



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: 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 the Marshall Islands (RMI)	GEF Project ID: ¹	5544
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5685
Other Executing Partner(s):	Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC)	Submission Date:	September xx, 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration(Months):	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>	Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities - Integrated Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood	Project Agency Fee (\$):	353,519

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	Output 1: New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems	GEF TF	3,048,336	1,101,223
BD-2	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Output 1: Policies and regulatory frameworks (number) for production sectors	GEF TF	725,000	2,521,222
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”	GEF TF	154,645	434,694
Total project costs				3,927,981	4,057,139

B. 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	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1: Expanding and	TA	Outcome 1: Conservation areas	Output 1.1: Marine and terrestrial biodiversity and	GEF TF	2,698,958	3,007,139

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.

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	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Sustaining RMI Protected Area Network		delineated, declared, and efforts sustained in 5 priority outer islands to meet Reimaanlok targets and contributing to the Micronesia Challenge and Aichi targets	<p>socioeconomic surveys conducted (or updated) in 5 outer islands to assess status and threats and serve as a guide in the delineation of conservation areas and spatial planning</p> <p>Output 1.2: Conservation areas delineated and declared in 5 outer islands 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</p> <p>Output 1.3: Integrated management plans developed (or updated) and implemented in 5 outer islands following the Reimaanlok process and balancing livelihood considerations</p> <p>Output 1.4: 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</p>			
Component 2: Improved Governance for Integrated Atoll Management	TA	Outcome 2: Supportive policies, institutions and communities in place to ensure successful implementation of the Reimaanlok vision	<p>Output 2.1: Action plan for developing secondary legislation to the Protected Area Network (PAN) Act 2015 formulated</p> <p>Output 2.2: The PAN Office is operationalized through agreed organizational arrangements formally adopted through an appropriate policy instrument</p>	GEF TF	607,734	450,000

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	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
			<p>Output 2.3: Strengthened community-based management structures recognizing traditional ownership of resources (land, coastal, etc.) and local-national arrangements to enable communities to take ownership and leadership in the formulation and subsequent implementation of integrated resource management plans</p> <p>Output 2.4: Capacity building on integrated approaches for conservation and livelihoods benefitting key national government agencies, community leaders and residents in all 24 outer islands in the entire country; participation by key project stakeholders in regional training programs conducted by the Pacific R2R program support project</p>			
<p>Component 3: Knowledge Management</p>	<p>TA</p>	<p>Outcome 3: Accessible data and information systems and improved linkages and collaboration with regional initiatives to support adaptive management of the biodiversity in RMI</p>	<p>Output 3.1: GIS-based management information system (MIS) developed under the Reimaanlok project improved as an accessible repository for all spatial biodiversity and resource management information to aid in policy formulation, enforcement, monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management</p> <p>Output 3.2: Local and traditional knowledge documented and compiled in the MIS for easy access and preserved for inputs in the development of integrated management plans</p> <p>Output 3.3: Support for expansion / continuation of</p>	<p>GEF TF</p>	<p>434,694</p>	<p>325,000</p>

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	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
			education and awareness programs at the local and national levels, e.g., the ‘Just Act Natural’ initiative; complementary awareness programs implemented using various forms of media to mobilize support for conservation and livelihoods Output 3.4: 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			
Subtotal					3,741,386	3,782,139
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEF TF	186,595	275,000
Total project costs					3,927,981	4,057,139

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC)	In-kind	500,000
Recipient Government	Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC)	grant	500,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Internal Affairs	In-kind	2,452,768
CSO	Marshall Islands Conservation Society (MICS)	In-kind	100,000
CSO	Women United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI)	In-kind	378,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	126,371
Total Co-financing			4,057,139

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b

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

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	GEF TF	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. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	181,500	0	181,500
National/Local Consultants	324,000	0	324,000

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

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

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

In 2015, after the PIF was approved, the Republic of the Marshall Islands passed an Act to amend Title 35 (Environment) of the Marshall Islands Revised Code (MIRC) by inserting a new Chapter 5, to create the Protected Areas Network for the purposes of conservation and management of natural resources of the Marshall Islands. The short title of the Act is cited as “Protected Areas Network (PAN) Act 2015”. This Act provides a legislative framework for the Reimaanlok process and was an important step towards realizing broader governmental commitment to conservation and sensible management of the valuable natural ecosystems of the RMI. The R2R project is being developed during an opportune time, by supporting the Government of RMI in development of requisite secondary legislation to the PAN Act and supporting Reimaanlok stakeholders by operationalizing the PAN Office and PAN Fund Board.

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

The multi-focal area project is in line with the integrated approaches that are intrinsic to the R2R strategic framework.

Strategic Focal Area: Biodiversity (BD): 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.

Objective 1 of the GEF-5 Biodiversity Strategy aims to “*Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems*”, is tied to the Aichi Targets and also closely aligned with the targets of the Micronesia Challenge, which aims at expanding protection of terrestrial and marine protected areas to 20% and 30%, respectively, in participating countries by the year 2020. In each of the 5 selected outer islands of the R2R project, new terrestrial protected areas will be designed and designated, and new marine protected areas will realized in 4 of the 5 outer islands. There is an existing MPA in Likiep,

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

covering 32 ha, which is <1% of the nearshore marine area of this atoll. The project is also relevant with respect to Outcome 1.2 of Objective 1 of the Biodiversity Strategy, by supporting development of sustainable financing mechanisms in order to fulfill total expenditures needed to effectively manage the protected area system.

Objective 2 of the GEF-5 Biodiversity Strategy (“*Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors*”) is centered on biodiversity mainstreaming, and consistent with the Reimaanlok process, the management plans for the 5 selected outer islands embrace the concept of mainstreaming, by applying integrated approaches to natural resource management. The management plans capture the intrinsic connection between ecosystem goods and services with the socioeconomic priorities of the local communities, e.g., by formulating measures that promote sustainable use within the fisheries and agro-forestry sectors, reconciles ecological water demand with sustenance and production needs.

Strategic Focal Area: International Waters (IW): The System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) for RMI is used to leverage additional financing from the IW focal area to allow for an integrated R2R approach at the outer island level. Considering that proportion of the GEF grant allocated from the IW focal area is approximately 4% of the total, the scope of the IW activities are modest. The project strategy is most closely linked with Objective 3 of the GEF-5 IW strategy which aims to “*Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for joint, ecosystem based management of trans-boundary water systems*”, specifically in general accordance with Outcome 3.2 of the IW strategy, with on-the-ground modest actions implemented in coastal fisheries. The majority of the IW funds are allocated for coordination with the regional R2R project, with respect to capacity building, and South-South collaborations.

A.3. The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

The comparative advantage of the UNDP is multifaceted. Firstly, the UNDP has extensive experience throughout the Pacific, including RMI, and maintains a favorable standing among RMI governmental stakeholders. As the GEF Agency for the R2R regional program, the UNDP has mobilized their regional and global expertise in guiding the integrated R2R approaches under implementation. The UNDP has a residence office in Fiji and a regional hub for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok. Through UNDP’s large portfolio of GEF-financed biodiversity projects, the agency has built up a considerable body of work and knowledge on facilitating interventions aimed at improving management effectiveness and financial sustainability of protected areas.

Acknowledging the institutional capacity of the UNDP Pacific Office and the limited experience by national stakeholders in executing full-size GEF projects, the Government of RMI has formally requested to administer this project under direct implementation modality (DIM), with the UNDP as the Implementing Partner. The higher level of project management costs as compared to the amount outlined in the PIF is due to the higher direct project costs associated with a DIM arrangement. The indicative project management costs are USD 286,024, or 7% of the requested GEF implementation grant.

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

Challenges and Root Causes

The Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI) consists of 870 reef systems reaching up from 2.1 million km² of the vast deep Central Pacific⁵. Upon these reef systems are 29 coral atolls and 5 low-lying islands, respectively 22 and 4 of which are inhabited. These 1,225 sand cays and vegetated islets altogether comprise 182 km² of land which remain visible above water level during high tide, and although these small islands represent the only potentially habitable land with a mean elevation of less than 2 meters. It also has a vast maritime jurisdiction with more 6,500 km² of lagoon and more than 2 million km² 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.

⁵ Does not include Aneen Kio (Wake Island).

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 sustainable management of different varieties of breadfruit, pandanus, and a salt-resistant strain of taro – altogether capable of supporting dense populations on these margins of land – and the *mo* (traditional no-take areas governed by the *Iroi* or chiefs) and other site restrictions, species and seasonal harvesting restrictions that are linked to land ownership and extended family lineages are, are slowly being eroded. 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 purchase giant clams, lobsters, coconut crabs, sea cucumbers and shark fins. . Third, climate change related events such as sea level rise, rising ocean temperature and ocean acidification is further undermining the resilience of these atoll ecosystems.

The root causes of the above problems are largely 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 the remoteness of many of its communities, the necessary critical mass of skilled people and institutional cohesion needed to manage such a geographically scattered archipelago, scant financial resources, and limited information about biodiversity. 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 government has made progress in building national capacity particularly those related to implementing Reimaanlok through the 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 a USD 13 million endowment fund to achieve the Micronesia Challenge goals.

Although there have been notable advances in biodiversity conservation in RMI, both in terms of policy reform and on-the-ground activities, there remain certain barriers that continue to hinder achievement of effective and financially sustainable management of terrestrial and nearshore marine ecosystems.

Barrier 1: Lack of information on the ecosystem health of the outer islands

The Reimaanlok Framework derives from a historical emphasis on marine and socioeconomic survey methodologies since it was introduced in 2008. Marine surveys and socioeconomic assessments have been made for some islands, but there remain a number of gaps. This scarcity of information also impedes development of scientific based climate change adaptation strategies, something that is increasingly a concern for the atoll communities throughout RMI.

Barrier 2: Insufficient human resources for PAN management and biodiversity conservation, and lack of community-level capacity

One of the key principles of the Reimaanlok approach is to empower local communities in quantifying and managing their ecosystem goods and services. Presently the PAN operates exclusively through the capital atoll of Majuro, with site visits to the outer islands by CMAC facilitators. As the PAN grows and expands to achieve the Micronesia Challenge goals of 20% terrestrial and 30% marine conservation, it will require additional resources to cover growing network management costs increasingly in the northern atolls of the RMI, and in some cases it will be increasing important for outer island communities to take a leading role in sustainable natural resource management. Strengthening local capacities is imperative in order to overcome the limited support rendered to these remote communities due to poor communication infrastructure, expensive transportation options, etc. Realization of the Reimaanlok approach in the long run will depend on devolving natural resource management to the outer island communities, and developing cross-sectoral enabling conditions at the national level to support the process. Currently, the supply of qualified professionals in RMI is insufficient to meet these needs.

Barrier 3: Weak legislative framework and institutional arrangements for PA network management

Although legislation for the RMI Protected Area Network was approved in August 2015 and complementary PAN Regulations are slated to be in place in 2017, at present the RMI PAN is still in its infancy. In particular, a nationally articulated sustainable financing mechanism as well as communication, monitoring, and enforcement protocols are lacking. The Reimaanlok model for integrated resource planning, management, and development is not yet fully appreciated at all relevant sectors of the national government as a means to achieving national and international sustainable development goals applicable to the outer islands. Therefore, outer island local government efforts to develop conservation and sustainable development plans via the Reimaanlok process can occur exclusively within the “environmental sector” and in isolation of various complementary sectors.

Barrier 4: Insufficient human resource capacity for sustaining effective PAN management

Realization of the Reimaanlok approach in the long run will depend on devolving natural resource management to the outer island communities and developing cross-sectoral enabling conditions at the national level to support the process. Currently, there is no professional based resource management certification program in place to supply qualified professionals in the RMI to meet the needs. Moreover, regional training programs (e.g., the R2R regional program) are not comprehensively designed to the unique challenges of resources management in the RMI outer islands.

Barrier 5: Erosion of traditional conservation and management practices, and insufficient awareness, knowledge, and access to available information

Most all outer island communities in the RMI share a clear understanding of the importance of traditional conservation and management practices, as evidenced in the maintenance of traditional conservation areas (*mo*) in all of the selected 5 outer islands. However complementary elements of Marshallese language, experience, and traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) related to natural resource management, weather patterns, and navigation remain underutilized as a means to communicate and achieve modern PA management objectives. This is particularly evident in youth residing in the urban centers of the Marshall Islands.

Since 2006 the Reimaanlok guidelines and Conservation GIS database has been slowly taking shape under the careful watch of a team of government and non-government organizations all with a common interest in the conservation, development and management of the natural resources of the RMI. On behalf of CMAC, the College of the Marshall Islands (CMI) is overseeing US federal grant funds expiring in 2018 to establish a National Spatial Analytic Facility which will consolidate and augment the Conservation GIS database, offer a short-course in *Participatory GIS for Atoll Conservation*, and make Conservation GIS available to college students and outer island communities. However, beyond 2018, CMAC and CMI will have insufficient personnel and operational capacity to fully use this National Spatial Analytic Facility for PAN management and biodiversity conservation.

Baseline Scenario

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 nearshore marine resources and 20% of the terrestrial resources across Micronesia by 2020. This ambitious challenge exceeds current goals set by international conventions and treaties. 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.

To date, RMI has legally designated protected areas in 16 of the 34 total atolls/islands. According to information contained in the World Database on Protected Areas⁶, the terrestrial protected areas in RMI make up a cumulative land area of 34 km², which is approximately 19% of the 181 km² of total land area in the country, and the marine protected areas cover a combined 5,338 km². The terrestrial protected areas nearly fulfill the 20% target of the Micronesia Challenge. However, as indicated in the State of Environment Report 2016, most of the protected areas do not yet have management plans. With respect to the marine target of 30%, the lack of a nearshore baseline for the country prohibits

⁶ www.protectedplanet.net

an accurate account of what proportion the 5,388 km² represents. Nearshore marine area in RMI is defined as the high water mark out to 100 m depth; however, there are insufficient bathymetric survey data available to determine a baseline. The Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of RMI is vast, covering more than 2 million km², and not a valid approximation of nearshore marine area.

Legislation for the RMI Protected Area Network was approved in August 2015 and complementary PAN Regulations are slated to be in place by early 2017. Once fully functional, the PAN is expected to accelerate implementation of concrete on-the-ground conservation efforts through regular disbursements from an endowment fund entrusted to the fiscal management of the Micronesia Conservation Trust. The Micronesia Challenge is envisaged to provide a lasting source of income to meet the gap to carry on the Protected Areas Network (PAN) of the three Micronesia countries, including RMI. As of 2016, capitalization of the RMI sub-account stands at over USD 3.5 million⁷. The amount is still a long way from the target of USD 13 million.

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

Incremental Cost Reasoning

The project has been designed to incrementally build on the existing Reimaanlok foundation and institutional capacities. The project is organised into three components and will be implemented over a period of five years. With respect to Component 1, “*Expanding and Sustaining RMI Protected Area Network*”, the incremental value of the GEF grant includes:

- a. Build on lacking or outdated biodiversity baseline survey data by undertaking additional terrestrial surveys to assess the status of biodiversity in terrestrial and nearshore marine ecosystems as basis for planning and management;
- b. Formulate or update management at the atoll level, taking into account national and regional conservation guidelines and procedures, community cohesion and subsistence (food), and modern livelihoods opportunities to secure commitments in the PAN, MC and Aichi targets;
- c. Ensure impacts through the formulation, implementation, and monitoring of management plans with community leadership and social systems integrated and participatory approaches; and
- d. Contribute to sustainability by furthering sustainable financing mechanisms for biodiversity conservation within and outside the MC Endowment Fund.

Component 2, “*Improved Governance for Integrated Atoll Management*”, will provide the supportive governance framework to fully implement the Reimaanlok process. It is noted that following the Council approval of the PIF, the PAN Act was passed providing a new governance baseline for the project. The incremental value of GEF funding for this component include the following:

- a. Advise on secondary legislation to support implementation of the PAN Act.
- b. Support and build 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;
- c. Support the interim operation of the PAN office; and
- d. Build capacities of national and local stakeholders towards integrated approaches through appropriate training, with a paramount focus on conservation, sustainable livelihoods, and community based adaptation.

The incremental value of GEF funding for Component 3, “*Knowledge Management*”, is related to the implementation of activities already identified in Reimaanlok, as described in the preceding paragraph, which will strengthen the

⁷ Micronesia Challenge Measures Working Group Meeting, August 2016.

achievement of global environmental benefits by the project, and highlighting local engagement with respect to conservation and climate change adaptation planning and implementation.

Global Environmental Benefits

The Marshall Islands contain some of the most diverse and pristine ecosystems in the world. Among the 5 outer islands selected for the R2R project, 4 of them are situated within 2 of the 15 key biodiversity areas (KBAs) identified in RMI: Northern Ratak (KBA site ID 23791) and Southern Ralik (KBA site ID 23792)⁸. These KBAs were identified in 2007, as part of the ecosystem profile of the Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot, supported by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF).⁹

Biodiversity in terrestrial and marine ecosystems are essential to the culture, economy and livelihoods of the Marshallese people. In 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/island level is 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.

Expansion of the RMI nearshore marine and terrestrial protected areas by 510 km² and 5 km², respectively, will also contribute towards the RMI Government's effort in achieving relevant SDG's, specifically Goal 14, "*Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development*" and Goal 15, "*Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss*". Ensuring long-term health of marine and terrestrial ecosystems of the outer islands through generation of these global environmental benefits is closely linked to the well-being, livelihoods, and social equity of the local communities. The integrated R2R approach to natural resource management will also deliver a number of co-benefits, including enhancing resilience to climate change. For instance, promoting agroforestry for sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity conservation, also delivers improved soil conservation and ecosystem based adaptation benefits, e.g., by reducing the rate of erosion and providing increased protection against storm surge. These co-benefits are directly in line with SDG 13, "*Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts*", specifically Target 13.b, "*Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least developed countries and Small Island developing States, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities*". Another co-benefit is reducing vulnerability of scarce freshwater resources in the RMI outer islands. Consistent with SDG 6, "*Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all*", the R2R project is supporting hydrogeologic and groundwater assessments and monitoring systems in one of the selected outer islands, in order to expand the knowledge base regarding fresh water resources and improving early warning systems.

The incremental GEF funding will deliver the global environmental benefits outlined above through implementing sustainable development of fragile outer island ecosystems and good governance, e.g., by financing the operation of the RMI PAN Office, strengthening the capacities of the professional and scientific communities, and increasing awareness among local and national stakeholders.

Project Strategy

⁸ BirdLife International (2017) *The World Database of Key Biodiversity Areas*. Developed by the Key Biodiversity Areas Partnership: BirdLife International, IUCN, Amphibian Survival Alliance, Conservation International, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Global Environment Facility, Global Wildlife Conservation, NatureServe, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, World Wildlife Fund and Wildlife Conservation Society. Downloaded from <http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org> on 16 June 2017.

⁹ CEPF, 2007. Ecosystem Profile, Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot. Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund

The **project goal** is to maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to the society of the Republic of Marshall Islands.

The **project objective** is to sustain biodiversity and livelihoods by building community and ecosystem resilience to threats and degrading influences through integrated management of terrestrial and coastal resources in priority atolls/islands.

In order to achieve the above objective, and based on the barrier analysis outlined above, which identified: a) the problems being addressed by the project, b) its root causes, and c) the barriers to overcome in order to actually address the problem and its root causes, the project's intervention has been organized in three components, under which three 'outcomes' are expected.

Component 1: Expanding and Sustaining RMI Protected Area Network

This component focuses on the implementation of RMI's commitment to its protected area network (PAN) and thus contributing to the Micronesia Challenge and Aichi targets. The design of Component 1 is largely unchanged from the outlined presented in the PIF; however, a few minor modifications have been made, including consolidation of indicative outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 in the PIF into a single output in the project document:

Indicative Outputs in PIF

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.

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.

Consolidated Output 1.3 in Project Document

1.3 Integrated management plans developed or updated and implemented in 5 outer islands following the Reimaanlok process and balancing livelihood considerations.

The project is designed to feed into and strengthen the Reimaanlok process. Scaling up the implementation of integrated natural resource management plans to other islands/atolls is one of the focuses of the replication strategy and will be realized through continued execution of the Reimaanlok, spearheaded by an operational PAN office and supported by a strengthened enabling environment. **The project will support formulation of sustainable financing mechanisms, including a possible 'Blue Fee' to raise revenues for the PAN Law.**

The indicative output included in the PIF of "Pollution of coastal waters contained in up to 2 atolls to minimize negative impacts on adjacent marine conservation areas (IW)" was removed from the project design. The International Waters (IW) funding was rather allocated to coordination with the regional R2R program, including capacity building activities. The resource surveys and implementation of integrated natural resource management plans for the selected 5 islands/atolls will address water quality, coastal fisheries, and other aspects that are consistent with Outcome 3.2 of Objective 3 of the IW GEF-5 strategy. Moreover, RMI is developing a water sector project under the Green Climate Fund (GCF) which will address vulnerability of scarce freshwater resources across the country.

As natural resource management is very much inter-linked with the well-being of outer island residents, improved ecosystem management also contributes toward strengthening climate resilience and community based adaptation. Several of the activities designed under Outcome 1 are specifically focused on supporting adaptation planning efforts; for example, flood risk assessments, hydrogeologic surveys, and groundwater monitoring. Linking conservation finance with climate finance, addressed in the sustainable financing activities in Output 1.4, is reflective of the integrated approach to natural resource management promoted on this project and also enhances the likelihood for securing funding.

Component 2: Improved Governance for Integrated Atoll Management

The focus of Component 2 is strengthening the enabling conditions realizing effective governance required for integrated atoll/island management. Outputs include supporting development of secondary legislation to the PAN Act, operationalizing the PAN Office, building institutional and individual capacities, and supporting proactive land use arrangements that facilitate the ecosystem based approach to natural resource management. As mentioned earlier, the PAN Act was passed after PIF approval.

Component 3: Knowledge Management

The knowledge management strategy for the project is multidimensional. Firstly, resources are allocated for strengthening the management information system, Conservation GIS, with the aim of enhancing the content of the system and improving access as a knowledge sharing platform. The project will work closely with MIMRA, the entity responsible for maintaining and updating the GIS system after project completion. One of the other aspects of the project that is showcased in the knowledge management strategy is integrating traditional ecological knowledge into the management plans for the outer islands, working closely with custodians of the traditional knowledge on how best to collect, disseminate, and apply collective wisdom. Substantive resources are also earmarked towards increasing involvement and awareness among youth, regarding the importance of sustainable natural resource management in their communities and to nurture future transformative change agents. The R2R regional program functions partly as a South-South knowledge exchange platform and project implementation staff members will regularly share and learn from experiences on the national R2R projects.

The knowledge products generated during the project will also be shared on international platforms, including the Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform¹⁰ maintained by the United Nations Division of Sustainable Development. Finally, 1% of the GEF IW grant for the project will be devoted for supporting the IW:LEARN¹¹ knowledge management platform.

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 key risks that could possibly adversely affect the delivery of outcomes set forth in the project are tabulated below, along with an assessment of the potential impact and estimated probability of each risk, what measures have been taken to mitigate the risks, and an indication of who the owner of each separate risk is.

Project risks					
Description	Type ¹²	Impact & Probability ¹³	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status ¹⁴
Limited pool of qualified individuals to lead or carry out projects activities.	Operational	The effectiveness and timeliness of delivering project outputs and outcomes would be affected. Impact: 3 Probability: 3	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.	Implementing Partner	No change
Weak coordination among project partners; government	Organizational	If cross-sectoral collaborative structures do not function	CMAC, interagency committees created and meet regularly; senior staff participating; workplan	Responsible Party	No change

¹⁰ The Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform is maintained by the United Nations Division for Sustainable Development (DSD), which has a mandate to provide leadership and catalyse action in promoting and coordinating implementation of internationally agreed development goals, including the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org>

¹¹ IW:LEARN is the GEF International Waters learning exchange and resource network. <http://iwlearn.net>

¹² Includes the following eight categories: environmental; financial; operational; organizational; political; regulatory; strategic; and other.

¹³ Impact and probability rated on a scale of on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high).

¹⁴ Status indicated as over, reducing, increasing, or no change.

Project risks					
Description	Type ¹²	Impact & Probability ¹³	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status ¹⁴
partners are overloaded; limited coordination with outer island leaders		efficiently, the requisite enabling conditions might not be in place to foster delivery of project results. Impact: 3 Probability: 3	endorsed by Chief Secretary; foster strong ownership of the project by mainstreaming project objectives into government process.		
Poor communications and limited travel to outer islands	Operational	Monitoring and evaluation of project activities would be hindered. Impact: 2 Probability: 3	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. Travel costs allocated in project budget, including annual retreat with all 5 site coordinators and other PIU staff.	PIU	No change
Weak enforcement of laws	Regulatory	If the regulatory framework is unreliable, stakeholders might be discouraged to participate in the integrated approaches advocated by the project. Impact: 2 Probability: 2	Assess and address reasons why specific laws are not respected or enforced. Include issues of enforcement in education and awareness campaigns.	Implementing Partner	No change
Limited understanding and appreciation of natural ecosystems and their services	Environmental	Designs of integrated natural resource management plans might not be representative. Impact: 3 Probability: 2	Biodiversity surveys to be conducted to assess status and improve understanding; higher education providers could be a partner in these surveys.	PIU	No change
Climate change events hinders implementation and limits impacts of projects	Environmental	Incentives for participating in sustainable use of natural resources would be negated by the adverse impacts of climate change on the ecosystem goods and services that the incentives are based upon. Impact: 3 Probability: 3	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 RMI Protected Areas Network is envisioned to improve resilience of the natural ecosystems to climate change	PIU	No change
Relatively higher costs of project implementation in an geographically spread-out country	Organizational	The costs of implementation outweigh the potential benefits delivered. Impact: 2 Probability: 4	Plan for higher costs. Explore more cost-efficient partnerships with other projects and stakeholders through joint undertaking of activities	PIU	No change

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

The GEF-financed 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. Both are reflected in the project framework (Outputs 2.4 and 3.4). Exchanging experiences and lessons learned on the other national R2R projects will be shared twice per year during joint meetings organized by the R2R regional project coordination team. Project resources are also allocated for funding four RMI professionals, not members of the PIU, to complete the post-graduate programme, which is also

organized through the regional project. Representatives from the 24 inhabited RMI atolls/islands will also be provided opportunities to complete online R2R training modules.

There will also be close collaboration between the R2R project and the Pacific Islands Regional Oceanscape Project (PROP). The PROP project in RMI has a budget of USD 8.58 million, with USD 6.75 million from the International Development Association (IDA) and USD 1.83 million from GEF. Component 1 of the PROP project has the bulk of the IDA funding, roughly 80% of the total. Component 2 of the PROP project – Sustainable Management of Coastal Fisheries – is complementary with the R2R project.

The 5-year duration PROP project, which started implementation in 2016, is largely focused on fisheries, whereas the R2R project, consistent with the Reimaanlok process, takes more of an integrated approach to natural resource management, with activities dealing with terrestrial biodiversity conservation, pollution prevention and control, groundwater and coastal zone management, establishing new protected areas and strengthening the management of existing ones, valuing traditional ecological knowledge and land tenure systems, and strengthening information management systems. By extending the activities to all 24 local governments, the available resources on the PROP project are limited for supporting substantive implementation activities. The R2R project, focusing on 5 outer islands, will be able to sponsor more meaningful implementation activities at the local level. The following synergies between the two projects are envisaged:

- a. The PROP project is supporting marine assessments at each of the 24 local government jurisdictions, including the 5 outer islands selected by the R2R project. The R2R project will be able to utilize the results of these assessments in developing updated biophysical profiles for the 5 selected outer islands;
- b. Implementation of coastal fisheries management plans developed under the PROP project will be shared with the R2R project, as part of the integrated natural resource management plans developed for the 5 pilot outer islands; and
- c. Joint training workshops will be organized between the two projects.

The two projects will also collaborate on delivering capacity building for local communities with respect to management of local natural resources, including coastal fisheries.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

The stakeholder engagement plan presented below is based on consultations made during the project preparation grant (PPG) phase, starting with the a national PPG inception workshop, and subsequently through interviews with key governmental sector officials, community consultations in the selected 5 outer islands, a workshop with the mayors of the 5 outer islands, and a national validation workshop.

The project will engage with stakeholders at the national, local, and regional level, utilizing existing structures as much as practicable. At the national level, the Coastal Management Advisory Council (CMAC) will be one of the key stakeholder engagement platforms. The CMAC, consisting of the following members, is defined as the Technical Advisory Committee in the Protected Areas Network (PAN) Act 2015 and has been guiding the Reimaanlok process over the past several years.

- Marshall Islands Marine Resource Authority (MIMRA)
- RMI Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA)
- College of the Marshall Islands (CMI)
 - Land Grant
 - Sea Grant
- Marshall Islands Visitors Authority (MIVA)
- Historic Preservation Office (HPO)

- Marshall Islands Conservation Society (MICS)
- University of the South Pacific (USP)
- Office of Environmental Policy & Planning Coordination (OEPPC)
 - SPREP
- Women United Together in the Marshall Islands (WUTMI)
- Ministry of Resources & Development (R&D)
- International Organization of Migration (IOM)

The CMAC will essentially act as the Technical Working Group, and along with the OEPPC as responsible party and UNDP as the GEF agency and implementing partner, will be responsible for providing technical and strategic guidance during implementation. The Council of *Iroij* and the Marshall Islands Mayors Association (MIMA) are other existing traditional and local governance structures that will be important stakeholder engagement partners for the project, closely involved in the development of the integrated management plans for the 5 selected islands, design and deliver capacity building activities, cultural surveys, and discussions on strengthening local repositories on traditional knowledge.

At the local level, Local Resource Committees (LRCs), formed as part of the Reimaanlok process, will be the main stakeholder engagement structures for facilitating development and implementation of the integrated management plans for the 5 outer islands. Also, local government units and church organizations will be utilized to help guide the activities on the islands.

Participation of the private sector is an important element with respect to enhancing the likelihood that the results achieved during the project’s lifespan will be sustained after GEF funding ceases. Private sector enterprises have the business savvy and market entry points that could enable local communities in further developing sustainable use of certain ecosystem goods and services. The Marshall Islands Chamber of Commerce (MICOC) will be engaged as a focal point for private sector enterprises, and the Division of Trade and Investment of the Ministry of Resources and Development (R&D) will be involved, as part of their ongoing efforts aimed at promoting and facilitating trade and investment in the country.

The UNDP Pacific Office will be an important regional partner, not only as the GEF agency for this project but as a vehicle for sharing lessons learned and best practices on other projects and programs in the region, including the R2R regional program. As this project is designed to feed into the Reimaanlok process, part of the stakeholder engagement plan is to strengthen existing collaborative regional mechanisms, including the Micronesia Challenge (MC) and the various activities developed around this inter-governmental initiative. The project will support involvement of RMI stakeholders in MC annual meetings, for example, and the Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT) will be an important stakeholder in assessing sustainable financing options. Engagement with other key regional stakeholders, including the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), will be facilitated, largely through technical advisory arrangements and networking on complementary projects and initiatives.

In summary, the table below describes the major categories of stakeholders identified, and the level of involvement envisaged in the project.

Stakeholder	Description	Role in the Project
Direct beneficiaries and community based stakeholders:		
Local Communities	Residents of the 5 outer islands	Direct project beneficiaries.
Local Government Units	Mayor of each of the 5 outer islands and other local government stakeholders	Direct project role, facilitating integration of project activities into the development framework for the respective outer islands.
Local Resource Committees	Committees established under the Reimaanlok process	Direct project role, with respect to implementation of the project activities at the respective outer islands.
Women’s groups and other Community based organizations	Community organizations	Direct project role, local implementing partners, facilitating field and livelihood interventions.
Custodians of traditional knowledge	Traditional knowledge custodians	Direct project role, guiding cultural surveys and development of traditional ecological knowledge guidelines.
Landowners	Owners of land in the 5 outer islands	Direct project role, participating in delineation of protected areas, and development and implementation of enabling land use

Stakeholder	Description	Role in the Project
		arrangements for the implementation of project activities and long-term implementation of local management plans.
Local Church groups	Organized church groups	Indirect role, as important local stakeholders, providing guidance on implementation of field activities in the outer islands.
Project implementation stakeholders:		
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Pacific Office	Multilateral development agency	GEF Agency and Implementing Partner for the project
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning Coordination, OEPPC	Government agency responsible for providing policy advice to the President and Cabinet on multilateral environmental agreements and associated treaties, and collaborating with other government partners, NGOs, and communities in implementing environmental protection projects and programmes.	Responsible party for the project, housing the project implementation unit, and providing supervision and guidance during project implementation.
National level stakeholders:		
Coastal Management Advisory Council, CMAC	Interagency coordination and advisory group consisting of governmental agencies, civil society, and academic and research institutions dedicated to advancing the Reimaanlok Framework	Direct oversight role, as technical advisory group for the project and PAN Office, and facilitating and coordinating the Reimaanlok process.
Ministry of Internal Affairs	Government agency, responsible for administering local governance and implementing national gender strategy.	Direct project role, as member of CMAC, project cofinancing partner, and ensuring the project is aligned with national and local priorities with respect to local governance, the national gender inclusion strategy.
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority, MIMRA	Component unit of RMI, principal line of business is to facilitate the sustainable and responsible use of marine resources in the RMI.	Direct role, as CMAC coordinator, and collaborating with the project in expanding coastal fisheries management at the local government and community level. Also, as executing agency for the PROP project in RMI, MIMRA is also positioned to facilitate collaboration between the two projects. Also, as manager of the Fish Markets on Majuro and Ebeye, MIMRA is positioned to support livelihoods development activities.
Environmental Protection Authority, EPA	Government agency, responsible for enforcement of environmental legislation in RMI.	Direct project role, as member of CMAC, and ensuring the project is aligned with national pollution, water, and sanitation priorities. Also, as executing agency for the UNDP-Regional R2R program/project in RMI, EPA is also positioned to facilitate collaboration between the two projects.
Ministry of Resources and Development (R&D), Division of Agriculture	Government agency responsible for implementing agricultural and forestry legislation.	Direct role in fulfillment of government mandate to develop agroforestry and livestock livelihoods in rural atolls.
Ministry of Resources and Development (R&D)	Government agency responsible for promoting and assisting the development of agriculture, energy, trade and investment sectors.	Indirect role, in facilitating private sector stakeholders with livelihood interventions in the 5 outer islands.
Office of the Chief Secretary (OCS)	The Chief Secretary is the head of the Public Service and the chief administrative and advisory officer of the RMI Government.	Office of the Chief Secretary is leading a multiple stakeholder initiative to institutionalize integrated water resource management (IWRM) as manifested through legislation and policy establish a centralized national water office and implement the National Water and Sanitation Policy and Action Plan. The OCS is also leading an initiative to integrate the national climate change adaptation policy and action plan with the national disaster risk management plan into a single Joint National Action Plan (JNAP).
Office of the President	Government Executive Branch	Indirect, oversight role, ensuring alignment with national goals and sustainable financing for the protected area network.
Ministry of Resources and Development, Division of Trade and Investment	Government agency, responsible for promoting and facilitating trade and investment in the country.	Direct project role, facilitating synergies between the private sector and community based organizations supported by the project.
College of the Marshall Islands, CMI	Autonomous community college (WASC accredited), State owned and operated	Direct project role, as member of CMAC, and supporting capacity building activities, providing technical advisory services, and supporting traditional knowledge activities.
Historic Preservation Office, HPO	Government agency under the Ministry of Internal Affairs, responsible for preserving cultural heritage resources.	Direct project role, as member of CMAC, and ensuring the project is consistent with identification and preservation of cultural heritage resources.
The Council of <i>Iroij</i>	One segment of the bicameral parliament and provides a consultative function concerning traditional laws and customs.	Direct role envisaged in supporting the sustainable financing analyses for the protected area network.
Marshall Islands Visitors Authority, MIVA	Government agency, responsible for promoting tourism in the RMI.	Direct project role, as member of CMAC, and involved in strengthening capacities of community based organizations and identifying possible eco-tourism opportunities.

Stakeholder	Description	Role in the Project
Ministry of Finance	Government agency, responsible for coordinating national development planning, and mobilize and prudently manage available financial and economic resources.	Indirect, oversight role, ensuring financial management during project implementation. Also direct role envisaged in supporting the sustainable financing analyses for the protected area network.
Ministry of Education	Government agency, responsible for establishing and implementing education legislation and curricula.	Direct project role envisaged in supporting the primary school engagement and national capacity building activities
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Government agency, responsible for administering and facilitating foreign affairs and bilateral and multilateral cooperation.	Indirect, oversight role, ensuring the project is aligned with national and regional priorities and strategies, including the Micronesia Challenge.
National Training Council, NTC	Government agency, assisting with job search and training	Indirect project role, ensuring the project is aligned with national capacity building goals
Marshall Islands Mayors Association (MIMA)	Association of atoll/island local governments	Direct role envisaged in supporting the sustainable financing analyses for the protected area network
GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) in RMI	GEF financed program, providing grants of up to \$50,000 directly to local communities including indigenous people, community-based organizations and other non-governmental groups for projects in Biodiversity, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management, International Waters and Chemicals.	Direct project role, facilitating synergies with other complementary activities, and provide guidance regarding gender and social inclusion objectives.
Non-governmental organizations (domestic):		
Marshall Islands Conservation Society (MICS)	RMI based conservation organization	Direct project role, as member of CMAC, project cofinancing partner, and providing technical advisory services, and supporting youth and school engagement and traditional knowledge activities.
Women United Together Marshall Islands, WUTMI	NGO in RMI dedicated to the empowerment and advancement of women	Direct project role, as member of CMAC, project cofinancing partner, and facilitating synergies with other complementary activities, and provide guidance regarding gender inclusion objectives.
Waan Aelōñ in Majel, WAM	Non-governmental program traditional Marshallese skills for men and women as a medium to transfer needed life skills and capacity building to the youth of the Marshall Islands	Direct project role implanting traditional navigational project activities as required within the individual project site Reimaanlok plans
State-owned Enterprises:		
National Telecommunications Authority (NTA)	Private corporation with significant ownership by the National Government. It is the authorized sole provider of telecommunications services and is responsible for providing domestic and international voice, fax, data, and Internet services to and from the Marshall Islands	Indirect project role, facilitating communications requirements between Majuro and the outer island sites
Air Marshall Islands (AMI)	Commercially operated airline which is wholly owned by the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), and based out of Majuro Atoll the Capital City of the country and also acts as the country's flag carrier providing daily services between Majuro, Kwajalein Atoll, and the country's outer island (rural) communities	Indirect project role, facilitating transportation requirements between Majuro and the outer island sites
Private sector stakeholders:		
Marshall Islands Chamber of Commerce, MICOC	Local organization of businesses and companies in Majuro with the intention to develop and further the interests of local companies and businesses in Marshall Islands.	Indirect project role, facilitating the sustainable financing analyses for the protected area network
Atoll Marine Aquaculture Ltd.	Private sector enterprise, engaging local communities in collection of aquarium fish and supporting aquarium coral and clam farming.	Possible synergies with community livelihood activities, e.g., in Aur. Also, there could be opportunities to collaborate with respect to transportation to/from the sites.
MMMA (Clam Farm)	Private sector enterprise involved in clam farm development and operation.	Possible synergies with community livelihood activities, e.g., in Wotho. Also, there could be opportunities to collaborate with respect to transportation to/from the sites.
Regional Stakeholders:		
The Pacific Community, SPC	Scientific and technical organization in the Pacific region owned and governed by 26 country and territory members.	Direct project role, as program coordinator for the Pacific Regional R2R program.
<i>Micronesia Challenge</i>	<i>Inter-Governmental Initiative</i>	<i>Direct project role, as a platform for reporting progress towards the MC goals</i>
Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT)	Financial mechanism for the Micronesia Challenge Endowment Fund. MCT now hosts Micronesians in Island Conservation (MIC) network, a vital resource for building natural resource management capacity in	Direct project role, as a key stakeholder with respect to sustainable PA financing, MCT now hosts Micronesians in Island Conservation (MIC) network, a vital resource for building natural resource management capacity in the region.

Stakeholder	Description	Role in the Project
	the region.	
Pacific Island Marine Protected Area Community, PIMPAC	Long term capacity sharing program and social network of site based managers, non-governmental organizations, local communities, federal, state, and territorial agencies, and other stakeholders working together to collectively enhance the effective use and management of managed and protected areas in the Pacific Islands	Possible direct role, providing technical support to site coordinators and local community groups.
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, SPREP	Regional organization established by the Governments and Administrations of the Pacific charged with the protection and sustainable development of the region's environment	SPREP has actively assisted the RMI Government on a number of issues, including completing the State of the Environment report in 2016. Possible direct role as a service provider on the project.
International Union for Conservation of Nature, IUCN	Membership union composed of both government and civil society organizations.	IUCN is assisting the RMI Government in preparing project concepts for the GEF-6 funding cycle. Potentially direct project involvement, regarding development of secondary legislation to the PAN Act and operationalization of the PAN Office.
The Nature Conservancy, TNC	International conservation organization	As a contributor to the MC endowment fund, TNC will have an indirect role on the project, e.g., through capacity building, sharing lessons learned. Also, possible direct role as a service provider.
Conservation International, CI	International conservation organization	As a contributor to the MC endowment fund, CI will have an indirect role on the project, e.g., through capacity building, sharing lessons learned. Also, possible direct role as a service provider.

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

Sustainable use of outer island ecosystem goods and services will lead to reduction in pressures on natural resources and also contribute to community development priorities in the medium and long-term. The socioeconomic benefits of the project are broadly distributed. Human capital will be enhanced through training and awareness-raising activities which will better enable community stakeholders to manage available natural resources. Natural capital will be increased through implementation of management measures such as sustainable agro-forestry, which will reduce rates of erosion and salinization, thus conserving soil quality, and bolstering shoreline and groundwater resilience while also reducing storm water runoff and land-based contaminants therein to nearshore marine habitats. These improvements to terrestrial ecosystem conditions will lead to increased productivity, boosting food security capacities. Financial capital is also slated to increase, e.g., introduced alternative livelihoods could result in reduced fluctuations in household income flows, enabling communities, particularly youth, women, and the elderly to better cope with outmigration and other socioeconomic challenges facing the outer islands. The project will also help enhance physical capital, through modest capital inputs, such as environmental monitoring devices and physical assets for the alternative livelihood pilots. Finally, there will be substantive contributions to social capital of the communities. Implementation of community driven management will strengthen local self-governance capacities, value traditional ecological knowledge, seek mutually beneficial arrangements with ecosystem users and landowners, and encourage more equitable access to ecosystem goods and services for women.

The integrated approaches included in the project strategy require certain changes in behavior, in order to achieve sustainable use of terrestrial and nearshore resources in the 5 selected outer islands. Substantive resources are allocated for training and awareness-raising on biodiversity friendly land use practices. One of the barriers to effective and financially sustainable management of terrestrial and nearshore ecosystems that the project is addressing is the erosion of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). The project is supporting strengthening the documentation and application of TEK in natural resource management. Qualified and experienced specialists will support the project, with particular attention placed on integrating TEK in a manner that is respectful to the rights and customs of the local communities.

The R2R project is well positioned to support filling a gap regarding information on terrestrial biodiversity and ecosystem services and threats in the selected 5 outer islands, and bolstering community driven integrated natural resource management plans with more representation of terrestrial systems; aligned with SDG 15. Under Component 1 of the project, sustainable livelihood opportunities will be facilitated at the 5 selected outer islands, based upon

integrated natural resource management plans developed under the guidelines of the Reimaanlok process, inclusive of resource surveys and community consultations. The objective of such alternative livelihoods is to provide island residents with economically viable opportunities that lead to reduced pressure on biodiversity, while increasing the sustainability and resilience of the ecosystem goods and services that the communities rely on.

Ensuring long-term health of marine and terrestrial ecosystems of the outer islands through generation of these global environmental benefits is closely linked to the well-being, livelihoods, and social equity of the local communities. The integrated R2R approach to natural resource management will also deliver a number of co-benefits, including enhancing resilience to climate change. For instance, promoting agroforestry for sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity conservation also delivers improved soil conservation and ecosystem based adaptation benefits, e.g., by reducing the rate of erosion and providing increased protection against storm surge. These co-benefits are directly in line with SDG 13, *“Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts”*.

The project is also relevant with respect to SDG 5, *“Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls”*, and SDG 11, *“Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”*.

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

The project will implement Reimaanlok, which is a national policy adopted in 2008. The processes outlined in this policy document will be followed. Furthermore, the initial work done by CMAC and its member institutions will be carried forward as baseline for the implementation of the project. The employment of time-tested processes, building on completed and ongoing work implementing the Reimaanlok and use of available data ensure cost efficiency and effectiveness.

A substantive proportion of the GEF funds are allocated for capacity building activities, aimed at strengthening the enabling conditions of the institutional and individual stakeholders tasked with long term management and conservation of RMI ecosystems. This investment is seen as a cost-effective approach at mainstreaming priority actions into national development programming and budgetary frameworks.

Strengthening community based management capacities is also a long-term cost-effective approach. Considering the geographic remoteness and limitations with respect to logistical arrangements of the RMI outer islands, community management of natural resources is essentially the only viable option. The appointment of site coordinators will ensure efficient on-the-ground coordination of project activities and partnerships with local governments.

The involvement of the 5 mayors in the atolls/islands and the integration of project activities in local programs will lead to synergies towards greater project impacts.

Cofinancing contributions are pledged from 5 separate partners, signifying the high level of cross-sectoral importance in the RMI for this project. Implementation of community driven integrated natural resource management plans at the 5 selected outer islands has a strong replication potential, i.e., scaling up similar approaches for other islands. While Component 1 of the project focuses on demonstration of implementation of integrated natural resource management plans at the community level, Components 2 and 3 cover the dimension of the RMI protected area network, with improvements in governance and knowledge management, respectively. This combination of local and network levels is a pragmatic and inclusive strategy.

Efficiency gains are integrated into the project through synergies with ongoing initiatives, such the PROP project and RMI Forest Inventory Analysis to take place in 2018, through sharing information, such as the results of the marine and terrestrial surveys carried out by the PROP and FIA projects, collaborating on logistical arrangements, whenever possible, etc. A number of cost-effective considerations were also incorporated into the design of the project implementation arrangements and activities, for example:

- b. Among the criteria applied for project site selection, local commitment, represented by the outer island government having previously requested to implement the Reimaanlok process, was seen as a measure of ensuring local ownership and, hence, money well spent.
- c. The designed project activities are envisaged to be implemented by qualified local service providers, NGOs, research institutions, and/or local consultants.
- d. The PIU will be hosted in office space provided by the Government of RMI, and local governments have indicated that site coordinators would be offered with in-kind assistance, to the degree practicable.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation to ensure the project effectively achieves these results.

Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with UNDP requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP and UNDP Evaluation Policy](#). While these UNDP requirements are not outlined in this project document, the UNDP Country Office will work with the relevant project stakeholders to ensure UNDP M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion and to high quality standards. Additional mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements (as outlined below) will be undertaken in accordance with the [GEF M&E policy](#) and other relevant GEF policies.

In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management will be agreed during the Project Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report. This will include the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities including the GEF Operational Focal Point and national/regional institutes assigned to undertake project monitoring. The GEF Operational Focal Point will strive to ensure consistency in the approach taken to the GEF-specific M&E requirements (notably the GEF Tracking Tools) across all GEF-financed projects in the country. This could be achieved for example by using one national institute to complete the GEF Tracking Tools for all GEF-financed projects in the country, including projects supported by other GEF Agencies.

M&E oversight and monitoring responsibilities:

National Project Director (NPD): The NPD will be responsible for providing government oversight and guidance for project implementation. The NPD will not be paid from the project funds, but will represent a Government in-kind contribution to the project.

Project Coordinator: The Project Coordinator is responsible for day-to-day project management and regular monitoring of project results and risks, including social and environmental risks. The Project Coordinator will ensure that all project staff members maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in M&E and reporting of project results. The Project Coordinator will inform the Project Board, the UNDP Pacific Office, and the UNDP-GEF RTA of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation so that appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted.

The Project Coordinator will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in the project document, including annual output targets to support the efficient implementation of the project. The Project Coordinator will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the results framework indicators are monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF PIR, and that the monitoring of risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g., gender strategy, KM strategy, etc.) occur on a regular basis.

Field level monitoring and evaluation duties will be largely the responsibility of the site coordinators, who will work closely with LRCs, service providers, and other enabling stakeholders. Once per year, the Project Coordinator will arrange a stock-taking retreat, where each of the 5 site coordinators, other PIU staff members, and relevant supporting stakeholders will jointly discuss progress, share monitoring and evaluation field results, and develop action plans for the subsequent period.

Project Board: The Project Board will take corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. The Project Board will hold project reviews to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan for the following year. In the project's final year, the Project Board will hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to highlight project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. This final review meeting will also discuss the findings outlined in the project terminal evaluation report and the management response. In order to facilitate adaptive management, one of the two annual board meetings will be held in successive outer islands over the course of the 5 year project. The meetings held in the outer islands will also serve as monitoring visits, allowing the board members first-hand opportunities to observe project progress and also better understand possible implementation or development challenges.

Project Implementing Partner: The Implementing Partner, the UNDP Pacific Office, is responsible for providing any and all required information and data necessary for timely, comprehensive and evidence-based project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary and appropriate. The Implementing Partner will strive to ensure project-level M&E is undertaken by national institutes, and is aligned with national systems so that the data used by and generated by the project supports national systems. The UNDP Pacific Office will support the Project Coordinator as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The annual supervision missions will take place according to the schedule outlined in the annual work plan. Supervision mission reports will be circulated to the project team and Project Board within one month of the mission. The UNDP Pacific Office will initiate and organize key GEF M&E activities including the annual GEF PIR, the independent mid-term review and the independent terminal evaluation. The UNDP Pacific Office will also ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality.

The UNDP Pacific Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](#). This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed, and monitored and reported using UNDP corporate systems; the regular updating of the ATLAS risk log; and, the updating of the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on gender mainstreaming progress reported in the GEF PIR and the UNDP ROAR. Any quality concerns flagged during these M&E activities (e.g. annual GEF PIR quality assessment ratings) must be addressed by the UNDP Country Office and the Project Coordinator.

The UNDP Pacific Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure in order to support ex-post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).

UNDP-GEF Unit: Additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support will be provided by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP-GEF Directorate as needed. Monitoring visits may be undertaken together with the Pacific Office.

Audit: The project will be audited according to UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on NIM implemented projects.¹⁵

Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:

Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held within three months after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to, amongst others:

- a. Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project implementation;
- b. Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;
- c. Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;

¹⁵ See guidance here: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/frm/pages/financial-management-and-execution-modalities.aspx>

- d. Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF OFP in M&E;
- e. Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; Environmental and Social Management Plan and other safeguard requirements; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;
- f. Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and
- g. Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first year annual work plan.

The Project Coordinator will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Pacific Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, and will be approved by the Project Board.

GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Project Coordinator, the UNDP Pacific Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Coordinator will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the PIR. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR.

The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Pacific Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR as appropriate. The quality rating of the previous year's PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.

Lessons learned and knowledge generation: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to the project. The project will identify, analyze and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely. There will be continuous information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The following GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be used to monitor global environmental benefit results: International Waters and Biodiversity.

The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool(s) – submitted in Annexes M and N to this project document – will be updated by the Project Coordinator/Team and shared with *the* mid-term review consultants and terminal evaluation consultants (not the evaluation consultants hired to undertake the *MTR* or the *TE*) before the required review/evaluation missions take place. The updated GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be submitted to the GEF along with the completed Mid-term Review report and Terminal Evaluation report.

Independent Mid-term Review (MTR): An independent mid-term review process will begin after the second PIR has been submitted to the GEF, and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in the same year as the 3rd PIR. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be 'independent, impartial and rigorous'. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final MTR report will be available in English and will be cleared by the UNDP Pacific Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, and approved by the Project Board.

Terminal Evaluation (TE): An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The terminal evaluation process will begin three months before operational closure of the project allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Coordinator will remain on contract until the TE report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](#). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final TE report will be cleared by the UNDP Pacific Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, and will be approved by the Project Board. The TE report will be publically available in English on the UNDP ERC.

The UNDP Pacific Office will include the planned project terminal evaluation in the UNDP Pacific Office evaluation plan, and will upload the final terminal evaluation report in English and the corresponding management response to the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). Once uploaded to the ERC, the UNDP IEO will undertake a quality assessment and validate the findings and ratings in the TE report, and rate the quality of the TE report. The UNDP IEO assessment report will be sent to the GEF IEO along with the project terminal evaluation report.

Final Report: The project’s terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

M&E Requirements and M&E Budget

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ¹⁶ (USD)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Cofinancing	
Inception Workshop	UNDP Pacific Office	USD 11,000		Within three months of project document signature
Inception Report	Project Coordinator	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP	UNDP Pacific Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	Project Coordinator	None		Annually
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Coordinator, UNDP Pacific Office, UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
Financial Audit as per UNDP audit policies	UNDP Pacific Office	Per year: USD 2,500 (USD 12,500 cumulative)		Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Coordinator	None		Annually

¹⁶ Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ¹⁶ (USD)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Cofinancing	
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Coordinator, UNDP Pacific Office	None		On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Coordinator, UNDP Pacific Office, BPPS as needed	None for time of Project Coordinator, and UNDP CO		
Project Board meetings	Project Board, UNDP Pacific Office, Project Coordinator	USD 35,000		Project Board meetings twice per year, one in Majuro and one in the outer islands
Supervision missions	UNDP Pacific Office	Per year: USD 2,500 (USD 12,500 cumulative)		Annually, by UNDP Pacific Office project staff
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None ¹⁷		Troubleshooting as needed
Knowledge management as outlined in Outcome 3 (1% of GEF grant)	Project Coordinator	USD 39,280		On-going
Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by the Project Coordinator	Project Coordinator	None		Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Pacific Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 30,000		Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR.
Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by the Project Coordinator	Project Coordinator	None		Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Pacific Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 30,000		At least three months before operational closure
Translation of MTR and TE reports into English	UNDP Pacific Office	Not applicable		
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD 170,280		

¹⁷ The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee


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

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):): (PLEASE ATTACH THE [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

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

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

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

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator		11 May 2017	Jose Erez Padilla	+66 80 604 4435	jose.padilla@undp.org

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

<p>This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): SDG 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development; SDG 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss; SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; SDG 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all; SDG 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable; SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls</p>
<p>This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: Regional UNDAF Outcome 1: By 2017, the most vulnerable communities across the PICTs are more resilient and select government agencies, civil society organizations and communities have enhanced capacity to apply integrated approaches to environmental management, climate change adaptation/mitigation, and disaster risk management</p>
<p>This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:</p> <p><u>Output 2.5:</u> Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation</p>

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Assumptions
<p>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</p> <p><i>3-4 indicators maximum</i></p>	<p>Number of countries with legal, policy and institutional frameworks in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems</p>	<p>Legal framework is in place, but institutional and regulatory frameworks are generally lacking</p>	<p>Similar status as baseline</p>	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governmental partners remain committed to pass and implement enabling institutional and regulatory frameworks
	<p>Number of direct project beneficiaries</p>	<p>Negligible as Reimaanlok implementation is in early stages</p>	<p>500 total, including 250 women</p>	<p>2000 total, including 1000 women</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local stakeholders in the 5 selected outer islands remain committed to implementing the Reimaanlok process The RMI government is committed to facilitate the requisite enabling conditions for encouraging private sector and civil society to make innovative and inclusive contributions to biodiversity conservation of the outer islands
<p>Component 1: Expanding and Sustaining RMI Protected Areas Network</p> <p>Outcome 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</p> <p><i>3 indicators maximum</i></p>	<p>Terrestrial and marine ecosystems under enhanced management</p>	<p>New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems:</p> <p>0</p>	<p>New protected areas and coverage of unprotected ecosystems:</p> <p>Number of new terrestrial PAs: 2</p> <p>Coverage of new terrestrial PAs: 100 ha</p> <p>Number of new marine PAs: 2</p>	<p>New protected areas and coverage of unprotected ecosystems:</p> <p>Number of new terrestrial PAs: 5</p> <p>Coverage of new terrestrial PAs: 502 ha</p> <p>Number of new marine PAs: 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process of legally designating the protected areas will be completed within the timeframe of the project

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Assumptions
			Coverage of new nearshore marine PAs: 10,000 ha	Coverage of new nearshore marine PAs: 30,550 ha	
	Number of Resource Management Plans (NRMPs), inclusive of integrated terrestrial and coastal resource assessments and management strategies, approved by local resource committees and under implementation	1 (Aur) NRMP completed	2 NRMPs completed	5 NRMPs completed and adopted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local stakeholders in the 5 selected outer islands remain committed to implementing the Reimaanlok process
Component 2: Improved Governance for Integrated Atoll Management Outcome 2: Supportive policies, institutions and communities in place to ensure successful implementation of the Reimaanlok vision <i>3 indicators maximum</i>	Position of PAN Coordinator, overseeing operation of the PAN office, is institutionalized	PAN Office is not operational, and there is no PAN Coordinator in place	PIU functioning as interim PAN Office and PAN Coordinator financed with project funds	Position of PAN Coordinator is institutionalized as a permanent position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional will is in place to make this position permanent
	Number of RMI professionals trained in integrated approaches through Regional Pacific R2R Program	0, by the project	2	4, including 2 women	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient interest in this opportunity is realized
Component 3: Knowledge Management and Monitoring & Evaluation Outcome 3: Accessible data and information systems and improved linkages and collaboration with regional initiatives to support adaptive management of the biodiversity in RMI <i>3 indicators maximum</i>	National repository for spatial biodiversity and resource management information enhanced and sustained	ConservationGIS database and online clearing house established with user access protocols established and operational	ConservationGIS database and online clearing house updated with new data from 5 project sites	ConservationGIS database and online clearing house updated with new data including TEK data from all 5 project sites	Use of the ConservationGIS database and management information system is mainstreamed inclusive of sustainable financing source(s), user access protocols, and intellectual property rights protocols
	Cultural expressions (stories, chants, dances, oration, material production, proverbs) linked to resource management documented and mapped in the 5 project sites management plans, and celebrated annually via inter-generational knowledge transmission events	The relationship between RMI expressions of culture and resource management is not appreciated and celebrated, and younger generations lack understanding of the relationship	TEK surveys completed in the 5 project sites, and their management plans incorporate materials and activities linking cultural expressions and resource management	The 5 project sites hold and document (including at least one video documentary) a public event linking cultural expressions and resource management and which is organized by, with and for an intergenerational gathering of community members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governmental partners and NGOs are willing to support mapping of cultural knowledge and expressions Sufficient number of cultural custodians and practitioners are willing to participate and transmit cultural resource management knowledge to the younger generations

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).

Comments	UNDP response(s)	Project Document Reference
GEF Secretariat Review (9 September 2015)		
6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions.	<p>SW – July 28, 2015 Yes, the detail is sufficient for the PIF stage and we look forward to further analysis by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p><u>December 2016:</u> More details are provided in the project on the baseline project. Barriers that continue to hinder effective and financially sustainable management of terrestrial and near-shore marine ecosystems are further articulated, and an update of the baseline scenario is described.</p>	Section II, Development Challenge
8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>SW – July 29, 2015 Yes. The information provided in this section is sufficient for the PIF stage; however, more detail will be required at CEO Endorsement. In particular, sustainable finance mechanisms will need to be identified by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p><u>December 2016:</u> Identification of global environmental benefits have been expanded in the project document and linked to efforts aimed at achieving relevant sustainable development goals (SDGs) in RMI. A separate output, 1.4, is focused on sustainable financing of the RMI PAN. In 2010, as part the Reimaanlok process as a response to RMI’s commitment to the Micronesia Challenge, a sustainable financing plan (SFP) was developed. Costs for establishing new PAs and system-wide expenses for managing the PAN were estimated. These estimates were referenced in approximating the funding shortfall for expanding and maintaining the RMI PAN. The R2R project will support RMI in assessing sustainable financing alternatives for narrowing the funding gap, demonstrating at least one financing mechanism. The community driven implementation of integrated management plans for 5 outer islands will also provide replicable case studies on recurrent costs associated with managing protected areas in a remote outer island context.</p>	Section III, Strategy, Global Environmental Benefits Section IV, Results and Partnerships, Component 1, Output 1.5, Sustainable Financing
12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>SW – July 29, 2015 Yes. Please expand on this section at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p><u>December 2016:</u></p>	Section III, Strategy, Linkage with National/Regional Programmes

Comments	UNDP response(s)	Project Document Reference
	<p>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. Both are reflected in the project framework (Outputs 2.4 and 3.4). Exchanging experiences and lessons learned on the other national R2R projects will be shared twice per year during joint meetings organized by the R2R regional project coordination team. Project resources are also allocated for funding four RMI professionals, not members of the PIU, to complete the post-graduate programme, which is also organized through the regional project. Representatives from the 24 inhabited RMI atolls/islands will also be provided opportunities to complete online R2R training module.</p> <p>There will also be close collaboration between the R2R project and the Pacific Islands Regional Oceanscape Project (PROP). The PROP project in RMI has a budget of USD 8.58 million, with USD 6.75 million from the International Development Association (IDA) and USD 1.83 million from GEF. Component 1 of the PROP project has the bulk of the IDA funding, roughly 80% of the total. Component 2 of the PROP project – Sustainable Management of Coastal Fisheries – is complementary with the R2R project. The following synergies between the two projects are envisaged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PROP project is supporting marine assessments at each of the 24 local government jurisdictions, including the 5 outer islands selected by the R2R project. The R2R project will be able to utilize the results of these assessments in developing updated biophysical profiles for the 5 selected outer islands; • Implementation of coastal fisheries management plans developed under the PROP project will be shared with the R2R project, as part of the integrated natural resource management plans developed for the 5 pilot outer islands; • Joint training workshops will be organized between the two projects; and • The two projects will also collaborate on delivering capacity building for local communities with respect to management 	

Comments	UNDP response(s)	Project Document Reference
	of local natural resources, including coastal fisheries.	
16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>SW – July 29, 2015</p> <p>Yes. Additional co-financing would be welcome at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p><u>December 2016:</u></p> <p>Committed cofinancing by December 2016 is USD 4,057,139, which is USD 557,139 or 16% more than the indicative cofinancing sum documented in the PIF.</p>	Section IX , Financial Planning and Management
GEF Compilation of Comments Submitted by Council Members		
N/A	N/A	N/A
STAP Screening of PIF (24 September 2015)		
<p>1. This is a child project of the Pacific Islands Ridge to Reef (R2R) program approved by the GEF Council in 2013. Several of STAP's recommendations provided in the program screen continue to be applicable for this proposal. They include justification for stronger coordination between project activities at the regional and national levels, particularly taking into account geographic separation between national and local management bodies (e.g., Coastal Management Advisory Council and Community Management Planning Committees) on the one hand and national and regional (i.e., SOPAC) institutions on the other hand. STAP recommends that project proponents consider explicit and targeted activities across all components (particularly in information and technology flows and governance arrangements) that would support local versus national and national versus regional coordination, capacity building and learning.</p>	<p><u>December 2016:</u></p> <p>Decentralization of natural resource management in RMI is not a question of efficiency, but rather of necessity. Due to the remoteness of the outer islands and the high cost of delivering goods and services, managing terrestrial and nearshore marine ecosystems falls inherently upon local communities. The Reimaanlok process was developed to facilitate community driven natural resource management, and the R2R project provides incremental support to strength the requisite institutional and individual enabling conditions.</p> <p>Coordination between national and local stakeholders will be reinforced across each of the three project components. Under Component 1, many of the service providers qualified to carry out the scientific surveys and assessments are national institutions and organizations. Local communities, facilitated by site coordinators hired by the project in each of the 5 selected outer islands, will work closely with these service providers through participatory arrangements, leading to the development and implementation of integrated resource management plans.</p> <p>Operationalization of the PAN Office – one of the outputs under Component 2 of the RMI R2R project – will also strengthen coordination across all relevant sectors in the country and improve the flow of information between national and local stakeholders.</p> <p>Cross site coordination will also be facilitated through annual retreats, where the 5 site coordinators will be brought together to discuss progress and jointly work through challenges. Also, one of the twice per year</p>	<p>Section III, Strategy, Linkage with National/Regional Programmes; Component 2, Component 3; Partnerships</p> <p>Section VII, Monitoring & Evaluation Plan</p>

Comments	UNDP response(s)	Project Document Reference
	<p>project board meetings will be held at successive outer islands, in order to provide opportunities for local resource committee members and other outer island stakeholders discuss progress with the national level board members. These site meetings will also afford the board members to personally observe activities on the ground.</p> <p>The collective resources of the R2R regional programme and national projects will be utilized to support implementation of the RMI R2R project. Representatives from each of the 24 inhabited RMI atolls/islands will have the opportunity to complete the online R2R training modules. Funds have been allocated to finance four RMI professionals to complete the post-graduate programme that is under development with the help of the R2R regional programme. The Project Coordinator will participate in R2R regional programme meetings twice per year; where he/she will have the chance to share experiences and lessons learned with representatives from the other national R2R projects.</p> <p>Bolstering RMI’s ConversationGIS management information system is another way in which coordination among and between national and local stakeholders will be enhanced. Through improved content and access, this system will become an important knowledge management platform. Knowledge products generated on the project will also be shared through the R2R regional program.</p>	
<p>2. While submitted as a part of R2R focused program, this project has relatively weak links to this concept. Project’s focus on information gathering and at some extent capacity building happens at the expense of further supporting area-based management approaches such as integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning. Points 11 and 12 of the STAP’s program screen (https://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=5395) remain applicable. Project proponents may refer to additional guidance on operationalizing S2S concept available (Granit, J., Liss Lymer, B., Olsen, S., Lundqvist, J., Lindstrom, A. 2014. Water Governance and Management Challenges in the Continuum from Land to the Coastal Sea “ Spatial Planning as a Management Tool. SIWI Paper 22. SIWI. Stockholm; From Ridge to Reef (2015), available at: https://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1544; for additional information S2S Action Platform</p>	<p><u>December 2016:</u></p> <p>Following the process outlined in the Reimaanlok approach, area-based planning principles will be followed in developing the management plans, consistent with the marine spatial planning approaches. The management plans will provide a practical framework to local communities that consider environmental, social, cultural, and economic variables within the unique biogeographic context of the respective outer islands. The spatial enabled data collected as part of the assessments carried out under Outcome 1 will inform the management plans by describing environmental characteristics; species and habitat distributions; ecosystem goods, services, and vulnerabilities; ways in which the local communities value terrestrial and coastal resources; and the cumulative impact that human activities or pressures are exerting on the outer island ecosystems. Information</p>	<p>Output 1.3: Integrated management plans developed (or updated) and implemented in 5 outer islands following the Reimaanlok process and balancing livelihood considerations</p>

Comments	UNDP response(s)	Project Document Reference
<p>resources could also be useful: http://www.siwi.org/programmes/action-platform-for-source-to-sea-management/latest-news/). Application of area-based management governance remains the only effective way of addressing the main drivers of environmental degradation in the S2S continuum of RMI such as land rights, unsustainable fisheries, urban development and pollution, as well as climate change impacts. There would not be a simple solution supporting these spatial management frameworks in the face of decentralized location and limited resources available in RMI. Employing some elements of marine spatial planning with its forward looking perspective to the proposed in the PIF atoll-level integrated management plans could be one possible option.</p>	<p>gathered will be fed into the Conservation GIS information management system, which will be further developed with support of the project, into a shared management platform that will facilitate cross-sectoral conservation planning, monitoring, and evaluation.</p>	
<p>3. STAP recommends that the project proponents explore further how to strengthen and mainstream climate resilience and community-based adaptation into proposed project activities taking into account high climate change risks of the project geography. STAP recommends exploring mainstreaming climate resilience and adaptation into local and national strategies and action plans, paying particular attention to community based adaptation as well as ecosystem based adaptation. Climate change impacts on governance related to adaption in component 2 are not described. Stronger linkages between this project and MRI's approaches to adaption should reflected upon in the final project document. The PROVIA program hosted by UNEP could provide useful scientific guidance: http://www.unep.org/provia/Default.aspx?tabid=55299.</p>	<p><u>December 2016:</u> Climate resilience and community based adaptation have been integrated throughout the project strategy. One of the barriers in realizing effective and financially sustainable management of the RMI protected area network is the general lack of information on ecosystem resources. This scarcity of information also impedes development of scientific based climate change adaptation strategies, something that is increasingly a concern for the atoll communities throughout RMI. As natural resource management is very much inter-linked with the well-being of outer island residents, improved ecosystem management also contributes toward strengthening climate resilience and community based adaptation. Several of the activities designed under Outcome 1 are specifically focused on supporting adaptation planning efforts; for example, flood risk assessments, hydrogeologic surveys, and groundwater monitoring. Development of integrated management plans for the five selected outer islands will also address community based adaptation. Linking conservation finance with climate finance, addressed in the sustainable financing activities in Output 1.4, is reflective of the integrated approach to natural resource management promoted on this project and also enhances the likelihood for securing funding. Under Component 2, the capacity building activities supported by the project will contribute towards strengthening institutional and individual capabilities to plan and implement climate change adaptation strategies. For example, the</p>	<p>Section IV, Results and Partnerships, Component 1, Component 2, and Component 3</p>

Comments	UNDP response(s)	Project Document Reference
	<p>proposed tertiary agro-forestry programme at one of the local higher education providers and completion of the post-graduate programme by 4 RMI professionals will help strength the RMI scientific community’s capacity in designing and implementing. Consistent with the conditions outlined in §108 in the Scholarship Assistance Act 1979 (14 MIRC Ch. 1), the RMI Government will require the candidates to agree to return to RMI for a period of not less than seven years after completion of the post-graduate program.</p> <p>Enhancing the PAN management information system (MIS) and making it more accessible will also contribute towards strengthening the climate change early warning systems in the country. The activities under Component 3 focused on public awareness will contribute towards mainstreaming ecological and climate resilience.</p>	
<p>4. The global environmental benefits (GEB) section should relate closely to the SDGs and the role of this project in achieving relevant goals when it applies to RMI.</p>	<p><u>December 2016:</u> Expansion of the RMI nearshore marine and terrestrial protected areas by 510 km² and 5 km², respectively, will also contribute towards the RMI Government’s effort in achieving relevant SDG’s, specifically Goal 14, “<i>Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development</i>” and Goal 15, “<i>Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss</i>”. Ensuring long-term health of marine and terrestrial ecosystems of the outer islands through generation of these global environmental benefits is closely linked to the well-being, livelihoods, and social equity of the local communities. The integrated R2R approach to natural resource management will also deliver a number of co-benefits, including enhancing resilience to climate change. For instance, promoting agroforestry for sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity conservation, also delivers improved soil conservation and ecosystem based adaption benefits, e.g., by reducing the rate of erosion and providing increased protection against storm surge. These co-benefits are directly in line with SDG 13, “<i>Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts</i>”, specifically Target 13.b, “<i>Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least</i></p>	<p>Section III, Strategy, Global Environmental Benefits</p>

Comments	UNDP response(s)	Project Document Reference
	<p><i>developed countries and small island developing States, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities</i>". Another co-benefit is reducing vulnerability of scarce freshwater resources in the RMI outer islands.</p> <p>The incremental GEF funding will deliver the global environmental benefits outlined above through implementing sustainable development of fragile outer island ecosystems and good governance, e.g., by financing the operation of the RMI PAN Office, strengthening the capacities of the professional and scientific communities, and increasing awareness among local and national stakeholders.</p>	
<p>5. Component 3 on knowledge management could include support for further scientific research on the degradation of the atoll ecosystems and anthropogenic impacts in RMI. STAP suggest that research into the impacts of protected areas, biodiversity and climate change is initiated in this child project. This would be a good opportunity to explore how the scientific community in RMI could be strengthened. Ideally this should happen through collaboration with the Pacific Island Forum that plays an important role in the region. The RMI President stressed this need: http://www.forumsec.org/. STAP recommends exploring further how proposed in the project knowledge management system (MIS) and flows would benefit local communities in atolls that they would become not only suppliers of information and knowledge but also owners and users of regionally and globally generated knowledge. Proponents could find useful assessing lessons learned in knowledge management of GEF projects recently compiled by the STAP (https://www.thegef.org/gef/node/11232)</p>	<p>December 2016:</p> <p>The knowledge management strategy for the project is multidimensional. Firstly, resources are allocated for strengthening the management information system, ConservationGIS, with the aim of enhancing the content of the system and improving access as a knowledge sharing platform. Assessing progress of the interventions implemented at the 5 outer islands will provide a scalable monitoring and evaluation framework for the Reimaanlok process that will be shared among the scientific community in RMI as well as other local, national, and regional stakeholders. One of the other aspects of the project that is showcased in the knowledge management strategy is integrating traditional ecological knowledge into the management plans for the outer islands, working closely with custodians of the traditional knowledge on how best to collect, disseminate, and apply collective wisdom. Substantive resources are also earmarked towards increasing involvement and awareness among youth, regarding the importance of sustainable natural resource management in their communities and to nurture future transformative change agents. The R2R regional program functions partly as a South-South knowledge exchange platform and project implementation staff members will regularly share and learn from experiences on the national R2R projects. The project coordinator will also participate in regional workshops and conferences, in order to promote knowledge exchange.</p> <p>The knowledge products generated during the project will also be shared on international platforms, including the Sustainable Development Knowledge</p>	<p>Section IV, Results and Partnerships, Component 3, Knowledge Management</p>

Comments	UNDP response(s)	Project Document Reference
	<p>Platform maintained by the United Nations Division of Sustainable Development. As this Division also houses the SIDS Unit within the United Nations, there are also opportunities to utilize their outreach resources for disseminating information to other SIDS countries, in line with the SIDS Partnership Framework and other collaborative mechanisms. Finally, 1% of the GEF IW grant for the project will be devoted for supporting the IW:LEARN knowledge management platform.</p>	
<p>6. STAP recommends strengthening the results-based components of the project. The updated Plan should could benefit from stronger integration of adaptive learning and management into proposed activities and governance frameworks. There would be major benefit if the project adopted an M and E system that promoted learning and adaptations within the project team conducted as an annual "retreat" or similar face-to-face modality.</p>	<p><u>December 2016:</u></p> <p>In order to facilitate adaptive management, one of the two annual board meetings will be held in successive outer islands over the course of the 5 year project. The meetings held in the outer islands will also serve as monitoring visits, allowing the board members first-hand opportunities to observe project progress and also better understand possible implementation or development challenges.</p> <p>Field level monitoring and evaluation duties will be largely the responsibility of the site coordinators, who will work closely with LRCs, service providers, and other enabling stakeholders. Once per year, the Project Coordinator will arrange a stock-taking retreat, where each of the 5 site coordinators, other PIU staff members, and relevant supporting stakeholders will jointly discuss progress, share monitoring and evaluation field results, and develop action plans for the subsequent period</p>	<p>Section VII, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan, M&E Oversight and Monitoring Responsibilities</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁸

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Technical review	35,000	32,659.43	2,340.66
Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	35,000	26,800	8,200
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments	25,000	19,815	5,185
Component D: Initiation and validation workshops	30,000	23,300	6,700
Component E: Completion of final documentation and submission package	25,000	19,815	5,185
Total	150,000	122,389.34	27,610.66

¹⁸ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

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

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

NA