



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Tonga Integrated Land and Agro-ecosystem Management Systems (ILAMS)			
Country(ies):	Tonga	GEF Project ID: ¹	5578
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	625491
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries, and Forests; Ministry of Lands, Survey, and Natural Resources; Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MEIDECC)	Submission Date:	Feb 5, 2016
		Resubmission Dates:	May 6, 2016 July 21, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	BD, LD, SFM	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	"Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods"	Project Agency Fee (\$):	211,046
➤ For SFM/REDD+			
➤ For SGP			
➤ For PPP			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
BD-2: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.	Output 2.1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (number) for production sectors. Output 2.2. National and sub-national land-use plans (number) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.	GEFTF	155,715	476,119
LD-1: Agriculture and Rangeland Systems: Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services sustaining the livelihoods of local communities	Outcome 1.1: An enhanced enabling environment within the agricultural sector Outcome 1.2: Improved agricultural management Outcome 1.3: Sustained flow of services in agro-ecosystems	Output 1.1 National policies that guarantee smallholder and community tenure security Output 1.2 Types of Innovative SL/WM practices introduced at field level Output 1.3 Suitable SL/WM interventions to increase vegetative cover in agro-ecosystems Output 1.5 Information on SLM	GEFTF	711,646	2,175,950

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework when completing Table A.

		technologies and good practice guidelines disseminated			
LD-3: Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape	Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities	Output 3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented Output 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested Output 3.4 Information on INRM technologies and good practice guidelines disseminated	GEFTF	892,501	2,728,937
SFM-1: Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services	Outcome 1.1: Enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector and across sectors	Output 1.2: Forest area (hectares) under sustainable management, separated by forest type Output 1.3: Types of services generated through SFM	GEFTF	585,092	1,788,994
Total project costs				2,344,954	7,170,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To strengthen the resilience of communities by enhancing land tenure systems, improving forest management, and piloting an integrated agro-ecosystem approach to rehabilitate degraded landscapes						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated land and agro-ecosystem management.	TA	<p>1.1: Increased acknowledgement and incorporation of integrated land and agro-ecosystem management principles in national policies, laws, and regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 3 ILAM Policy Intention Papers cited in sectoral policies, strategies and plans. <p>1.2: Reliable information on land tenure is available to guide land use planning and facilitate the application of sustainable land management nationwide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 'complete watershed' areas, with completed up to date cadastral maps used for GIS-based applications for land use planning and for monitoring land use changes over time. - Allotment map data capture and quality improvement work 100% completed. - By project end MLSNR staff have assumed all responsibility for data capture and input - MLSNR is actively accepting applications and new survey plan data 	<p>1.1.1: Policy intention papers to inform sectoral policy and planning processes</p> <p>1.1.2: National Land Use Policy document</p> <p>1.2.1: Enhanced National System of Land Administration, and operational with spatial functionality of SOLA utilized to recommend allowable land uses, monitor land use changes over time and clarify tenure.</p>	GEFTF	515,364	1,575,792

		<p>digitally through the internet.</p> <p>1.3 Improved strategic planning of forest resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Central and local government bodies and civil society organizations have reflected the provisions of the Plan in their own operational plans - A fully functional Forest Monitoring System is in place and its data outputs are being used in planning by key entities of central and local Government and civil society organisations. 	<p>1.3.1: National Strategic Forestry Development Plan developed</p> <p>1.3.2: National Forest Monitoring system</p>			
2: Site-based capacities for evidence-based negotiation of land use planning, management and tenure rights	TA	<p>2.1: Capacities for evidence-based and negotiated formulation of resource management plans at landscape and village levels, clarification of farmers' tenure rights and obligations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multi-stakeholder mechanisms are active at least twice per year in target locations - All key stakeholder groups (commoners and nobles, men and women) participate actively in the mechanisms - 80% of participants in multi-stakeholder mechanisms consider that the mechanism contributes significantly to resolving issues that impede equitable and sustainable approaches to land management - Operational plan developed for the implementation of the 'Eua Watershed Management Plan over at least the project period, and corresponding activities implemented in accordance with the plan. - No new instances of clearance of forests in the 'Eua watershed for agriculture 	<p>2.1.1: Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for the negotiation of resource management and tenure</p> <p>2.1.2: Negotiated and evidence-based plans for land use and integrated agroecosystem management at landscape and village levels</p> <p>2.1.3: 'Eua Watershed Area Management Plan developed, and implemented</p>	GEF TF	277,921	849,779
3: Strengthening of capacities for the formulation and implementation of sustainable land management practices with an integrated R2R approach	INV/TA	<p>3.1: Increased capacities in Government institutions and NGOs for identifying and supporting SLM practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 20 members of Government institutions and 28 members of NGOs have received training through the modules and show improved knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) as a result - 20 members of Government institutions and 28 members of NGOs report using the training manuals as 	<p>3.1.1: Training modules for extension agents</p> <p>3.1.2: Manuals for use by extension agents</p>	GEF TF	1,231,072	3,764,160

	<p>regular guides for their work.</p> <p>3.2: Increased capacities in local communities in the target localities to develop, apply and adapt SLM practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated agroecosystem management practices are applied on 225 tax allotments (<i>'api tukuhau</i>) covering 750ha, including at least 30 <i>'api tukuhau</i> covering 100ha in each of the target localities - 75% reduction in the amounts of firewood collected from vulnerable forest areas - At least 50% increase in water storage capacity in whole area where piggeries and intercropping systems will be covered under each ILAMP. - No net reduction in water availability for domestic uses in pilot communities, despite the establishment of piggeries. - On average farmers in the pilot communities report a 75% reduction in the areas of crops damaged by roaming pigs. - 30 farmers in each target locality with 15% increases in crop yields over 100ha. - 225 farmers report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established (live after 1 year) trees on their farms - 14% reduction in the amounts of bottled gas used resulting from switch to biogas from piggeries, resulting in avoidance of emissions of 296 tCO₂ e/yr - 100% of interviewees in villages where pig management practices have been modified report that there has been no reduction in their abilities to meet social and cultural obligations <p>3.3. Increased capacities for the formulation and implementation of forest restoration plans, and for supporting improved management of forests, mangroves, and trees outside forests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forestry Division and communities concerned agree that the provisions of operational plans and SFMAs covering 	<p>3.2.1: Demonstration modules for integrated agroecosystem management systems</p> <p>3.2.2: Farmer field schools for participatory problem analysis and development of SLM practices</p> <p>3.2.3: Extension modules applied in target communities</p> <p>3.3.1: Operational plans for forest restoration, including mangroves, formulated and implemented</p> <p>3.3.2: Systematisation of traditional tree</p>			
--	---	---	--	--	--

		<p>150ha are being met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80% of tree nurseries nationwide are able to meet at least 90% of their seed supply requirements - 80% of tree nurseries nationwide with long term funding needs ensured (from sources other than short term project-based support) - 100ha of agricultural land returned to forest use in the target localities 	<p>management systems</p> <p>3.3.3: Sustainable Forestry Management Agreements</p> <p>3.3.4: Improved mechanisms for supply of tree seed and planting materials</p> <p>3.3.5: Training modules on forest restoration and management, for Forestry Division staff and community members</p>			
4. Knowledge Generation and Dissemination and Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	<p>4.1 Project implementation based on results-based management and application of lessons learned and good practices in current and future interventions, facilitated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of ILAMS Annual project progress reports presented at R2R regional meetings - Number of Technical or Policy reports published on MAFFF website and ECC Portal - Mid-term Evaluation and Final Evaluation reports published 	<p>4.1.1 Knowledge generated by the project shared within Tonga and the region</p> <p>4.1.2 Monitoring and Evaluation of project activities conducted and used for adaptive project management purposes</p>	GEF TF	208,933	638,840
Subtotal					2,233,290	6,828,571
Project management Cost (PMC)					111,664	341,429
Total project costs					2,344,954	7,170,000

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Finance and National Planning	In-kind	500,000
National Government	Ministry of Finance and National Planning	Grant	2,840,000
Regional Organization	Secretariat of the Pacific Community	In-kind	750,000
NGO	Mainstreaming of Rural Development Innovation Tonga Trust (MORDI)	In-kind	980,000
NGO	Oxfam	In-kind	240,000
Bilateral agency	GIZ	Grant	150,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	300,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	1,100,000
National Academic Organization	Tupou College	In-kind	155,000
National Academic Organization	Hango Agricultural College	In-kind	155,000
Total Co-financing			7,170,000

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount(a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEF TF	Biodiversity		155,715	14,015	169,730
FAO	GEF TF	Land Degradation		1,604,147	144,373	1,748,520
FAO	GEF TF	Sustainable Forest Management	Tonga	585,092	52,658	637,750
Total Grant Resources				2,344,954	211,046	2,556,000

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants	676,700	480,000	1,156,700
International consultants	376,500	770,000	1,146,500

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT?

NA

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions

1. No major changes from the approved PIF.
2. One positive development since the PIF was approved is the development of the Tonga Agriculture Sector Plan (TASP) with support by IFAD, the World Bank and FAO. Tonga has been lacking an overall agricultural policy or strategic framework, and the development of the TASP, expected to be finalized by end of 2015, will provide a much-needed, over-arching framework for future agricultural development in Tonga, as well as a set of priority activities, including the institutional strengthening of MAFFF, that are expected to complement the ILAMS project.

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

3. No changes from the approved PIF.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

4. No changes from the approved PIF.

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

5. No major changes to the threats analysis presented in the PIF apart from additional detail. The barrier analysis has been reformulated as follows:

PIF	CEO Endorsement
1. Limited land and resource use planning	1. Regulatory and policy frameworks do not adequately support integrated, landscape-wide approaches to land use planning and management
2. Lack of data for monitoring and decision making	2. Land use planning capacities and tenure conditions are unfavourable for sustainable land management
3. Lack of technical and financial capacity	3. Inadequate capacities in Government and among land managers for the support and implementation of sustainable land management practices adapted to biophysical, socioeconomic and tenure conditions
4. Social and cultural norms and limited environmental awareness	

A.5 Incremental / Additional cost reasoning:

6. Taking into account STAP and GEFSec comments, the structure and emphasis of outcomes and outputs has been modified to improve logical flow and the balance of emphasis on key elements. The most significant modifications are as follows:

- A new component (Component 2) has been added, with corresponding outputs, in order to increase the emphasis of the project on supporting capacities to evidence-based negotiation of land use planning, management and tenure rights. On the basis of analyses during the PPG phase, these are now recognized as being essential complements to the technical aspects of land use planning and tenure definition proposed under Component 1. This new emphasis will build upon prior experience of FAO worldwide in relation to participatory and negotiated territorial development (PNTD).
- Support to the National Strategic Forest Development Plan and Forest Monitoring System has now been included under Component 1, which covers all activities related to “enabling conditions”.
- Site-level activities focusing on capacity development for sustainable agricultural, agroforestry and forestry-related management systems are now all included under Component 3, rather than being separated between components as they were in the PIF. This change reflects better the integrated inter-sector vision that is central to the R2R approach.

7. The importance of supporting farm-level integrated systems, as emphasized in the PIF, is maintained; however additional emphasis has been added on linking these with village- and landscape-level perspectives, reflecting the R2R vision of the project, which will address landscape-wide flows of environmental threats and services.

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:

8. No major changes from the approved PIF.

9. Project risks have been identified and analysed during the full project preparation and mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project design (see Risk Matrix below). With the support from and under the supervision of FAO, the Project Management Committee (PMC) will be responsible for the day-to-day management of these risks and the effective implementation of mitigation measures. The project’s M&E system will serve to monitor project outcomes and outputs indicators, project risks and mitigation measures. The PMC will also be responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of mitigation measures and adjusting mitigation strategies as needed, and identify and manage any eventual new risks not foreseen during project development, in dialogue with other project partners.

10. The six-monthly Project Progress Report is the main tool for project risk monitoring and management. The reports include a section on systematic follow-up of risks and mitigation actions identified in previous reporting periods. The PPRs also include a section for identification of eventual new risks or risks that still need attention, their rating and mitigation actions, as well as the responsible for monitoring those actions and the expected timeline. FAO will monitor the project risk management closely and follow up if needed by providing support for the adjustment and implementation of risk mitigation strategies. Reporting on risk monitoring and rating will also be part of the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) prepared by FAO and submitted to the GEF Secretariat.

Risks	Rating	Mitigation Measures
Limited collaboration by local communities: Collaboration of local communities will be critical to achieving the objectives of the	High	Effective participation and consultation to ensure local community collaboration: extensive community consultations are built into every aspect of the project. Project sites have been selected, in large part, on the basis of

<p>project, but these communities will need to meet their own needs before agreeing to devote time and resources to resource management and biodiversity conservation. It may be difficult to reach agreement with all members of communities on management and enforcement measures.</p>		<p>communities' expressions of interest and willingness to engage in project activities and the existence of relations of trust that have been built up through previous agency initiatives. Participation will further be ensured through the tangible socioeconomic benefits that will result from the project's actions in the short term, in the form of reductions in the damage to crops and lands caused by roaming pigs, and the provision of clean and accessible renewable energy in the form of biogas.</p>
<p>Limited human and financial capacities in national Government: while the Government of Tonga (GoT) has experience implementing GEF-financed and other projects, overall human resource capacity is generally low, particularly in the outer islands where government presence is nearly non-existent. Government budgets are fairly low, which could present problems if already low budgets are reduced due to changes in national budget allocations.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Strengthening of Government capacities, and reduction of community reliance on external capacities: Significant capacity-building activities, for government and stakeholders alike, are included in the project to address capacity gaps. Project management will closely monitor government budget allocations in order to flag and potential shortfalls as soon as possible, so that corrective measures can be taken as needed to ensure continued implementation of project activities. In addition, the project will seek to minimize communities' dependence on Government support by promoting their capacities for the participatory generation, adaptation and dissemination of SLM technologies, based wherever possible on traditional knowledge; and "low-tech" approaches to the production and supply of planting materials.</p>
<p>Unsuitability of technologies to local conditions: While the biogas/piggery system is already being piloted in Tongatapu, the integration of the system with whole farming system at the community-level to be piloted under this project has not been tested as yet in Tongatapu or the outer islands.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Development of capacities and governance mechanisms for the management and adaptation of technologies by local communities: the project will build on previous experiences with piggery systems in Tonga and community-based biogas systems in other countries, which have shown a high level of uptake and sustainability. On-going training in operating and maintenance of the entire system would be provided during project implementation. In addition, this training will focus on developing capacities among community members to troubleshoot technical, social or other problems that may arise in the future; while the community-based governance mechanisms to be supported by the project will facilitate the resolution of any stakeholder conflicts that may arise regarding, for example, roles and responsibilities for the maintenance of the systems, or the equity of the distribution of their benefits.</p>
<p>Climate change: climate change will pose a risk to the achievement of the project's objective as it may result in the climatic coping limits of the proposed production systems being exceeded (due to increases in temperature, rainfall variability and storm damage); land loss and degradation due to sea level rise, saltwater intrusion and salt spray impacts may also exacerbate productive pressures, and associated degradation, on the remaining land.</p>		<p>Development of capacities for innovation and adaptation to climate change: The project's approach will mitigate these risks by promoting capacities among extension agents and among community members to innovate and adapt the resource management systems they promote or apply, through the use of participatory, adaptive approaches to analysis, learning and technology generation such as farmer field schools. The project's support to negotiated approaches to addressing land use planning and land tenure issues will further enable communities to adapt to CC-related changes in biophysical and demographic conditions.</p>

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

11. No major changes from the approved PIF. Addition detail has been provided on how the project will contribute to the overall GEF-financed Ridge-to-Reef (R2R) Regional Program and how it will complement the parallel UNDP R2R project on Integrated Environmental Management of the Fanga'uta Lagoon Catchment.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

12. A list of key stakeholders and their potential roles in the project are provided in the table below. Special attention would be given to youth, women, disabled citizens, and residents of outer islands.

Stakeholders	Roles
Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Forests, and Fisheries	Main implementation partner. Responsible for day-to-day execution, management, coordination, and monitoring of project activities.
Ministry of Lands, Survey, and Natural Resources	Lead executing agency for activities relating to SOLA under Component 1
Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications (MEIDECC)	Lead executing agency for activities relating to mangrove rehabilitation under Component 3
Local communities	Main project beneficiaries
District and Town Officers and Councils	Project beneficiaries (from capacity building) and project partners in activities on outer islands
Civil Society (NGOs, churches)	Project beneficiaries (from capacity building) and project partners in implementing project activities
Other Government Ministries (eg. Internal Affairs, Tourism)	Project beneficiaries (from capacity building) and project partners in implementing project activities

13. One of the key lessons learned from previous community-level interventions in Tonga is the need to build consensus and commitment within participating communities. In addition to being essential for promoting negotiation and sustainability as key elements of land planning and management decisions, this participatory approach will help to ensure buy-in and ownership of the project itself by community members, which is crucial to their adoption of the proposed integrated agro-ecosystem management systems. This will require participatory meetings, workshops, training and awareness raising, including spatial planning at community/household/group level and community agreements on objectives and roles and responsibilities in the implementation of the project. Use wherever possible of existing mechanisms for organization, representation and dialogue such as Village Agriculture Committees (VAC) and community meetings (fonos).

14. Real and effective stakeholder participation will be particularly central to the project's approach under Component 2. Under Output 2.1.1, the project will seek to maximize the engagement of local stakeholders in processes of land use planning and resolution of tenure issues, by facilitating multi-stakeholder negotiation of resource management and tenure arrangements using the approach of participatory and negotiated territorial development (PNTD). This will involve supporting community members in carrying out initial diagnostics of their interests and visions regarding the management of their territory, and commencing dialogue; initial discussion of proposals for the management of the territory; and facilitating negotiation between the actors with the aim of, wherever possible, achieving consensus-based agreements. These actions will build on progress made to date with the building of relations of trust with local communities, with support from IFAD and other agencies.

15. A similarly participatory approach will be applied under Output 2.1.3 in order to maximize stakeholders' engagement in the formulation and implementation of the 'Eua Watershed Management Plan. In this case the project's actions will build upon the bases of trust, participation and engagement established through actions supported by GIZ on this island; GIZ will continue to provide advisory support to the project in order to ensure the continuity of the participatory approach applied there.

16. Stakeholder engagement in the actions proposed under Component 3 will be promoted through a participatory approach to extension, including the use of: Farmer field schools for participatory problem analysis and development of SLM practices (Output 3.2.2) and the systematisation of traditional tree management systems (Output 3.3.2) as the starting point for the promotion of improved tree management and restoration.

17. Actions under Component 4, meanwhile, will focus on knowledge management, including the effective systematization and dissemination of results lessons learned at field level. This knowledge and messages will be fed to actors with influence on policy and regulatory frameworks, and technical support, thereby promoting their engagement and motivating them to take effective action, especially under Component 1.

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):

18. The project is expected to provide both direct and in-direct benefits to a wide range of stakeholders. The most significant socioeconomic benefits will be as follows:

- Increased crop production and improved local environments in villages where piggeries are installed (under Component 3), as a result of reductions in the damage caused by roaming pigs.
- Increases in levels, sustainability and diversity of agricultural production as a result of the application of integrated nutrient management and agroforestry systems.
- Access to biogas for cooking and lighting, from the piggery/biogas systems, reducing the workload of fuelwood collection and expenditures on lamp oil and bottled cooking gas.
- Improved security of tenure, in the form of longer term assured rights to use and manage land, as a result of the multi-stakeholder negotiation processes proposed under Component 2.

19. The project has the potential to generate significant gendered benefits for women, including the following:

- Increase in access to clean biogas for cooking and lighting, thereby reducing their workload in gathering firewood, and improving the home environment.
- Increased opportunities for the generation food and income through small-scale vegetable and fruit production, and improvement of sanitary conditions, due to the elimination of roaming pigs from the village environment.
- Reductions in the impacts of sediment run-off on fisheries in near-shore areas, on which women traditionally depend for household consumption and sale.
- Increased opportunities for handicraft production and other economic activities based on agroforestry products such as pandanus, paper mulberry and vanilla.

20. In quantitative terms, the estimated numbers of people benefitting directly or indirectly from the project will be as follows:

- 20 members of Government institutions and 28 members of NGOs have received training through modules developed by the project, and show improved knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) as a result

- 20 members of Government institutions and 28 members of NGOs report using training manuals developed by the project as regular guides for their work.
- 225 allotment ('api tukuhau) holders (at least 30 in each target locality) applying integrated agroecosystem management practices that contribute to the sustainability of their production systems and livelihoods.
- 30 farmers in each target locality with 15% increases in crop yields over 100ha.
- 225 farmers report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established (live after 1 year) trees on their farms
- 130 households benefiting from biogas produced from piggery biodigesters

21. The delivery of these socioeconomic benefits will directly underpin the delivery of global economic benefits. Specifically, the benefits of the piggery/biodigester systems in terms of biogas generation for local use, reductions in crop damage and improved village environments, will provide direct motivations for local communities to adopt these systems, resulting in the parallel generation of GEBs in the form of increased sustainability of land management, reduced impacts on biodiversity and forest resources and (incidentally) reduced emissions of methane.

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

22. The opportunities for rehabilitating degraded landscapes are severely limited by the problem of roaming pigs. The pigs prey on vegetable crops, including root crops, and tree seedlings. One option that has been tried is improve fencing around crops and tree seedlings, but experience has shown that these fences are easily broken by the pigs and often are not repaired over time.

23. Simply put, the best option for long-term sustainability of increased vegetative cover and increased productivity of land is to remove the pigs from the environment. However, past attempts at large, communal piggeries have failed, as has enacting laws to require that all pigs be penned (due to social and cultural factors, namely the reluctance for people to kill their neighbour's pigs even if found destroying their crops). As a result, the best option for removing the pigs from the environment is to provide positive incentives (eg. support for growing fodder crops to feed pigs, biogas production to power cooking stoves and lighting, organic fertilizer from the bio-slurry) to households to do so.

24. The piggery/biogas systems installed by MAFFF with support from China Aid have proven to work well at the household level. The challenge now is to scale these systems up from the household to the community level, which is the focus of Component 2 of this project. Four pilot communities have been carefully selected to trial these community-level activities; all have shown a keen interest in penning their pigs and reaping the benefits of biogas and organic fertilizer production. The project is designed to provide support to these pilot communities as a way of demonstrating the benefits of penning pigs, with the longer-term impact expected to be increased interest and up-take of the piggery/biogas systems by other communities.

25. The activities focused on improving the planning and management of the 'Eua Watershed are designed to support the natural water flows that the people of 'Eua depend on. One estimate of the costs of finding and providing alternative sources of water to 'Eua communities is upwards of US\$2 million, meaning that protecting the watershed is far more cost effective than the alternative.

26. Supporting the enhancement of the Land Administration system (SOLA) will have multiple positive benefits for government, land owners, and the private sector, as it streamlines the land transaction process as well as ensures land records are more secure. The current back log in digitizing land records and transactions reduces the incentives for people to invest in their land. Further, the lack of digitized spatial data for land records makes any type of zoning or land use planning impossible in any other way than an ad-hoc, project-funded basis. Investing in the central system and its capacity to process spatial data and produce maps to be used for land use planning and management will produce long-term benefits for a

range of stakeholders, including those committed to improving their environment and protecting key ecosystems from ad-hoc, unplanned development and encroachment.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN

27. Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and indicators established in the Project Results Framework (Annex A). The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted at USD 112,800 (see below). Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The monitoring and evaluation system will also facilitate learning and replication of project results and lessons in relation to integrated management of natural resources.

Summary of main monitoring and evaluation activities

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budget
Inception Workshop	NPD, PM, FAO (BH, LTO, and the GEF Coordination Unit)	Within two months of project start up	USD 2,000 and FAO cost covered by agency fee
Project Inception Report	NPD and PM, cleared by LTO, BH, and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after the workshop	Project staff covered by co-financing and FAO cost covered by fees
Field-based impact monitoring	PM, institutions and pilot villages communities, and farmers participating in the project	Continually	USD10,800 (9% of project coordination time, technical workshops for identification of indicators, M&E workshops)
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	PM, LTO and other technical units supporting the project, TCI/GEF Coordination Unit	Annual or as required	FAO visits will be financed through GEF agency fee. Project coordination visits will be financed by the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports (PPR)	PM with inputs from; FAO LTO and BH; BH to submit PPR to GEF Coordination Unit for clearance and uploading on FPMIS	Six-monthly	Included in salary of project manager; inputs from FAO will be covered by fee
Project Implementation Review (PIR) report	FAO LTO and PM supported by the NPD and PSC. PIRs cleared and submitted by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat	Six-monthly	Covered by project staff time & agency fee
Co-financing Reports	PMO, LTO, and BH	Annual (with PIR)	Covered by project staff time & agency fee
Technical reports	PM, LTO, BH	As appropriate	Included in cost of consultants and budget for information supplies, co-financing, etc.
Mid-term Evaluation	FAO Office for Evaluation to recruit external consultants; evaluation conducted with inputs from the project stakeholders and the project team including the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, the LTO, BH	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 50,000 for two independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budget
Final evaluation	FAO Office for Evaluation to recruit external consultants; evaluation conducted with inputs from the project stakeholders and the project team including the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, the LTO, BH	At the end of project implementation	USD 50,000 for two independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Terminal Report	PMO, BH, LTO, TCSR	At least two months before the ending date of the project	Included in salary of project manager; inputs from FAO will be covered by fee
Total Budget			USD112,800

28. An independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken at the end of the first 24 months of project implementation to review progress and effectiveness of implementation in terms of achieving project objective, outcomes and outputs. Findings and recommendations of this review will be instrumental for bringing improvement in the overall project design and execution strategy for the remaining period of the project's term if necessary. FAO (the Office of Evaluation) will arrange for the MTE in consultation with project management. The evaluation will, *inter alia*:

- a) Review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- b) Analyse effectiveness of partnership arrangements;
- c) Identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- d) Propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the implementation strategy as necessary; and
- e) Describe the technical achievements and lessons learned derived from project design, implementation and management.

29. An independent Final Evaluation (FE) will be carried out three months prior to the terminal review meeting. The FE will aim to identify the project impacts, sustainability of project results and the degree of achievement of long-term results. The FE will also have the purpose of indicating future actions needed to expand on the existing Project in subsequent phases, mainstream and up-scale its products and practices, and disseminate information to management authorities and institutions with responsibilities in food security, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, small farmer agricultural production and ecosystem conservation to assure continuity of the processes initiated by the Project. Critical elements that both the MTR and FE will pay special attention to are the outcome indicators.


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 template. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Asipeli Palaki	CEO GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF LANDS, ENVIRONMENT, CLIMATE CHANGE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	01/07/2014

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
Gustavo Merino Director Investment Centre Division, Technical Cooperation and Programme Management FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy TCI- Director@fao.org		21 July, 2016	Subregional Coordinator, FAO Subregional Office for the Pacific Islands, Apia, Samoa	+685 22127	SAP-SRC@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator, GEF Coordination Unit Email: GEF- Coordination- Unit@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 5680			Naoko Nakagawa, GEF Coordination Unit	+39 (0)6 570 55817	Naoko.Nakagawa@fao.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Outcomes	Indicators	Start of Project Baseline	Mid-term project Target	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Project Objective: To strengthen the resilience of communities by enhancing land tenure systems, improving forest management, and piloting an integrated agro-ecosystem approach to rehabilitate degraded landscapes						
Component 1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated land and agro-ecosystem management.						
1.1: Increased acknowledgement and incorporation of integrated land and agro-ecosystem management principles in national policies, laws, and regulations	Number of ILAM Policy Intention Papers cited in sectoral policies, strategies and plans	No Policies specifically indicate intention to promote ILAM.	At least one (1) Policy Intention Paper developed, related to a key sector in ILAM approach.	At least 3 ILAM Policy Intention Papers cited in sectoral policies, strategies and plans.	Review of sectoral policy, strategy and planning documents	High level commitment from MAFF to influencing sectoral policies and plans
	<i>Output 1.1.1: Policy intention papers to inform sectoral policy and planning processes</i> <i>Output 1.1.2: National Land Use Policy document</i>					
1.2: Reliable information on land tenure is available to guide land use planning and facilitate the application of sustainable land management nationwide	Number of 'complete watershed' areas with up to date cadastral maps used for GIS-based applications for land use planning and for monitoring land use changes over time.	None of the 'complete watershed' areas i.e., project locations have up-to-date allotment cadastral layer of map data available for developing mapping products.	Up-to-date allotment cadastral layer of map data available for developing mapping products.	4 'complete watershed' areas, with completed up to date cadastral maps used for GIS-based applications for land use planning and for monitoring land use changes over time.	Review of GIS-based applications	Staff stability in MLSNR
	Degree of completion of allotment map data capture and quality improvement work	Less than 10% of both the tax and town allotments in the right allotment map data quality for digital capture	Allotment map data capture and quality improvement work at least 70% completed	Allotment map data capture and quality improvement work 100% completed.	MLSNR reports	
	Level of in house capacity in MLSNR for data capture and input	Tonga SOLA system not able to utilize spatial functionality of SOLA to deal with the cadastral mapping due to significant gaps in capacity for data capture and data quality.	Tools required for data improvement work in place and local staff received training on these tools.	By project end MLSNR staff have assumed all responsibility for data capture and input	MLSNR reports	
Capacity of MLSNR to	Land administrative			MLSNR is actively	MLSNR reports	

Outcomes	Indicators	Start of Project Baseline	Mid-term project Target	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	streamline business processes and accept applications and new survey plan data digitally through the internet.	processes and services predominantly paper-based		accepting applications and new survey plan data digitally through the internet.		
Output 1.2.1: National System of Land Administration enhanced, and operational with spatial functionality of SOLA utilized to recommend allowable land uses, monitor land use changes over time and clarify tenure.						
1.3 Improved strategic planning and management of forest resources	Extent of application of National Strategic Forest Development Plan by Central and local government bodies and civil society organizations	No National Strategic Forest Development Plan (NSFDP) exists to implement the 2009 Tonga Forest Policy.	A draft NSFDP prepared, with participation of local government and civil society organizations.	Central and local government bodies and civil society organizations have reflected the provisions of the Plan in their own operational plans	Review of operational plans	Buy-in to the NSFDP among key stakeholder institutions
	Degree to which National Forest Monitoring System (FMS) is utilised in planning	No Forest Monitoring System in place	Conceptual design and workplan for establishing the FMS developed; implementation at least 15% completed.	A fully functional FMS is in place and its data outputs are being used in planning by key entities of central and local Government and civil society organisations.	Review of FMS Interviews with members of user entities Review of planning documents using FMS data	
Output 1.3.1: National Strategic Forestry Development Plan developed						
Output 1.3.2: National Forest Monitoring system						
Component 2: Site-based capacities for evidence-based negotiation of land use planning, management and tenure rights						
2.1: Capacities for evidence-based and negotiated formulation of resource management plans at landscape and village levels, clarification of farmers' tenure rights and obligations	Frequency of meeting of multi-stakeholder mechanisms in target locations	N/A	Multi-stakeholder mechanisms are active at least twice per year in target locations	Multi-stakeholder mechanisms are active at least twice per year in target locations	Minutes of meetings of multi-stakeholder mechanisms	Recognition by members of target communities of the need to enter into negotiation and resolve issues
	Representativeness of participation in multi-stakeholder mechanisms in target locations	N/A	All key stakeholder groups (commoners and nobles, men and women) participate actively in the mechanisms	All key stakeholder groups (commoners and nobles, men and women) participate actively in the mechanisms	Minutes of meetings of multi-stakeholder mechanisms	Social and cultural acceptance of multi-stakeholder negotiation
	Percentage of participants in multi-	N.A	50%	80%	Questionnaires, interviews and focus	

Outcomes	Indicators	Start of Project Baseline	Mid-term project Target	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	stakeholder mechanisms consider that the mechanism contributes significantly to resolving issues that impede equitable and sustainable approaches to land management				groups with participants	
	Degree of initial implementation of 'Eua Watershed Management Plan (WMP)	inter-sectoral Committee established with GIZ support, to coordinate work on a Catchment Area Management Plan.	Draft Plan developed, including identification of alternatives for farmers to reduce encroachment, and rehabilitation plans for degraded forest areas.	Operational plan developed for the implementation of the 'Eua WMP over at least the project period, and corresponding activities implemented in accordance with the plan.	Review of operational plan Interviews with entities and communities involved in plan implementation	
	Effectiveness of the Plan in reducing encroachment on forests in the watershed	75 ha of farmed land within the catchment areas (45 registered tax allotments) relocated and rehabilitated with forest as a conservation area	90 ha of farmed land rehabilitated with forest as part of the expanded 'Eua Watershed Catchment area under the WMP	No new instances of clearance of forests in the watershed for agriculture	Interviews with community members, direct observations	
<p><i>Output 2.1.1: Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for the negotiation of resource management and tenure</i></p> <p><i>Output 2.1.2: Negotiated and evidence-based plans for land use and integrated agroecosystem management at landscape and village levels</i></p> <p><i>Output 2.1.3: 'Eua Watershed Area Management Plan developed, and implemented</i></p>						
Component 3: Strengthening of capacities for the formulation and implementation of sustainable land management practices with an integrated R2R approach						
3.1: Increased capacities in Government institutions and NGOs for identifying and supporting SLM	Numbers of staff members in Government institutions and NGOs who have received effective training	None	8 members of Government institutions ³ and 14 members of NGOs ⁴ have received training through the modules	20 members of Government institutions and 28 members of NGOs have received training through the modules	Records of training events, KAP surveys.	Stability of staff members Receptivity of members of target institutions (at

³ 4 Field Project Officers + 4 4 MAFFF Extension Officers (1 per island group)

⁴ 4 from TRIP (1 in each island group) + 4 Langafonua'a Fafine Tonga (1 rep per island group) + 4 Tonga Livestock Farmers Council (1 per island Group) + 2 Agriculture Schools (1 Hango, 1 Tupou)

Outcomes	Indicators	Start of Project Baseline	Mid-term project Target	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
practices	through the modules		and show improved knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) as a result	and show improved knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) as a result		technical and strategic levels) to integrated, participatory approaches to SLM
	Number of members in Government institutions and NGOs making regular use of the training manuals	None	8 members of Government institutions and 14 NGOs report using the training manuals as regular guides for their work.	20 members of Government institutions and 28 members of NGOs report using the training manuals as regular guides for their work.	Staff interviews.	
<i>Output 3.1.1: Training modules for extension agents</i>						
<i>Output 3.1.2: Manuals for use by extension agents</i>						
3.2: Increased capacities in local communities to develop, apply and adapt SLM practices	Number of tax allotments ('api tukuhau) in target localities on which integrated agroecosystem management practices are applied, including more than one of the following: - Use of piggery digestate as fertiliser - Use of cover crops - Enrichment of fallows - Integrated pest management - Increased use of agroforestry trees for animal feed, household or commercial tree products and/or nutrient cycling		75 'api tukuhau (tax allotments) covering 250ha, with at least 12 'api tukuhau covering 40ha in each of the target localities	225 'api tukuhau covering 750ha, with at least 30 'api tukuhau covering 100ha in each of the target localities	Direct inspections of target localities	Community members continue to consider benefits of integrated systems to justify investments, and that they are compatible with social and cultural norms
	Reduction in the	Baseline to be	25% reduction over	75% reduction over	Interviews,	

Outcomes	Indicators	Start of Project Baseline	Mid-term project Target	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	amounts of firewood collected from vulnerable forest areas (in the target localities where such forest areas exist).	established at project start	baseline levels (baseline to be established at project start)	baseline levels	questionnaires or focus groups	
	Percentage increase in water harvesting and storage capacity in target communities (m ³ /month).	Baseline to be established at project start	At least 20% increase in water storage capacity in whole area where piggeries and intercropping systems will be covered under each ILAMP.	At least 50% increase in water storage capacity in whole area where piggeries and intercropping systems will be covered under each ILAMP.	Household surveys, focus groups and field inspections	
	Availability of water to local communities in target localities	Baseline to be established at project start	No net reduction in water availability for domestic uses in pilot communities, despite the establishment of piggeries.	No net reduction in water availability for domestic uses in pilot communities, despite the establishment of piggeries.	Household surveys and focus groups	
	Percentage reduction in crop damage and loss from roaming pigs in pilot communities and demonstration sites.	Baseline to be established at project start	On average farmers in the pilot communities report a 25% reduction in the areas of crops damaged by roaming pigs.	On average farmers in the pilot communities report a 75% reduction in the areas of crops damaged by roaming pigs. The total area benefitting from reduced degradation over the life of the project will be 245ha.	Household surveys, focus groups and field inspections	
	Numbers of farmers in target localities with increased crop yields	Baseline to be established at project start	12 farmers in each target locality with 15% increases in crop yields over 40ha.	30 farmers in each target locality with 15% increases in crop yields over 100ha.	Household surveys, focus groups and field inspections	
	Numbers of farmers in target localities who report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established	Baseline to be established at project start	75 farmers report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established (live after 1 year) trees on their	225 farmers report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established (live after 1 year) trees on their	Farmer interviews corroborated by selective ground truthing	

Outcomes	Indicators	Start of Project Baseline	Mid-term project Target	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	(live after 1 year) trees on their farms		farms	farms		
	Avoidance of CH ₄ emissions as a result of the use of piggery waste as biogas fuel	N/A	247tCO ₂ eq/year	247tCO ₂ eq/year (988t total by project end)	Inspections of numbers of pigs managed, biodigester volumes and effectiveness, and numbers of households using biogas as fuel	
	Numbers of households benefiting from biogas produced from piggery biodigesters	No households use biogas and 70% use bottled gas	70, with a corresponding 7% reduction in the amounts of bottled gas used	130, with a corresponding 14% reduction in the amounts of bottled gas used	Household interviews/questionnaires	
	Numbers of people in target villages where pig management practices have been modified who report no reduction in their abilities to meet social and cultural obligations	Baseline to be established at project start	100% of interviewees in villages where pig management practices have been modified report that there has been no reduction in their abilities to meet social and cultural obligations	100% of interviewees in villages where pig management practices have been modified report that there has been no reduction in their abilities to meet social and cultural obligations	Participatory retrospective time line exercises with community members	
<p><i>Outout 3.2.1: Demonstration modules for integrated agroecosystem management systems</i></p> <p><i>Outout 3.2.2: Farmer field schools for participatory problem analysis and development of SLM practices</i></p> <p><i>Outout 3.2.3: Extension modules applied in target communities</i></p>						
3.3. Increased capacities for the formulation and implementation of forest restoration plans, and for supporting improved management of forests, mangroves, and trees outside forests	Area in target localities covered by operational plans and Sustainable Forest Management Agreements (SFMA) that are under effective implementation	No areas under SFMA		Forestry Division and communities concerned agree that the provisions of operational plans and SFMA covering 150ha ⁵ are being met	Review of plans and SFMA, interviews with Forestry Division staff and community members	Continued commitment of community members to reforestation and forest protection
		Numbers of tree nurseries nationwide able to meet their seed supply requirements	30% of tree nurseries nationwide are able to meet at least 90% of their seed supply	80% of tree nurseries nationwide are able to meet at least 90% of their seed supply	Forestry Division records based on nursery reports	

⁵ Assuming 20% of each tax allotment = 225 total covering 750ha to be trees/forest

Outcomes	Indicators	Start of Project Baseline	Mid-term project Target	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	Number of tree nurseries nationwide with long term funding needs ensured	No nursery has secure long term funding	requirements 30% of tree nurseries nationwide with long term funding needs ensured (from sources other than short term project-based support)	requirements 80% of tree nurseries nationwide with long term funding needs ensured (from sources other than short term project-based support)	Interviews with Forestry Division and nursery managers	
	Area of agricultural land returned to forest use in the target localities (where land managers express intention to maintain the area under forest and there are at least XX trees/ha already present alive after 1 year)	Baseline to be established at project start	30ha	100ha	Interviews with land managers, and selective surveys	
<p><u>Output 3.3.1: Operational plans for forest restoration, including mangroves, formulated and implemented</u></p> <p><u>Output 3.3.2: Systematisation of traditional tree management systems</u></p> <p><u>Output 3.3.3: Sustainable Forestry Management Agreements</u></p> <p><u>Output 3.3.4: Improved mechanisms for supply of tree seed and planting materials</u></p> <p><u>Output 3.3.5: Training modules on forest restoration and management, for Forestry Division staff and community members</u></p>						
<p>Outcome 4.1 Project implementation is based on results-based management and application of lessons learned and good practices in current and future interventions.</p>						
4.1 Project implementation is based on results-based management and application of lessons learned and good practices in current and future interventions.	Number of ILAMS reports presented at R2R regional meetings or shared with R2R regional networks	N/A	At least 2 technical reports presented at R2R regional meetings or disseminated through R2R regional networks	At least 2 technical reports presented at R2R regional meetings or disseminated through R2R regional networks	Review of reports	Stability of staff
	Number of Technical or Policy reports published on MAFFF website and ECC Portal	N/A	At least 4 Technical or Policy reports published on MAFFF website and ECC Portal	At least 10 Technical or Policy reports published on MAFFF website and ECC Portal	Review of reports	
<p><u>Output 4.1.1: Monitoring and evaluation system established, supporting adaptive project management</u></p> <p><u>Output 4.1.2: Mechanisms for effective management and dissemination of knowledge within Tonga and the region</u></p>						

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).

STAP comments (24 February 2014)	Responses
<p>1. The PIF presents a bleak view of the current situation, - barriers described appear to be insurmountable - so the assessment of significant risk seems valid, and the modest claims for benefits would seem to be realistic. However, the baseline activities are not clearly described and therefore incremental benefits are hard to assess.</p>	<p>The incremental logic has been reviewed, the barriers reformulated to ensure logical correspondence with the components, and additional detail has been added to the baseline description. In summary, the main elements of the incremental logic, and the project strategies to surmount the presented barriers, are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investments under the NBSAP, National Land Use Policy and National Spatial Planning and Management Act provide favourable policy and legislative conditions for integrated land management and environmental protection; activities under Component 1 will support the incorporation of an integrated, holistic and landscape-wide vision which is currently lacking from this baseline. - The Lands Department has been working with FAO to customize the computerized Solutions for Open Land Administration, in order to support the regularisation of land tenure; under Component 2, the project will support the application of tenure and leasehold models that favour long-term approaches to land management. Most significantly, the project will support negotiated approaches to land use planning and the improvement of tenure security, that will help to address inequities and consequent barriers to SLM even if the underlying legal framework governing tenure is not modified in the short term. - The SOLA system implemented in November 2013 initiated the digital capture of both the tax and town allotments and started to address data quality issues with the allotment map data; incremental support to be provided under Component 2 will result in improvements in capacities to monitor land use changes over time, as the basis for the land use planning. - Government ministries provide sectoral support including planting materials and technical advice to select communities as financial and technical resources allow, primarily through externally-funded projects; however service delivery is hampered by inadequate funding for planting materials propagation and inadequate staffing levels. Under Component 3, the project will provide further direct support to developing communities' capacities and awareness of SLM; incremental support will focus on developing alternative, cost-effective and sustainable models for learning and technology generation (e.g. FFS). - Investments in land use planning and forest conservation are hampered by inadequate information on forest resources and trends over time; incremental support will establish, in collaboration between the Forest Division of MAFFF and the Lands Department and Planning and Urban Management Agency (PUMA), a system to ground-truth satellite imagery and monitor changes in forest cover over time. - The Government, with support from external agencies, is supporting agricultural extension but human and financial resources are insufficient to ensure the required extent and sustainability of coverage. GEF incremental support under Component 3 will focus on developing Government capacities in this regard, but also on reducing communities' dependence on external technical support by working wherever possible with the adaptation of traditional practices and developing the capacities of community members and their organisations for situation analysis and the generation and transfer of knowledge.
<p>2. Components 1, 2 and 4 are poorly developed. While the proposal seeks the majority of funding for land degradation, a comprehensive</p>	<p>The project components have been restructured in order to relate them more logically to the described barriers, and to place increased emphasis on the need to support negotiated multi-stakeholder approaches to land tenure, planning and management.</p>

STAP comments (24 February 2014)	Responses
<p>approach to management of land degradation is not presented; rather the strategy to manage land degradation appears to rely almost entirely on housing or confining pigs.</p>	<p>The threats analysis has been expanded to make clearer the multiple aspects of land degradation that the project will address, including the degradation of soil and water resources through the inappropriate use of inorganic fertilisers; the direct and indirect implications of free-ranging pigs in terms of land degradation, as well as their impacts on crops; and deforestation and degradation of forests due to agricultural expansion and household demand for forest products.</p> <p>The restructuring of the components reflects the need for an integrated and landscape wide approach to addressing these threats, rather than solely farm- or technology-specific actions. Actions under Component 2 will address barriers related to land use planning and tenure, in order to ensure that productive and extractive activities are adequately located in the landscape, in order to reflect variations in environmental vulnerability and address threats operating at landscape level, and that farmers have adequate security of tenure to allow them to address land degradation processes through long-term SLM practices.</p> <p>The description of technical solutions to be promoted under Component 3 has been expanded, to make clear that these constitute a balanced and integrated range of options, which will be adjusted according to the needs and conditions in each target site and complemented as necessary by the adaptation of traditional practices or other options proposed by community members. Piggeries will be one element of integrated farm-wide systems, generating environmental benefits both directly and indirectly: they will feed into other elements of the system, including integrated nutrient management (through the use of piggery biogas digestate as fertiliser), which will also include other approaches such as the use of Mucuna cover crops and nutrient recycling by trees in agroforestry systems.</p>
<p>3. There is very limited detail on the proposed components, apart from the strategy to house pigs for biogas production. The other elements envisaged in Component 2, integrated agro-ecosystem management systems, should be described.</p>	<p>The introduction to Component 3 now includes descriptions of the different elements of the integrated agroecosystem management systems, including (in addition to piggeries) the use of Mucuna cover crops and agroforestry systems.</p>
<p>4. Controlling pigs is a desirable objective that will deliver multiple benefits; however, it is not clear how this constitutes an integrated agro-ecosystem management system.</p>	<p>It has now been made clearer in the document that controlling pigs does not in itself constitute an integrated agroecosystem management system. It is one element of these integrated systems, linked to a number of other elements including integrated nutrient management, agroforestry and reforestation (please see response to point 2 above).</p>
<p>5. Several aspects could be clarified in the full proposal, such as how the pigs will be fed, and how social barriers to adoption of the alternative approach to raising pigs will be overcome.</p>	<p>It is now explained in the introductory text to Component 2 (Box 3) that an initial requirement for the successful establishment of the pilot piggeries will be an external supply of feed; however, once the piggeries are established, the pressures of roaming pigs on the local environment will be eliminated, allowing agricultural production to recover and generate a surplus of fodder and root crops that in the long term will constitute a sustainable substitute to the donated feed. This feed will be complemented by other sources such as coconuts and breadfruit, availability of which will be increased through the project's investment in forestry and agroforestry; and by-products of the processing of agricultural products such as the extraction of virgin coconut oil in the processing plant at Tatakamotonga, East of Nuku'alofa on Tongatapu</p>
<p>6. In the section on expected global environmental benefits please note that organic fertiliser from biogas digestate will replace expensive and GHG-intensive chemical fertiliser (not pesticide!).</p>	<p>This has been corrected.</p>
<p>7. To address the issue of limited energy sources, perhaps the proponent could consider energy crops such as coconut or oil palm, which can be</p>	<p>Traditional farming systems in Tonga are already dominated by coconut palms. Coconut and other trees replanting nationwide is part of the key activities in Component 3 for promoting and strengthening agro-forestry systems. These trees will contribute significantly to the demand for fuelwood as 75% of Tongan households cook using</p>

STAP comments (24 February 2014)	Responses
successfully cultivated on degraded land, restoring soil and biomass carbon and substituting for imported fossil fuels. A sustainability assessment would need to be undertaken in assessing the viability of integrating energy crops into agricultural systems that also takes into account recovery of forest biodiversity.	<p>fuelwood obtained from scattered large hardwood trees and shrubs from tax and urban allotments, unused land and forests, from coconut slabs, mill off-cuts, husks and shells.</p> <p>Oil palms have a much deeper shade, and it would pose more of a challenge to combine these with traditional farming systems without displacing food production. Currently most firewood comes from secondary and fallow vegetation occurring in these traditional farming systems, as well as remaining coastal forests. The proposed project approach will focus on supporting the modification of existing production systems in order to increase their ability to generate firewood, and to develop conditions of governance and awareness in order to reduce the pressures of firewood extraction on coastal forests.</p>
8. The full proposal should detail the proposed technique for rainwater harvesting.	<p>Rainwater will be harvested with two objectives: 1) to supply the piggeries, in order to avoid these placing additional demands on community water resources, which are already scarce during drought periods; 2) for the irrigation of small-scale vegetable gardens (it is unlikely that storage capacities and labour availability would be sufficient to permit larger scale irrigation of agricultural crops).</p> <p>It is foreseen that rainwater will be collected from corrugated iron rooves and channelled from there via gutters to ferrocement holding tanks. In order to minimise the risk of these acting as foci for the propagation of malarial mosquitos, these will either be covered or fish will be introduced into them.</p> <p>The precise designs of the rainwater harvesting systems will be confirmed as part of the ILAM Plans to be developed under Output 2.1.2. This is proposed as the rainwater harvesting systems have to be site-specific to take into account the available areas of rooftops (on piggeries, houses and all other dwellings) and location of these rooftops, which will determine the sizes and number of water storage tanks to be used for rainwater harvesting.</p>
9. It is not clear how Component 1 will deliver the outcomes claimed, especially reduced vulnerability to drought, and how the proposed policy framework will tackle the issue of agricultural expansion.	<p>Component 1 has now been reworded: rather than focusing on specific issues such as reduced vulnerability to drought, activities under this component will aim to provide a more favourable enabling policy and regulatory environment for sustainable land management in general. This will be achieved, for example through policy guidance papers that aim to promote compatibility between the development of productive sectors and the sustainability of land management, and a policy framework that permits SLM-friendly land use planning; improvements in land use planning capacities; and strengthened capacities for monitoring forest resources and planning forest restoration. Actions under Component 1 will address the issue of agricultural expansion by making SLM practices more accessible to producers, thereby reducing the need to abandon degraded lands and expand into new areas; improving land use planning in order to avoid high priority areas for protection being subject to agricultural expansion; improving tenure conditions, enabling farmers to consolidate their SLM practices on existing holdings; and creating favourable enabling conditions for the restoration of areas affected by expansion.</p> <p>Activities under the reformulated Component 1 will not in themselves be sufficient to deliver SLM benefits: these will be achieved by complementing these actions with local level actions aimed at strengthening land use planning and tenure under Component 2, and strengthening capacities for the application of SLM practices under Component 3.</p>
10. Component 4 is a generic description that would benefit from more detail that demonstrates understanding of the particular constraints to adoption in this community	<p>As reformulated, community-level awareness barriers to SLM adoption are addressed under Component 3, which focuses on knowledge generation and transfer, and particularly participatory problem analysis. The corresponding barriers, now presented in the ProDoc, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure of knowledge, capacities and awareness among land managers to keep up with the pace of the changes affecting the agricultural sector and socioeconomic conditions - Difficulty of reconciling cultural traditions with the need to address their environmental implications - Inadequacy of technical and financial resources in Government to meet the

STAP comments (24 February 2014)	Responses
	<p>challenge of supporting the population in adapting to these changes, and to carry out related research.</p> <p>Component 4 will in fact address the barrier of inadequate access on the part of land managers and supporting institutions to information on best practices and lessons learned regarding SLM. Details of outreach and communications are provided in output 4.1.1. The approach is to build, and go beyond on the 'how to' manuals and guides as toolkits to be developed to support implementation in component 2, to highlighting the positive impacts as a result of following the 'toolkits' and adopting ILAM practices. Evidence of positive impacts is crucial to bringing about behaviour change.</p>
<p>11. STAP requests that the proponents clarify the proposed linkage and integration with the second biodiversity-focused project (UNDP). This linkage is alluded to in section A.4 on Coordination but not in sufficient detail. The concern that STAP has relates to the need to integrate policy and land use planning approaches which are not cross-referred to the proposed biodiversity focused project from the present project, except very briefly from Component 2.</p>	<p>The UNDP project area will overlap with one of the FAO project target areas, but with an emphasis on different specific technical aspects. The UNDP project will generate lessons on how to address specific coastal BD issues, and fisheries management, within the R2R vision, which may be transferrable to the other target areas of the FAO project; while the FAO project will focus in more detail on farm system aspects. There will be direct collaboration in the provision of training; the UNDP ProDoc says "Villagers and landowners living in the lagoon watershed will receive training to develop practical skills to successfully management and implement sustainable agricultural practices in their own lands (in coordination with the FAO R2R project on agriculture). The participants will be selected from key villages, local officers, and volunteers from FLC communities. The training will help raising environmental awareness of participants and will strengthen their commitment and involvement to the project implementation to minimize pollution loading into the lagoon".</p> <p>Impact monitoring will be coordinated between the two projects, especially in relation to fertiliser and sediment inputs into the lagoon, which may be influenced by the FAO project.</p> <p>The zoning and planning foreseen under Output 2.1.5c of the UNDP project will be closely coordinated and wherever possible integrated with the processes promoted through the FAO project, in order to ensure consistency and help build up a critical mass of trust and awareness more effectively than with parallel initiatives.</p> <p>The stakeholder bodies proposed within the "Multi-stakeholder management system" for the lagoon catchment, to be established under the UNDP project, will also be used as channels for stakeholder contact and engagement through this project, and may serve as models that the FAO project could also use elsewhere in the same target area and/or in the other target areas.</p> <p>Only the FAO project will work on policy issues, so the FAO project's policy outcomes (and other "enabling environment" work under Component 1) will have potential implications for the UNDP project and not the other way around. That being said, the UNDP and FAO projects will collaborate in the prioritisation (with local participation) of the specific issues to be targeted in the FAO policy and other enabling environment work.</p> <p>It is suggested that the coordinators of the two projects should be invited to participate in each other's steering committee meetings as a specific mechanism for coordination.</p>
<p>12. Also section A.4 does not mention how the project will connect to or benefit from the regional parent Program. In particular, the ecosystem-based Ridge to Reef approach calls for a spatially coherent approach to land and water use. However, the choice of pilot sites and expected outputs of Components 1 and 2 appear to sit in isolation from the more strategic approach outlined for Ridge to Reef.</p>	<p>Section 1.1.1 of the Project Document provides background on how the project relates to the regional R2R programme as a whole, and Section 1.4.2 (Strategy) explains how, in accordance with the R2R concept, the project will address the flows of ecosystem services and impacts between different land units and activities at farm, community and landscape levels, and goes on to detail the core elements and principles of the project's strategies in accordance with this R2R approach.</p> <p>In Section 1.2, the pilot localities have now been defined and justified in more detail, in accordance with this R2R approach. Each locality is now defined (and indicatively mapped) as a landscape across which flows of environmental threats and ecosystem services occur, which will be addressed in an integrated manner by the project. The precise ways in which the areas are defined vary between sites, in reflection of the diversity of</p>

STAP comments (24 February 2014)	Responses
<p>This aspect should be clarified in the full project brief, including likely trade-offs and leakage estimates.</p>	<p>conditions (ranging from steep islands such as 'Eua to flat, low-lying island such as Ha'ano) which limit the universal applicability of the watershed concept as conventionally applied under the R2R approach.</p> <p>Relations (tradeoffs and leakages) between the different interest groups located across these target areas will be addressed through processes of participatory negotiated territorial development under Component 2.</p>
<p>On the other hand Component 3 on mainstreaming sustainable forest management could deliver useful and strategic results which will help to target remedial actions and can be well integrated into a Ridge to Reef approach.</p>	<p>Actions proposed under the original Component 3 are now integrated with those focused on agricultural and agroforestry elements in the landscape, in recognition of the need for these different landscape elements to complement each other.</p>
<p>Integration and sustainability 13. From the Program perspective the PIF proposes dissemination of lessons learned through the regional learning network but is silent about the regional support to be delivered to the project. For example, regarding capacity building and expertise sharing, STAP advised that the parent Program has the opportunity, at least for the cluster of 14 countries represented with the Program, to strengthen the scientific and technical linkages between the PICs, building upon the SOPAC mechanism. The Science, Technology and Resources Network (STAR) of SOPAC could build capacity to make operational a regional multidisciplinary network similar to the SIDSTAP concept, augmented with SOPAC-STAR support and in coordination with the University of the South Pacific</p>	<p>The project will facilitate the participation of national stakeholders in regional coordination on Ridge to Reef approaches, including participation in the capacity building and information sharing activities of the UNDP-GEF Regional R2R Project "Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods" of which SOPAC is the executing agency.</p> <p>Tongs R2R project will fund the participation of its project staff / key stakeholders (estimated at 1-2 persons) in capacity building activities developed by the R2R program. In addition, the national project staffs will participate in the activities of the regional project to strengthen the scientific and technical linkages between Pacific Island Countries for Ridge to Reef approaches. In addition, national stakeholders from the Tonga will participate in the Regional Scientific Conference on coastal and marine spatial planning in PICs, which will support the uptake of regionally accumulated scientific knowledge in policy-making and planning and will facilitate exchanges between government and the scientific community.</p>
<p>14. STAP recommended in its screening of the regional support project (GEF ID 5404) that it should include support for a multi-focal "PaciW:LEARN" for the region, which could act to sustain a peer to peer scientific and technical network for in-service training. This would satisfy the long standing demand under the Mauritius Strategy for Implementation, at least in this Pacific SIDS area. This advice was provided for the reason that, given the complex multidisciplinary threats and barriers shared by many of the PICs to be overcome, the sharing of expertise between PICs would strengthen sustainability of individual projects</p>	<p>The Tonga project will rely on guidance and support from the Regional R2R Project in developing knowledge management tools for Ridge to Reef approaches, including tools / processes to build on the previous regional project GEF-UNDP-UNEP Implementing Sustainable Integrated Water Resources and Wastewater Management (PaciWRM). The Pacific IWRM project supported water governance reform, with most of the participating PICs having established Inter-ministerial Water Committees, developed national water policies, and completed national diagnostic reports for Water, Sanitation and Climate. These accomplishments, as well as a number of successful demonstration projects of ICM and IWRM developed in the Pacific and elsewhere, will be adapted for use in training by Pacific islanders to build local capacity for Ridge to Reef approaches that link coastal systems and catchment areas.</p> <p>The national R2R project also will strengthen Knowledge Management Systems for land and forest Areas. The project will support the establishment and management of databases and other information systems for land resource, designed to support sharing of information, best practices and resources in managing these sites and planning for and implementing island-wide interventions that can benefit multiple sites. The information resources will include: information on relevant laws, regulations, policies, management</p>

STAP comments (24 February 2014)	Responses
<p>within the Program, but also across the other GEF and non-GEF projects delivering against allied environmental targets. In this connection the inclusion of knowledge management (Component 4) is welcomed and STAP advises that beyond fulfilling IW:LEARN obligations, that the project should connect more formally to the proposed regional network as discussed above. Additionally, the baseline PacIWRM project's successful delivery of distance learning and twinning for IWRM capacity development is an excellent basis to build on regionally and nationally.</p>	<p>plans and authorities; the consolidation of existing mapping and GIS information, and any additional data developed by the project. The project also will make sure that national information is shared with and incorporates regional information, in the scope of the regional R2R programme.</p>

Response to comments from Germany Council Member on Tonga project (March 2014 Intersessional Council Meeting)	
Germany Council Member comment	FAO Response at CEO Endorsement Request
<p>A spatial planning approach on land- and seascape level for entire catchments and the marine protected areas should be considered to support a more integrated approach (March 2014)</p>	<p>The target locations have been defined as coherent landscapes (including coasts and inshore waters) on the basis of social and biological dynamics, as explained in Section 1.2 (the catchment concept is only applicable on 'Eua island, the other localities being virtually flat islands). In each of these areas, negotiated and evidence-based plans for land use and integrated agroecosystem management (ILAMS) will be developed at landscape and village levels (Output 2.1.2), and on 'Eua watershed management plan will be developed and implemented (Output 2.1.3).</p> <p>The target localities are spread across a range of situations, including two in the Tongatapu group, one in the Ha'apai group and one in the northernmost Vava'u group.</p>
<p>Integrate at least one pilot (component 2) in an outer island area, to gain experience within this environment. It might be an important area for local renewable energy sources</p> <p>A more detailed description of linkages to the parent Ridge to Reef Program (GEF ID = 5395) could be a plus.</p>	<p>As explained in section 3.1.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project will rely on guidance and support from the Regional R2R Project in developing knowledge management tools for Ridge to Reef approaches, including tools/processes to build on the previous regional project GEF-UNDP-UNEP Implementing Sustainable Integrated Water Resources and Wastewater Management (PacIWRM).... - This national R2R project also will strengthen Knowledge Management Systems for land and forest Areas... the project also will make sure that national information is shared with and incorporates regional information, in the scope of the regional R2R programme. - Project staff will participate in capacity building activities developed by the R2R program. In addition, the national project staffs will participate in the activities of the regional project to strengthen the scientific and technical linkages between Pacific Island Countries for Ridge to Reef approaches. In addition, national stakeholders from the Tonga will participate in the Regional Scientific Conference on coastal and marine spatial planning in PICs, which will support the uptake of regionally accumulated scientific knowledge in policy-making and planning and will facilitate exchanges between government and the scientific community.

Response to comments from Germany Council Member on the parent PFD (5395) (June 2013 Council Meeting)	
Germany Council Member comment	FAO Response at CEO Endorsement Request
<p>Since the proposed project is parenting fourteen Pacific Island Countries (PIC), the consideration of a comprehensive marine and coastal spatial planning</p>	<p>This comment is addressed through the response to the first comment by the Germany Council Member on the Tonga project, above. As set out in the Project Document, there will be close coordination between this project and the regional programme as a</p>

<p>approach is requested at a regional scale and at on-the-ground intervention levels in order to balance environmental and socio-economic considerations, fostering a more integrated approach that can help to resolve conflicting natural resource uses and enhance ecosystem connectivity.</p>	<p>whole: this will include ensuring that proposals for marine and coastal spatial planning in Tonga are harmonized with the approaches proposed at regional level in order to optimize synergies and reduce the risk of cross-border leakages of impacts between seascapes.</p>
<p>In relation to the (ecosystem-based) adaptation activities planned, it is requested that creating synergies between sub-national and national adaptation plans will be addressed. This could include consideration of measures to quantify and integrate ecosystem services when assessing and valuing EBA options.</p>	<p>The proposed coordination between the Tonga project and the regional R2R programme as a whole will include the communication of experiences and approaches for ecosystem-based adaptation, including objective and harmonized methodologies for quantification and integration of ecosystem services in the assessment of EBA options.</p>
<p>During the formulation of the project proposal, the implementing agencies and the executing partners should actively seek contact with on-going projects funded by the German Government in order to ensure synergies and complementarities and avoid duplication of efforts, as well as consult with concerned national and local authorities for improved coordination and cooperation.</p>	<p>The activities of the project on 'Eua island will build upon the GIZ-funded support to watershed planning and management there, and the project will also coordinate with the mangrove rehabilitation work currently being planned under the GIZ funded programme on Adaptation to Climate Change and Sustainable Energy (ACSE). This collaboration is formalized through a co-financing letter provided by GIZ: as stated in Section 3.4.1 of the Project Document, GIZ in-kind contribution will amount to approximately USD150,000 over the four years duration of the FAO project. It will include technical advisory services to ILAMS, building on GIZ experiences and tapping into good practices and lessons learned from the GIZ Programme - Coping with Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region as well as other on-going GIZ programmes in Tonga.</p>

Response to comments from Japan Council Member on the parent PFD (S395) (June 2013 Council Meeting)

<p>Germany Council Member comment</p> <p>In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect [a list of projects funded by Japan UNDP Partnership Fund]</p>	<p>FAO Response at CEO Endorsement Request</p> <p>Thank you for the comment. The project will seek to take lessons learned from the provided list of projects. Among them, particular attention is to be made to the "Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation" implemented in Mongolia, Tonga, Solomon Islands, Samoa, Palau, Marshall, Kiribati and Fiji, to inform the implementation phase of the proposed project in Tonga.</p>
---	--

Response to France Council Member Comment on the PFD 5395 (June 2013 Council Meeting)

<p>France Council Member comment</p> <p>One specific issue on "monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management": In the program framework document, it seems that this component will be implemented through platforms and "appropriate media". We suggest developing</p>	<p>FAO Response at CEO Endorsement Request</p> <p>As explained in the Project Document, the project will be closely coordinated with the regional R2R programme as a whole, including the exchange of knowledge, expertise, experiences and</p>
---	--

<p>exchanges of experiences, and to build on the best practices, transfer practitioners on sites with similar problems and facilitate peer exchanges or twinning.</p> <p>It may be interesting to articulate the proposed GEF project with an existing project « Restoration of ecosystem services against climate change unfavorable effects – Rescue » (SPC - AFD - FFEM). Indeed, this project seeks to find longterm economic and financial solutions to ensure that ecosystem services are maintained in the Pacific islands, which climate change and societal changes are tending to put into danger. The overall objective of this regional project thus focuses on improving and sustainably funding integrated management of Pacific island coastal zones, where most Pacific islanders live and where climate change has many negative effects. The added value of Rescuer is that it proposes setting up economic and funding instruments (including payments for ecosystem services) at six pilot sites in the Pacific, so as to provide for the sustainable funding of activities after project completion.</p>	<p>best practices.</p> <p>Although RESCUE will not work directly in Tonga, its approach is indeed highly relevant to and compatible with the Tonga project and opportunities for collaboration in terms of the exchange of knowledge and experiences will be explored at project start.</p>
---	---

Response to comments from the United States Council Member (March 2014 Interessional Council Meeting)

<p>United States Council Member comment (March 2014 Interessional Council Meeting)</p> <p>We request that the FAO further consider how capacities developed as a part of this project will contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes in the context of the numerous barriers for addressing environmental issues enumerated within the project proposal.</p>	<p>FAO Response at CEO Endorsement Request</p> <p>Proposed capacity strengthening strategies of key importance for sustainability are set out in:</p> <p>Section 1.4.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consolidation of capacities and mechanisms for land use planning (LUP) with a watershed/landscape wide perspective, taking into account socioeconomic interactions and flows of ecosystem services and environmental threats between the different units that make up the landscape; - Development of capacities for participatory, negotiated, human-centered and evidence-based approaches to decision-making regarding land use and the modalities whereby stakeholders are able to secure longer-term access and manage the land, respecting cultural and customary dimensions; - Support to the development of capacities among stakeholders to formulate and apply sustainable and integrated land management practices, which meet their livelihood and economic development needs while addressing land degradation processes, and reflect variations in biophysical, socioeconomic and tenure conditions between different sites. <p>Section 3.3.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening of Government capacities, and reduction of community reliance on external capacities: Significant capacity-building activities, for government and stakeholders alike, are included in the project to address capacity gaps. Project management will closely monitor
--	---

	<p>government budget allocations in order to flag and potential shortfalls as soon as possible, so that corrective measures can be taken as needed to ensure continued implementation of project activities. In addition, the project will seek to minimize communities' dependence on Government support by promoting their capacities for the participatory generation, adaptation and dissemination of SLM technologies, based wherever possible on traditional knowledge; and "low-tech" approaches to the production and supply of planting materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of capacities and governance mechanisms for the management and adaptation of technologies by local communities: the project will build on previous experiences with piggery systems in Tonga and community-based biogas systems in other countries, which have shown a high level of uptake and sustainability. On-going training in operating and maintenance of the entire system would be provided during project implementation. In addition, this training will focus on developing capacities among community members to troubleshoot technical, social or other problems that may arise in the future; while the community-based governance mechanisms to be supported by the project will facilitate the resolution of any stakeholder conflicts that may arise regarding, for example, roles and responsibilities for the maintenance of the systems, or the equity of the distribution of their benefits. - Development of capacities for innovation and adaptation to climate change: The project's approach will mitigate these risks by promoting capacities among extension agents and among community members to innovate and adapt the resource management systems they promote or apply, through the use of participatory, adaptive approaches to analysis, learning and technology generation such as farmer field schools. The project's support to negotiated approaches to addressing land use planning and land tenure issues will further enable communities to adapt to CC-related changes in biophysical and demographic conditions.
<p>Additionally, it may be beneficial for the proposed efforts as a part of this project to coordinate these proposed efforts with the needs and opportunities that exist in the wake of the January 2014 Cyclone Ian, the first category 5 cyclone in Tongan history.</p>	<p>The proposed project interventions will contribute to the achievement of the medium term agriculture recovery from Tropical Cyclone Ian response plan for the Ha'apai and Vava'u groups. The activities of the project in support of nursery development and reforestation will help to enhance food security and forest condition, thereby contributing to the provision of social (medicinal, firewood, tools and utilities, timber etc.) and economic (virgin oil, livestock feed etc.) as well as ecological (environmental, erosion control, windbreaks, carbon sequestration etc.) values.</p>

Response to the United States Council Member Comment on the PFD 5395, made at June 2013 Council Meeting:

<p>The United States Council Member comment</p> <p>The United States requests to review this project again prior to CEO endorsement. Prior to CEO endorsement we ask for an explanation of how the concerns raised in the STAP's request for major revision have been addressed, particularly with regard to adding value to the program beyond its role as an enabling and coordination mechanism.</p>	<p>FAO Response at CEO Endorsement Request</p> <p>Thank you for the comment. Responses to the STAP comments were provided with the CEO Endorsement Request. We trust that the CEO Endorsement Request package shall be circulated to the Council Members prior to CEO endorsement.</p>
--	---

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<p>2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?</p>	<p>12/30/13 Please re-submit a LOE from Tonga clearly indicating the amount of STAR funding Tonga is allocating to THIS Tonga project (versus the program) and how they are using their flexibility mechanism: e.g amount of CC STAR transferred to other FAs. The current LOE is not in line with GEF guidelines. Please contact Ms Quynh Phan Xuan from OBS for a country specific LOE model using the flexibility mechanism or assistance.</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed. The letter of endorsement has been correctly adjusted regarding the total amount of each FA.</p>	<p>A new LOE was produced by the Government of Tonga on 17th January 2014 showing the current focal area breakdown of the project: BD: USD155,745 LD: USD1,604,147 SFM: USD585,092</p>
<p>3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from the STAR allocation?</p>	<p>At CEO endorsement, please ensure: (a) that activities are included in the PIF re, the Small IW increment, consistent with IW Objective 3 under GEF 5; (b) that these activities will support actions towards facilitating adoption of integrated approaches with water-related outcomes through harnessing results and lessons learned from national and local multifocal area activities; (c) that these results and lessons learned will be shared with the regional project "Testing the integration of Water, Land Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries"</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</p>	<p>Please note that the project will not be using IW focal area funds. The IW allocation foreseen in the PFD will be used by the parallel UNDP R2R project in Tonga.</p>
<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p>	<p>9/20/2013 JS CCM No. The project has reallocated CCM funds for LD activities. However, all the CCM related previous activities are still included in the project. Please clarify.</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</p>	<p>The justification for retaining the piggeries and associated biodigesters in the proposal is not primarily because of their contribution to CCM (although this will remain as an incidental benefit), but because they are key elements of integrated community- and farm-level systems which will yield BD, LD and SFM benefits in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The enclosure of pigs will reduce the land and crop degradation caused by free-roaming animals and will allow farmers to invest in SLM practices such as cover crops and agroforestry without the need for major investment in fencing; - The biogas systems associated with the piggeries will reduce the degradation of forest remnants caused by firewood extraction (especially coastal forests of importance for buffering against climate change impacts), thereby generating SFM benefits in the

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>form of reduced emissions from deforestation and degradation, and safeguarded flows of environmental services from forests; as well as BD benefits in the form of reduced loss of priority coastal ecosystems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The use of biodigester residues as fertilizer, instead of inorganic fertilisers that current predominate, will contribute to SLM by increasing soil organic matter and agroecosystem health, as well as contributing to BD by reducing nitrate and heavy metal inputs in runoff and groundwater flows into biologically important coastal and marine ecosystems. <p>Furthermore, the continued inclusion of biogas systems will help to increase the social attractiveness of the project, and the proposed integrated ecosystem management systems, to the participating communities</p>
	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>Re. IW: please ensure that: (a) activities, consistent with IW Objective 3 under GEF 5, are included in the CEO endorsement; (b) these activities will support actions towards facilitating adoption of integrated approaches with water-related outcomes through harnessing results and lessons learned from national and local multifocal area activities; and (c) these results and lessons learned will be shared with the regional project "Testing the integration of Water, Land Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood's in Pacific Island Countries"</p>	<p>Please note that the project will not be using IW focal area funds. The IW allocation foreseen in the PFD will be used by the parallel UNDP R2R project in Tonga.</p>
<p>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>	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>2. While the R2R theme is referenced, the clear links to the theme and consolidated results expected in R2R are totally lacking. Please address and coordinate accordingly with the program's coordinating agency: UNDP</p> <p>9/20</p> <p>Re. Ct 2 While the R2R theme is referenced a little more, the clear links to the theme and consolidate results expected in R2R are still lacking. Please address and coordinate accordingly with the program's coordinating agency: UNDP. The GEF Ridge to Reef publication may also be a good source to consult towards the producing of a strong para. on this project reef to reef rationale, inputs and results expected.</p>	<p>This aspect has now been significantly strengthened, as explained in the introduction to section 1.4.2 of the Project Document on the project's strategy. Here it is explained, inter alia, that:</p> <p>"In accordance with the R2R concept, the project will address the flows of ecosystem services and impacts between different land units and activities at farm, community and landscape levels, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The risks of impacts on lagoon and other aquatic/coastal ecosystems caused by land-to-coast flows of nitrates and heavy metals generated through the excessive and inappropriate application of inorganic fertilisers; - The upstream-downstream impacts on water supplies caused by the deforestation of remnant forests located on catchments and recharge areas of steep islands such as 'Eua. - The undermining of the buffering role of coastal forests against the

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed</p> <p>5. Component 3 seems to be a mix of monitoring, protecting remaining natural resources, restoring degraded forest and improving the policy framework: a. Monitoring & please provide baseline. Please clearly indicate that inventories will be carried out through co-financing without use of GEF funds. The baseline is not clear. 9/20</p> <p>Re ct5a: there is no additional information on page 10</p> <p>22 March 2016</p> <p>5a. Partially addressed. The component 3 has been modified and the aspects related to monitoring moved to component 1. The co-financing provided by the national authorities for the inventories is noted but it still remains unclear where and what is the baseline informed in the document.</p> <p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p>	<p>impacts of salt spray, wave impact and sea level rise, and consequent impacts on agricultural lands and settlements further inland;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The landscape-wide implications of the inadequacy of provisions for land use planning and secure tenure, in terms of the pressure on existing land uses and on fragile ecosystems”.
	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed</p> <p>5. Component 3 seems to be a mix of monitoring, protecting remaining natural resources, restoring degraded forest and improving the policy framework: a. Monitoring & please provide baseline. Please clearly indicate that inventories will be carried out through co-financing without use of GEF funds. The baseline is not clear. 9/20</p> <p>Re ct5a: there is no additional information on page 10</p> <p>22 March 2016</p> <p>5a. Partially addressed. The component 3 has been modified and the aspects related to monitoring moved to component 1. The co-financing provided by the national authorities for the inventories is noted but it still remains unclear where and what is the baseline informed in the document.</p> <p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p>	<p>The Component structure has been significantly modified to improve clarity and logical flow: aspects related to monitoring have now been moved to Component 1 (“Improving the enabling environment for integrated land and agro-ecosystem management”), as part of Outcome 1.3 “Improved strategic planning of forest resources”.</p> <p>The fact that the generation and management of data will be cofinanced has now been made clear in the text related to Output 1.3.2.</p> <p>Response to comment of 22 March 2016</p> <p>Paragraph 143 of the Project Document says “The application of the FMS, including the realisation of forest inventories and the management and use of the resulting data, will be carried out by the Forestry Division; this will form part of the Government of Tonga’s co-financing contribution and ongoing activities in this regard (updating and management of data) will continue to be nationally funded after the project end”.</p> <p>Paragraph 100 of the Project Document has now been reworded to clarify that this monitoring is part of the baseline: “The application of the Forest Management System, including the realisation of forest inventories and the management and use of the resulting data, is carried out by the Forestry Division, which has access to satellite imagery from 1980 for all islands and to the GIS system at the Department of Lands and Survey.</p>
	<p>5b. Protecting remaining natural resources: what this means is not clear. Is it avoiding deforestation. If so how will it be done and what is the baseline activity? Does this relate to existing P.A networks? 9/20</p> <p>Re 5b: A few general words have been added to the PIF but no real detail. if a claim on avoided deforestation is being made, some rationale behind this is needed</p>	<p>The improvement of capacities for forest monitoring will enable hot spots of deforestation, where the greatest pressures of encroachment affecting remaining natural forests occur, to be identified and actions to be prioritized accordingly to avoid their continued deforestation. This may occur through improved land use planning (the monitoring data will be fed to these LUP processes) or increased investment in governance and control. This will benefit remnant forests throughout the country, whether included in PAs or not. This explanation has been</p>

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>22 March 2016 5b. Partially addressed. The baseline activity of the local authorities needs to be further explained to understand how the project leads to successfully avoid deforestation. In particular, which actions will be prioritized thanks to the improvement of the capacities for forest monitoring?</p>	<p>added to the text of Output 1.3.2.</p> <p>Response to comment of 22 March 2016 An explanation of the role of Village Development Committees has now been included in Section 1.1.10 of the Project Document on Institutional Arrangements. The influence of local authorities on curbing deforestation will be achieved through the Village Development Committees (VDC) that exist in each community, which comprise the Town Officer (TO) and community representatives. These play a key role in the implementation of community-level directives and policies in each village, including those related to conservation: it is the content of these directives and policies, and particularly their specifications of restrictions on tree felling and land clearance in particular vulnerable areas, that will be prioritized as a result of the improvement of capacities for forest monitoring (please see new text inserted into paragraph 142, Section 1.3.2 of the Project Document). The interventions proposed by the project, including the reduction in levels of land clearance and the felling of trees for firewood, have been discussed with the VDCs during the PPG phase and received positive feedback.</p>
	<p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>6. Land tenure is mentioned in the incremental cost reasoning but not in the descriptions of the components or the project framework. What is being proposed for this needs to be clear in Component 1. 9/20 Re Ct 6 land tenure: an explanation of what will be done is needed versus a few general words that tenure affects livelihoods. FAO just published guidance on improving governance of forest tenure: are these the sort of activities being planned?</p>	<p>Significantly increased emphasis has been placed on issues of land tenure in the Project Document. The PIF originally focused principally on the technical strengthening of the System for Open Land Administration (SOLA) in order to clarify land tenure and thereby facilitate land use planning; this is still foreseen, under Output 1.1.2. In addition, on the basis of PPG analyses and consultations and a review of FAO experiences at global level, a strong emphasis has now been introduced on the provision of support to site-based capacities for evidence-based negotiation of land use planning, management and tenure rights, which now constitutes the new Component 2. This recognizes that tenure issues are nuanced and multi-stakeholder in nature, often requiring delicate trade-offs between the interests of different stakeholder groups and involving informal agreements on use rights that go beyond the formal prescriptions defined by law.</p>
	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>7. Forest carbon estimates are very basic. It would be unlikely restoration areas would start with 0 tC so a bit of refinement is necessary. What about other elements of Component 3 e.g. avoiding deforestation (if this is what protecting remaining natural resources means)?</p>	<p>Emissions reductions have been calculated using the EX-ACT tool, as presented in Table 9 of the Project Document.</p>

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<p>9/20</p> <p>Re CT 7 forest carbon estimates are still extremely simplistic. Please use FAO's ex-act tool as a means of making this calculation more robust.</p>	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</p>	<p>An analysis of the economic viability of the piggery/biogas system is presented in Section 1.4.3 and Annex 7 of the Project Document.</p>
<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Component 2: Please clarify the economic viability of the proposed biogas systems. 24 June 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>Please revise the project indicator to align them with the GEF priorities, for example hectares prevented from livestock related degradation etc, amount of energy supplied to a number of households. 24 June 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>It is not clear how the component achieves CCM-5 objective, please make this linkage clear using appropriate outputs and indicators. 24 June 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>Component 3: To justify CCM-5 funding for the component please add forest carbon assessment and monitoring to the component activities. Please clarify what sustainable forest management including agro-forestry will entail and relate them to the identified drivers of forest degradation. 24 June 2016: Addressed.</p>	<p>Outcome 3.2 now includes the following targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The total area benefitting from reduced degradation over the life of the project will be 245ha. - 130 households will benefit from the use of biogas as energy. <p>Please note that under the flexibility mechanism the project will no longer be using CCM resources.</p>
	<p>22 March 2016</p> <p>Component 2: partially addressed. GEF notes the projections of the economic viability of the piggery/biogas systems shown in Figure 6. Nevertheless, while the detailed explanation of the basis of the calculations is announced in Appendix 7, the Appendix 7 refers to "Project environmental and social (E&S) screening checklist". Please clarify where this detailed explanation is.</p>	<p>Response to comment of 22 March 2016</p> <p>This should read Appendix 8, which is where detailed projections of the economic viability of the piggeries are presented.</p>
<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and</p>	<p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>9/4/2013 JS CCM</p> <p>Please clarify the added value of GEF funded activities for household level biogas activities under component 2 24 June 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>Please provide an estimate of CO2e emissions that would be reduced as a result of the project.</p>	<p>As explained in response to Comment 4 above, the added value of GEF funded activities will be to demonstrate how biogas digesters can function as part of integrated farm management systems capable of yielding multiple environmental benefits under diverse conditions. Emissions reductions as a result of avoided deforestation are presented in Table 9, based on figures generated through the EX-ACT tool.</p>

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<p>appropriate?</p>	<p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>Please specify, quantify, and refine the GEB at CEO endorsement stage</p> <p>22 March 2016: Partially addressed. Some GEBs aren't clearly quantified (BD, LD).</p>	<p>Estimates of further CCM benefits expected (despite the fact that the project will not use CCM funds) are presented in Box 5 of the Project Document.</p> <p>Detailed explanations of the GEBs expected under the BD, LD and SFM focal areas are now provided in Section 1.4.4 of the Project Document.</p> <p>Response to comment of 22 March 2016 Global BD benefits are described in qualitative terms in Section 1.4.4 paragraphs 199-200 of the Project Document. In order to avoid the need for costly species-specific monitoring, the results of which may be difficult to attribute directly to the project over the project lifetime, forest and tree cover are taken as proxies for BD benefits. Outcome 2.1 has a target of "No new instances of clearance of forests in the watershed for agriculture", Outcome 3.2 has targets of "225 farmers report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established (live after 1 year) trees on their farms", and "75% reduction in the amount of fuelwood collected from vulnerable areas", and Outcome 3.3 has a target of "100ha agricultural land returned to forest use in the target localities"; all of these targets are assumed to result in improved BD habitat and ecosystem status.</p> <p>LD benefits are measured through the targets (under Outcome 3.2) of: increased application of SLM practices; 75% reduction in the areas of crops damaged by roaming pigs (the total area benefiting from reduced degradation over the life of the project will be 245ha); and 30 farmers in each target locality with 15% increases in crop yields over 100ha.</p> <p>These quantitative targets have now been presented in Section 1.4.4 on GEBs: paragraph 196 (LD) and paragraph 199-200 (BD).</p>
<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p> <p>Please provide.</p>	<p>The socioeconomic benefits to be delivered, and the ways in which these will support the achievement of GEBs, are explained in Section B2 above. The socioeconomic benefits will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased crop production and improved local environments in villages where piggeries are installed (under Component 3), as a result of reductions in the damage caused by roaming pigs. - Increases in levels, sustainability and diversity of agricultural production as a result of the application of integrated nutrient management and agroforestry systems. - Access to biogas for cooking and lighting, from the piggery/biogas systems, reducing the workload of fuelwood collection and expenditures on lamp oil and bottled cooking gas.

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Improved security of tenure, in the form of longer term assured rights to use and manage land, as a result of the multi-stakeholder negotiation processes proposed under Component 2.</p> <p>The delivery of these socioeconomic benefits will directly underpin the delivery of global economic benefits. Specifically, the benefits of the piggery/biogas systems in terms of biogas generation for local use, reductions in crop damage and improved village environments, will provide direct motivations for local communities to adopt these systems, resulting in the parallel generation of GEBs in the form of increased sustainability of land management, reduced impacts on biodiversity and forest resources and (incidentally) reduced emissions of methane.</p>
<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed</p> <p>Please add the climate change dimension.</p>	<p>As explained in Section 3.3.1 of the Project Document, climate change will pose a risk to the achievement of the project's objective as it may result in the climatic coping limits of the proposed production systems being exceeded (due to increases in temperature, rainfall variability and storm damage); land loss and degradation due to sea level rise, saltwater intrusion and salt spray impacts may also exacerbate productive pressures, and associated degradation, on the remaining land. The project's approach will mitigate these risks by promoting capacities among extension agents and among community members to innovate and adapt the resource management systems they promote or apply, through the use of participatory, adaptive approaches to analysis, learning and technology generation such as farmer field schools. The project's support to negotiated approaches to addressing land use planning and land tenure issues will further enable communities to adapt to CC-related changes in biophysical and demographic conditions.</p>
<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed</p> <p>Please provide in text all relevant projects and programs and how they will be coordinated with.</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed</p>	<p>Coordination is proposed in detail in Section 3.1.2 of the Project Document</p>
<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <input type="checkbox"/> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. <input type="checkbox"/> Assess the project's</p>	<p>Please specify, quantify, and refine all these aspects at CEO endorsement stage</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed</p>	<p>These aspects have now been addressed in detail in ProDoc Sections 2.1 (innovativeness), 2.3 (sustainability) and 2.2 (scaling up)</p>

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<p>strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</p>		
<p>17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>72% of the co-financing is from the government in kind and is presented as a risk. How realistic is this? Less than 1% of the co-financing is in cash 9/20 A COUPLE OF ADDITIONAL CO-FINANCE SOURCES HAVE BEEN ADDED BUT IS THIS NOT STILL MAINLY THE SAME?</p> <p>Please strengthen co-financing plan, including sources and project management, at CEO endorsement stage</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed</p>	<p>Additional co-financing has now been negotiated (USD7,170,000 compared to the USD5,400,000 indicated in the PIF, with an increased proportion of "grant" (57%).</p>
<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>OK. Please specify co-financing component</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed</p>	<p>Co-financing for project management is 5% of the sub-total of the components.</p>
<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from STAP?</p>	<p>25 March 2016 The response to comment 5 doesn't explain how social barriers to adoption of the alternative approach to raising pigs will be overcome. Please address this comment too.</p> <p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p>	<p>Response to comment of 25 March 2016 It is the availability of pigs to meet social obligations that is culturally important, rather than the practice of allowing pigs to roam freely. Stakeholders consulted during the PPG phase all considered that it would be socially beneficial to control roaming pigs: currently, these are regarded by all community members as a pest that destroys crops and backyard plants, as well as damaging the environment, sanitary conditions and aesthetic values in the villages. To date there have been many conflicts within the villages, with people killing or injuring pigs that damage their crops, and seek compensation from their owners. Enclosed management would generate major benefits as it would allow community members to plant whatever they want to plant in their home gardens and tax allotments without the risk of pig damage. This explanation has now been added to paragraph 159 (introduction to Component 3) of the Project Document.</p>
	<p>25 March 2016 Please ensure that STAP comments be reflected in the project document and not only in the Annex B (see in particular the comment on rainwater harvesting techniques).</p>	<p>Response to comment of 25 March 2016 Explanation of the project's support to rainwater harvesting has now been included in paragraphs 166-168 (introduction to Component 3) of the Project Document.</p> <p>References to the locations in the text where STAP comments are</p>

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	24 June 2016: Addressed.	addressed have been included into the response matrix.
	<p>6 July 2016: Please provide a table showing that all council comments have been addressed and indicate where is the information in the project document.</p>	<p>21 July 2016: Responses to the Council member comments have been addressed with reference to the relevant part of the project document. A table is provided above.</p>
26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?	<p>6 April 2015 Not yet. Some comments above still need to be addressed.</p>	<p>Response to comment of 6 April 2016 Please see the responses above.</p>
	<p>6 April 2015 Furthermore, regarding the cofinancing letters: the activity financed by the GIZ under 3.1.2 is not the same as the one in the project document and the letter from the Asian Development Bank does not correspond to any cofinancing resources in table C. Please explain.</p>	<p>Response to comment of 6 April 2016 This is due to a typographical error in the cofinancing letter, which should refer to activity 2.1.3 rather than 3.1.2. The text of the letter does however identify clearly the name of the activity. If necessary, a corrected letter can be obtained from GIZ at a future date, but we hope that this explanation is sufficient to allow the current letter to be accepted at this stage in order to avoid delaying CEO Endorsement. The letter from ADB should not have been included in the submitted package (the Government cofinancing consists partly of ADB funds).</p>
	<p>6 April 2015 Regarding the tracking tools: 1/BD: the date of submission is missing. The area directly covered by the project of 6,180 ha is not reflected in the project document.</p>	<p>Response to comment of 6 April 2016 Please see the added explanation of the 6,180ha figure in the Project Document Section 1.4.4 (new paragraph 200), and the new table 10.</p>
	<p>6 April 2015 2/ LD: The surfaces of the areas focus of the intervention do not appear clearly in the project document. Please establish a clear relation between the TTs and the project document. In particular, but not only, to which concrete activity and the 350 ha SFM correspond in the document?</p>	<p>Response to comment of 6 April 2016 The areas of each of the target areas for intervention are now given in Section 1.2. The areas given in the TTs are now explained in the new Table 10 of the Project Document. As now explained in Table 10 of the Project Document, the 350ha of SFM 1 corresponds to the area of 'Eua watershed forest that will be under improved forest management; this figure also corresponds to the area of tropical moist broadleaf and mixed forestland given in the BD TT</p>
	<p>6 April 2015 3/ Again the figures in the table (areas and tCO2eq) are not always reflected in the project document. Please establish the consistence between the TT and the project document.</p>	<p>Response to comment of 6 April 2016 The new Table 10 now explains the relations between the figures in the TTs and the Project Document. Row 76 in the SFM TT (25ha) corresponds to the figure in Table 8 of the ProDoc, described as: "Avoided encroachment on 'Eua. The total land available to Tonga community below the watershed is 75ha, of which 50ha is currently under crop. This means 25ha can be avoided from encroachment and be rehabilitated at the water catchment if the</p>

Question	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>equivalent amount of land is made available for cropping when pigs stop degradation and ruining of crops."</p> <p>The tCO2 figure in Row 76 of the SFM TT (22,289t) corresponds with the 4 year balance for deforestation in Table 9.</p> <p>The CO2 figure (30,004t) in Row 75 of the SFM TT corresponds with the total of the other amounts in the 4 year balance column of Table 9 of the ProDoc.</p> <p>The area figure in row 75 of the SFM TT should correspond to the total of the other areas in Table 9 ($70 + 90 + 100 + 155 = 415\text{ha}$), but in fact the figure erroneously given was 395ha. This has now been corrected in the SFM TT.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁶

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

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: USD 100,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
1. Stakeholder workshop and consultations Activity 1.1: Inception Workshop Activity 1.2: Project team and Project Steering Committee (PSC) Activity 1.3: Local Consultations Activity 1.4: Final Validation Workshop	25,000	25,000	0
2. Collection and analysis of information and elaboration of activities for integrated land and agro-ecosystem management and sustainable forest management Activity 2.1: Collection and analysis of socio-economic and cultural information on project sites Activity 2.2: Collection and analysis of information for development of legal and policy frameworks to support land administration and agro-ecosystem management Activity 2.3: Selection of sites and activities for integrated agro-ecosystem management systems Activity 2.4: Selection of sites and activities for Sustainable Forest Tenure and Management Activity 2.5: Capacity development at national level in land administration and agro-ecosystem management	45,000	45,000	0
3. Consolidation of PPG findings into the project document	30,000	23,984	6,016
Total	100,000	93,984	6,016

⁶ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent funds, 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 activities.

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

NA

