context of south-south exchanges. Both are reflected in the project framework (Outputs 2.1.4 and 3.1.4).

Two regional oceanic fisheries projects (UNDP/FAO Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project Phase 2 and WB Pacific Islands Regional Oceanscape Program) could be relevant although the RMI R2R project is focused on nearshore fisheries.

Other projects will be identified during the design phase.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, etc.:

In developing this PIF the following strategies, plans and documents were drawn upon with overall guidance provided by the sustainable development programme outlined in RMI's Vision 2018: Reimaanlok: Looking to the Future – National Conservation Area Plan for the Marshall Islands, MC Business Plan (draft), National Coastal Management Framework 2008, Atoll Coastal Management Plans, National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Management, (DRM NAP) 2008-2018, Joint National Action Plan (JNAP - disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation), draft National and Water Sanitation Policy (2013), draft National Solid Waste Management Strategy (2012) and subsequent implementation reports where available including RMI reports and statements to UNCBD. The project PIF is cognizant of these investments, gaps and challenges in these strategies and action plans, aligned with their RMI approved policies and builds actions based on gaps and prioritized needs in their implementation.

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

Strategic Focal Area: Biodiversity – The project focuses on Objectives 1 and 2 of the GEF 5 Biodiversity Results Framework and will improve RMI's ability to manage biodiversity, address threats to this biodiversity, and ensure success of protected area efforts more fully through an integrated atoll management approach based on the culture and way of working in RMI embodied in the Reimaanlok approach.

Strategic Focal Area: International Waters – The STAR for RMI is used to leverage additional financing from the IW focal area to allow for an integrated R2R approach at the atoll level. Of relevance is IW **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.

UN CBD Aichi Targets - This project also addresses all five of the Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goals and several targets as outlined below.

- Target 1 (Awareness): Improved awareness of biodiversity nationally and in the 5 priority atolls;
- Target 2 (Biodiversity integrated): Biodiversity conservation will be integrated or mainstreamed into at least five atoll based development strategies and/or planning processes.
- Target 4 (Sustainable production): Sustainable exploitation of fisheries in nearshore areas and of terrestrial resources in the priority atolls
- Target 8 (Pollution): Pollution will be reduced in two atolls.
- Target 11 (% protected): Contributed to conservation/protection of biodiversity in terrestrial and coastal ecosystems in line with the MC and Reimaanlok targets
- Target 14 (ecosystem services): At least 5 atoll communities will be implementing equitably-derived plans to safeguard ecosystem services as part of whole-atoll integrated management.
- Target 18 (traditional knowledge): Traditional and indigenous knowledge is documented, compiled and maintained in the GIS-based MIS; these are incorporated in the participatory processes in the formulation and implementation of integrated atoll management plans.

B.3 The GEF agency's comparative advantage to implement this project:

UNDP has the required on-the-ground operational, financial and technical capacities to effectively manage and guide this proposed project in RMI under the umbrella of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, UNDAF (*2008-2012 UNDAF for the Pacific Sub-region*) and the extension UNDAF (2013-2017).

The RMI National Development Priority referred to in the UNDAF results matrix is Vision 2018 Strategic Development Plan Framework, Goal 10 – Environmental Sustainability. Thus, the focus of UNDAF in RMI is environmental management, climate change and disaster risk management with the primary focus on environmental management. The RMI R2R project is aligned with the following UNDAF outcomes:

Outcome 1.1: A functional regulatory system with high degree of compliance at all levels to achieve sustainable development of natural resources and protection of the environment through strengthened gender inclusive climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction;

Outcome 3.1: Enhanced self-reliance and resourceful livelihoods for poverty reduction, increased food and water security for inclusive socio-economic development; and

Outcome 5.1: A society based on good governance whose people and institutions uphold traditional, national and international laws and conventions.

The UNDP national level support to RMI is detailed in the *UNDP Sub-Regional Programme Document for Pacific Island Countries 2013-2017* with one focus being 'Environmental management, climate change and disaster risk management'. The Fiji Multi-country Office (MCO) based in Suva, will be the responsible UNDP unit for this project, and the office has the required capacity and staff in relevant areas: operational and financial services; and the Environmental Management & Financing Unit (6 staff). One staff member will function as the UNDP focal point for the project. The UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor for International Waters in Asia-Pacific in Bangkok, based at the UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub will technically oversee the project to ensure that it achieves its objectives in line with GEF guidelines. UNDP is the only GEF agency that has a full-time resident presence in RMI, who will be the first point of interface with the Government of RMI. The RMI resident office is supported, operationally, administratively and technically by the UNDP Fiji Multi Country Office.

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 with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/DD/YYYY)
Mr. Lowell ALIK	Director	Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination	JULY 10, 2015 (UNDP)

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF criteria for project identification and preparation.					
AGENCY COORDINATOR, AGENCY NAME	**SIGNATURE**	**DATE (M/DD/YYYY)**	**PROJECT CONTACT PERSON**	**TELEPHONE**	**EMAIL ADDRESS**
Adriana Dinu UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator		**6 JULY 2015**	Jose Erezo Padilla	+662 304 9100 ext. 2730	jose.padilla@undp.org