



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

| | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| Project Title: Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management | | | |
| Country: | Vanuatu | GEF Project ID: ¹ | 5397 |
| GEF Agency(ies): | FAO | GEF Agency Project ID: | 622863 |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | Ministries of Climate Change; Lands and Natural Resources; Agriculture, Quarantine, Forestry and Fisheries | Submission Date: Resubmission Date: | 28 June 2016 29 July 2016 |
| GEF Focal Area (s): | BD, LD, SFM, CCM, IW | Project Duration(Months) | 60 |
| Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> | “Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods” | Project Agency Fee (\$): | 414,511 |

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

| Focal Area Objectives | Expected FA Outcomes | Expected FA Outputs | Trust Fund | Grant Amount (\$) | Co-financing (\$) |
|--|---|---|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems | 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management. | 1. New protected areas (6) and coverage (5,000 hectares) of unprotected ecosystems. 3. Sustainable financing plans (5: 1 national and 4 island-specific) | GEFTF | 1,651,377 | 5,482,464 |
| LD-3: Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape | 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities 3.3: Increased investments in integrated landscape management | 3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested 3.3 Appropriate actions to diversify the financial resource base 3.4 Information on INRM technologies and good practice guidelines disseminated | GEFTF | 550,459 | 1,827,488 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------|------------------|-------------------|
| CCM-5: Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land use change, and forestry | Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests and non-forest lands, including peatland GHG emissions avoided and carbon sequestered | Carbon stock monitoring systems established Forests and non-forest lands under good management practices | GEFTF | 1,143,261 | 3,795,552 |
| IW-3: Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for joint, ecosystem-based management of trans-boundary water systems | 3.1 Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for ICM integrating with existing IWRM commitments 3.2 On-the-ground modest actions implemented for coastal habitat demonstrations for “blue forests” to protect carbon 3.3: IW portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/KM/experience sharing | National interministry committees established; Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses & Strategic Action Programmes; local IWRM or ICM plans Demo-scale local action implemented, including in basins with melting ice and to restore/protect coastal “blue forests” Active experience /sharing/ learning practiced in the IW portfolio | GEFTF | 145,551 | 483,220 |
| SFM-1 Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services | 1.1: Enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector and across sectors. 1.2: Good management practices applied in existing forests. 1.3: Good management practices adopted by relevant economic actors. | Payment for ecosystem services (PES) systems established (5: 1 national and 4 island-specific). Forest area (8,025ha of agroforestry systems, agrosylvopastoral systems and restoration) under sustainable management, separated by forest type. Types and quantity of services generated through SFM. | GEFTF | 600,000 | 1,991,961 |
| SFM-2 Strengthen the enabling environment to reduce GHG emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhance carbon sinks from LULUCF activities. | 2.1: Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks. 2.2: New revenue for SFM created through engaging in the carbon market. | National institutions certifying carbon credits (1). National forest carbon monitoring systems in place (1). Innovative financing mechanisms established (2). | GEFTF | 515,032 | 1,709,872 |
| Total project costs | | | | 4,605,680 | 15,290,558 |

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

| Project Objective: To test and implement sustainable and integrated management of forest, land and marine resources to achieve effective ridge-to-reef (R2R) conservation in selected priority watersheds in Vanuatu | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|---|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Project Component | Grant Type | Expected Outcomes | Expected Outputs | Trust Fund | Grant Amount (\$) | Confirmed Co-financing (\$) |
| 1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated sustainable land and coastal management. | TA | <p>1.1 Integrated R2R considerations mainstreamed into sector development policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism policy makes specific commitments for promoting the channelling of tourism income to environmental management - Agriculture, livestock, forestry and planning policy documents include specific commitments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services - Fisheries and planning policy documents include specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches <p>1.2 Environmental planning and decision-making processes take integrated R2R considerations into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EIA procedures specifically require consideration of landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics - 50% of EIAs specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics - 50% of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics <p>1.3 Increased financial resources channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$150,000/year channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management by project end | <p>1.1.1: Policy proposals for channelling tourism income to environmental management</p> <p>1.1.2: Policy proposals for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services</p> <p>1.1.3: Policy proposals in support of ICZM including protection of coastal and marine ecosystems on which fisheries sustainability and marine biodiversity depend</p> <p>1.2.1: Improved procedures for approving lease applications</p> <p>1.2.2: Improved capacities and regulatory instruments for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) considerations into EIA studies and determinations</p> <p>1.2.3: Land use planning guidelines providing for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) environmental and social processes</p> <p>1.3.1 Corporate social and environmental responsibility commitments from the cruise industry</p> | GEFTF | 410,924 | 1,364,242 |
| 2: Integrated ridge to reef management in priority | TA/ INV | <p>2.1 Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100,000ha in target localities | 2.1.1: Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management | GEFTF | 3,444,675 | 11,436,098 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| island localities | | <p>covered by integrated landscape/seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 75% of stakeholders in all categories consider that the mechanisms adequately represent them and address their needs. - On at least 80% of the land affected by management decisions (leases, land use changes) between project mid-term and end, the decisions coincide with provisions of R2R plans, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms <p>2.2 Farmers, ranchers and fishers are managing resources sustainably in target localities, resulting in improved flows of ecosystem goods and services, as a result of increased capacities and awareness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6,625ha increase in area over which sustainable hillside farming practices are applied - 600ha increase in area over which sustainable hillside ranching practices are applied - 500ha increase in area over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied - Increase of 10% in reef health indices - 10% increase in fish catch per unit of effort - 14% reduction in quantities of firewood used for drying of copra and other agricultural products <p>2.3 Capacities for generation of ecosystem goods and services are permanently restored in priority areas affected by land degradation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 800ha of degraded lands subject to restoration with direct project support, with resulting carbon benefits of 153,329tCO_{2eq} | <p>covering all three target localities</p> <p>2.1.2: Norms for resource management practices developed and agreed among stakeholder groups covering target localities</p> <p>2.1.3: Integrated landscape/seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners</p> <p>2.2.1: Extension modules for agriculture, fisheries, livestock and forestry including integrated R2R concepts</p> <p>2.2.2: Field schools and mechanisms for participatory learning and experimentation in target localities</p> <p>2.2.3: Pilot solar driers for copra and other agricultural products</p> <p>2.3.1: Ecosystem restoration programmes implemented in all three target localities</p> | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----|---|--|-------|---------|-----------|
| | | <p>2.4 Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1,300 local people receive a total of USD300,000 of economic benefits from sustainable ecotourism - 230 local people receive a total of USD65,000 of economic benefits from sustainable NTFP extraction - 120 local people receive a total of USD45,000 of economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes <p>2.5 Strengthened protected area network in target localities, filling ecosystem coverage gaps and responding to overall R2R management plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5,000ha increase in area coverage of PAs (Community Conservation Areas and Marine Protected Areas) in target localities - 30,000ha of buffer zones and corridors defined for special management in the target localities - Management effectiveness ratings of 8 existing and 6 new PAs increase from an average of 18.4 to 85. <p>2.6 Sustainable resource management and PA management supported by sustainable financing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual income of USD20,000 for PAs and ecosystems management in target localities | <p>2.4.1: Ecotourism development plans formulated with local participation in each target locality, including carrying capacity studies</p> <p>2.4.2: Ecotourism initiatives managed by local communities or with provision for generating significant benefits for local communities, including provisions for environmental sustainability</p> <p>2.4.3: Plans and norms agreed by local stakeholders in each target locality for sustainable extraction and marketing of NTFPs, incorporating results of ecological studies.</p> <p>2.5.1: MPA and CCA agreements negotiated and signed by government and local communities, with corresponding mapping and demarcation</p> <p>2.5.2: MPA and CCA agreements negotiated and signed by government and local communities, with corresponding mapping and demarcation</p> <p>2.5.3: Local PA management committees, functioning with capacities for adaptive management</p> <p>2.6.1: PA-specific financial management and investment plans</p> <p>2.6.2: Local-level financial mechanisms in support of PA management and landscape restoration</p> | | | |
| 3: Knowledge management | TA | 3.1 Best practices and lessons learned are systematized and disseminated: | 3.1.1: Systematisation and dissemination documents | GEFTF | 530,762 | 1,762,096 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|------------------|-------------------|
| | | - Directors of all key Government stakeholder institutions (departments) reporting access to best practices and lessons learned as being useful 3.2 Decision-making and planning are guided by information on trends in ecosystem conditions: - 100% lease application determinations and 100% of EIA studies in the target localities take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions 3.3 Project management is subject to effective M&E that feeds back into adaptive management decisions. | 3.2.1: Ecosystem monitoring systems in provincial government offices, feeding data on ecosystem conditions and trends to local organisations in target localities 3.3.1 Project M&E system | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | | 4,386,361 | 14,562,436 |
| Project management Cost (PMC) | | | | | 219,319 | 728,122 |
| Total project costs | | | | | 4,605,680 | 15,290,558 |

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 (\$) |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------|--------------------------|
| GEF agency | FAO | Grant | 1,175,000 |
| GEF agency | FAO | In-kind | 600,000 |
| Bilateral agency | Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research | Grant | 571,516 |
| NGO | Vanuatu Association of Non-Governmental Organisations | Grant | 650,000 |
| NGO | Vanuatu Association of Non-Governmental Organisations | In-kind | 5,000 |
| NGO | Live & Learn Vanuatu | In-kind | 20,000 |
| International Agency | The Pacific Community (SPC) | Grant | 1,354,597 |
| National Government | Vanuatu Government | Grant | 10,000,000 |
| National Government | Vanuatu Government | In-kind | 500,000 |
| Academic institution | New York Botanical Garden | Grant | 414,445 |
| Total | | | 15,290,558 |

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 | Vanuatu | 1,651,377 | 148,623 | 1,800,000 |
| FAO | GEF TF | Land Degradation | Vanuatu | 550,459 | 49,541 | 600,000 |
| FAO | GEF TF | Climate Change | Vanuatu | 1,143,261 | 102,894 | 1,246,155 |
| FAO | GEF TF | International Waters | Vanuatu | 145,551 | 13,099 | 158,650 |
| FAO | GEF TF | Sustainable Forest Management | Vanuatu | 1,115,032 | 100,353 | 1,215,385 |
| Total Grant Resources | | | | 4,605,680 | 414,510 | 5,020,190 |

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

| Component | Grant Amount (\$) | Co-financing (\$) | Project Total (\$) |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Local consultants | 847,412 | 2,868,551 | 3,715,963 |
| International consultants | 686,160 | 2,322,701 | 3,008,861 |

F. 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 significant changes from the approved PIF.

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

2. No changes from the approved PIF.

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

3. No changes from the approved PIF.

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

4. The threats and barriers presented in the PIF were largely validated through PPG studies. The only significant variations are as follows:

- Increased emphasis in the Project Document on tourism as a source of potential threats to environmental sustainability and global environmental values, given the very high growth rates in this sector (particularly the cruise ship sub-sector) over recent years.
- Increased emphasis on limited access to information as a barrier to maximizing the potential for environmental decision-making processes (e.g. lease and planning determinations and EIA processes) to contribute to the status of global environmental values.
- Increased emphasis on the significance of imbalances in power and the ineffectiveness of mechanisms for dialogue, planning and decision-making as barriers to environmental and social sustainability.

A.5 Incremental / Additional cost reasoning:

5. The organization and sequence of the key elements of the project reasoning have been modified in order to improve logical flow; this does not however imply significant modifications to the overall logic and justification of the project. These modifications are in accordance with the comment of the GEF Council Member from Germany: “Germany requests further elaboration on how the ridge-to-reef approach can be better demonstrated in specific watershed areas or zones as the project components still seem not adequately interconnected in terms of implementation arrangements. It might be a challenge in MFA projects to aggregate activities when distinct project components are formulated along the line of the different constituent focal areas.”

6. In accordance with typical GEF practice, the first component deals with the strengthening of the “enabling environment”; the second with field level interventions and the third with knowledge management. The second component now brings together all of the types of field level interventions that are necessary to ensure the delivery of a coherent and integrated “ridge to reef” approach, including the management of productive landscapes and protected areas, and ecosystem restoration. This approach emphasizes the position of protected areas as elements of overall integrated landscapes, rather than standalone items.

7. There has been some modification to the indicator targets, on the basis of PPG analyses:
 - The target of 35,000ha expansion in the PA network has been rationalized: while the overall area target has been maintained, 5,000ha of this will consist of PAs as such (Community Conservation Areas and Marine Protected Areas), and 30,000ha will consist of corridors and buffer zones in accordance with the project's focus on the integrated management of landscapes, which will involve addressing spatial dynamics of threats and promoting spatial connectivity.
 - The target of 8,000ha of restoration proposed in the PIF has now been broken down into direct restoration of 800ha, involving the planting and assisted natural regeneration of degraded areas subject to open access, where individual farmers could not be expected to carry out this investment using their own resources; 6,625ha of agroforestry systems; and 600ha of agro-sylvo-pastoral systems. The agroforestry and agrosylvopastoral systems will be promoted through technical assistance rather than direct investment, given that these systems are expected to be attractive to farmers and sustainable in productive, economic and environmental terms. These systems will involve increases in tree numbers in the target landscapes/watersheds, as proposed in the PIF.
8. Based on the results of PPG studies, it is now proposed to use a PA financing model based on a continuous through-flow of funds, with annual expenditures being balanced by regular inputs from sources such as the tourism industry; rather than a "trust fund" model (as originally proposed in the PIF) under which expenditure needs would be covered through interest earned on an initial injection of capital. This "through-flow" model is preferred for two reasons:
 - Given the buoyancy of the tourism industry in the region, the attractiveness of the country for tourism (and the relatively limited degree to which its potential has been realized to date) and the absence of significant concerns over political stability, there is room for a high degree of confidence that the industry will be able to make significant and reliable regular financial contributions to environmental activities in the foreseeable future.
 - The "through-flow" model is administratively simpler, with lower transaction costs, than the trust fund model.

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:

9. No major changes from the approved PIF.
10. 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.
11. 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.

| Risk | Rating | Mitigation Measures |
|---|---------------|--|
| Climate change may exceed the coping ranges of the proposed resource management strategies. | Medium | The project will focus especially on developing capacities for the formulation of natural resource management strategies among stakeholders at all levels, through the participatory approaches to technology generation and transfer proposed under Component 2, and the capacities for knowledge management and response to be promoted under Component 3. This will maximize the ability of the stakeholders to adapt to currently unforeseen future climatic extremes, rather than adhering to predetermined and rigid solutions designed for a limited range of conditions. |
| Leakage of project threats resulting from site-specific actions (for example unsustainable intensification of agriculture, increased logging in non-project areas) issues | Low | There is a certain degree of unavoidable risk of leakage given that the target localities will not cover the entirety of the islands in question. The net outcomes in terms of environmental impacts will, however be less than in the without-project scenario, given that the project's actions will not be limited to the target localities themselves. They will also include the strengthening of institutional capacities at national and provincial levels for land use planning, environmental assessment and PA prioritisation, which will be applied beyond the project areas themselves; in addition, the policy work foreseen under Outcome 1.1 will have nationwide benefits in terms of the avoidance of the potential impacts of sector development. It is furthermore expected that the innovative models of multi-stakeholder planning and governance promoted in the target localities will be replicated elsewhere on the target islands and beyond, thereby progressively reducing the extent of the areas in which leakage might occur. The involvement in the processes of the councils of chiefs of each of the target islands will have significant implications in terms of island-wide replication of the model. |
| Social and institutional risks | | |
| Resistance among key actors to taking or modifying actions in support of environmental sustainability | Medium | Many policy documents already contain strong commitments to environmental sustainability, but there is still a risk of some individual sector policies (e.g. livestock and tourism) being pursued at the expense of environmental considerations. The project's actions in relation to policy influence will recognize the valid motivations of the Government in stimulating the target sectors, as motors of national economic growth: rather than proposing to control their expansion per se, it will therefore focus on promoting the incorporation of considerations of environmental sustainability into sector growth. This will, in the medium and long terms, be positive for the sectors themselves, as it will ensure that they do not undermine the resource base on which they themselves depend, and at the same time will help to increase their resilience to climatic shocks; it will also help to ensure that the growth of individual sectors does not occur at the expense of the general good, undermining the sustainability of development as a whole; at the same time, this focus on sustainability will help to optimize the outcomes of these sectors in terms of their impacts on biodiversity and other global environmental values. |
| Resistance among local communities to collaborating in landscape planning, PA management, sustainable resource management and | Medium | The project will adopt a highly participatory and culturally-sensitive approach to raising awareness among community members of the social implications of resource management decisions, in order to maximize their motivation for collaboration in their own interests. Furthermore, the processes of inter-community analysis and negotiated planning will be subject to prior consultation and consent by the national and island-specific councils of chiefs, in order to ensure their credibility among |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| restoration. | | local community members. |
| Economic risks | | |
| Variations in availability of funding for PA management and environmental management | Low | The financing strategy is dependent on stability or growth in the levels of tourism activity, which is intended to be one of the main sources of income at local and national levels. Projections for tourism growth are, however, very positive. In order to protect against the risks of short-term downturns in income (for example following hurricanes), it is proposed that the resulting fund will be managed cautiously, building up a sufficient reserve to allow it to weather such periods. Furthermore, the nature of Vanuatu's small community-managed PAs means that such possible funding shortfalls would have limited implications for their management and exposure to threats in the short term, although over a longer term they would limit opportunities to implement proposed investments in infrastructure and management/planning mechanisms. |

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

12. 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.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

13. A list of key stakeholders and their potential roles in the project is provided in the table below.

| Stakeholder | Roles in the Project |
|---|--|
| Local communities | |
| Local communities using resources from project sites and PAs, including subsistence and semi-commercial farmers, fishers and NTFP users, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Main project beneficiaries and partners in livelihood activities - Collaborators in implementing project activities - Support for developing strategies for sustainable resource management - Recipients of trainings, awareness-raising and participants in conservation activities |
| Customary land owners | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partners in conservation through Community Conservation Area (CCA) Agreements |
| Local people living adjacent to PAs and people involved currently in tourism activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recipients of trainings. - Target group of project activities (e.g. job creation by ecotourism, alternate livelihood, etc.) |
| The general public | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recipients of awareness raising and participants in public education activities |
| Government of Vanuatu | |
| Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources; Ministry of Agriculture, Quarantine, Forestry and Fisheries; Ministry for Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-Hazards, Environment, Energy and Disaster Management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Main implementation partners and responsible for day to day execution, management, coordination and monitoring of the SLM, SFM, agriculture related and sylvo-pastoral activities - Collaboration in establishment of community nurseries, distribution of seedlings and related activities - Recipients of training - Collaboration in establishment of demonstration site/s and related training activities. - Support with policy in strengthening PAs, PA network system, and PA |

| Stakeholder | Roles in the Project |
|--|--|
| | financing - National government oversight of project implementation - Support for project management/oversight and M&E |
| Extension staff in agriculture, forestry and fisheries departments and MLNR Environment Department | - Project beneficiaries through the training and capacity building programmes. - Project partners providing implementation support to the project at community level |
| Ministry of Finance | - Partner in establishing and operating the PA financing mechanisms. - Technical support for Government co-financing arrangements |
| MTTCI | - Tourism and livelihood linked microenterprises promotion - Co-financing partner. |
| Ministry of Justice | - Legal support in realizing Community Conservation Area agreements and Marine Protected Areas and other PAs and further policy legislation |
| Provincial Governments | - Important partner in ensuring awareness and community ownership and on the project - Active partner in supporting implementation of project activities through existing provincial institutional structures - Implementing trainings and workshops at site level - Member of project implementation committees |
| Regional Development Training Centres | - Support in conducting trainings and capacity building for all stakeholders |
| UN REDD+ program | - Collaboration in undertaking assessment and monitoring - Continuation of monitoring beyond the term of existing planned activities |
| Civil Society and Non- Governmental Organizations, academic institutions and Research Organizations | |
| Civil Society and Non-Governmental Organizations – VANGO | - As project partners particularly at community level, providing support in community mobilization, building capacities, dissemination of knowledge and in implementation of project activities during and sustaining the same beyond project tenure. - As project partners and beneficiaries through capacity development and other trainings - Awareness raising in conservation and PA management and in communication of project activities. - Project partner: Extending expertise in SFM and SLM. |
| Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research | - Project partner - Collaboration in development and distribution of training materials |
| University of South Pacific | - Support in developing curriculum and training material and pictorial tool kits - Providing support in implementing training programmes and in awareness raising |
| International NGOs | |
| Live and Learn | - Collaboration in implementation of forest carbon pilot project and subsequent activities |
| WWF | - Collaboration in extending savings clubs towards income generating activities |
| World Vision | - Collaboration in implementation of livelihood activities in demonstration sites in project areas in collaboration with Integrated Community |

| Stakeholder | Roles in the Project |
|--|--|
| | Development Program |
| IUCN | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible collaboration through MARSH project in development of management plans, biodiversity studies and carbon monitoring. - Mangrove ecosystem management and rehabilitation for enhanced livelihoods of community and climate change adaptation through MESCAL project |
| Bilateral, multilateral and regional organizations | |
| FAO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GEF Executing Agency. Responsible for providing technical assistance and overall management and supervision of the project implementation, management, oversight and funding. - Support for project M&E. - Enhancing understanding related to REDD+ (forest carbon management) R2R and capacity development for MRV - Providing facilitation services and technical assistance as support to VPA processes - Reducing illegal logging by facilitating sustainable forest harvesting practices and enhancing natural forestry management - Providing technical support in sustainable land management Development and dissemination of lessons learned |
| The Pacific Community (SPC) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of technical services and capacity building related to improvement forest management and in SFM practices for FSC certification - Producing extension materials for SFM - Co-financing partner |
| SOPAC | - GIS mapping through GIZ |
| Australian Aid | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support in developing agroforestry systems for smallholders, with tree species for future commercial harvest at an early age - Development of value-adding small scale industries for local communities from both timber and non-timber forest products - Co-financing partner |
| European Union | - Co-financing partner. |
| NZAid | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tree nurseries and forestry training through Department of Forestry - Provide vocational training of rural youth through the Vanuatu Rural Development Training Centres Association - Co-financing partner. |
| Secretariat for Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) | - Partner in implementation of project activities Potential collaboration with technical support |
| Private Sector Organizations | |
| Private sector | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project partners where land-use developments are of a commercial nature and potential co-financing partners through PA sponsorship. - Key actors in adding value to both forest based and agricultural and marine products. Vital to generating sustainable income to local communities as project partners |

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:

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

- Assured access to environmental goods and services such as clean water, due to reduced risks of deforestation in key catchment areas resulting from improvements in governance under Outcome 2.1.
- Increased sustainability and productivity of agricultural production systems due to the incorporation of improved practices such as agroforestry and cover crops, as a result of actions in support of Outcome 2.2.
- Improved opportunities to obtain income in a sustainable manner from ecotourism and from forest and agroforestry products, as a result of project actions under Outcome 2.4.

15. The livelihood improvement activities proposed under Outcome 2.4, including community-based ecotourism and the sustainable harvesting and sale of NTFPs, are directly related to conservation actions as they will provide direct incentives that will further contribute to local stakeholders' motivations for supporting conservation. In both cases they will be subject to technical studies and participatory planning in order to ensure compatibility with and contribution to conservation goals.

16. There are particular opportunities for "conservation-friendly" forms of livelihood support activities to generate benefits for women, especially in the case of ecotourism, where they can earn income directly from the management of visitor accommodation and catering facilities, and NTFPs, given that existing value chains for NTFPs are largely controlled by women. These options compare favourably with the alternative scenario featuring land conversion for agriculture and ranching, the economic and power benefits from which typically accrue mostly to men.

Summary of socioeconomic benefits:

| | |
|--|---|
| | |
| Outcome 2.4: Local people in target localities with opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1,300 local people receive a total of USD300,000 of economic benefits from sustainable ecotourism - 230 local people receive a total of USD65,000 of economic benefits from sustainable NTFP extraction - 120 local people receive a total of USD45,000 of economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes |
| Population of target areas (benefiting directly or indirectly through e.g. assured access to environmental goods and services, and improved participation in environmental governance and decision-making) | 12,410 |
| Estimated number of farmers with increased capacities for application of sustainable production systems | 6,000, over 7,225ha (6,625ha of agroforestry and 600ha of agrosylvopastoral systems) |

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

17. The landscape-level approach of the project will be a major factor contributing to cost-effectiveness, as it will allow economies of scale in terms of the size of the area influenced by the decisions taken in the participatory processes to be facilitated by the project. This wide spatial focus will also maximize opportunities for scaling up pilot level investments in natural resource management practices to a landscape level.

18. The focus of the project on supporting the predominant PA model in Vanuatu, that of small-scale community-managed areas, will also contribute to cost-effectiveness and to sustainability, as the degree of community buy-in featured in these areas minimizes the need for costly investment of external resources.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN

19. 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 |

20. 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.

21. 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 MTE 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) |
|-----------------|--|---|----------------------|
| Albert Williams | Director GEF Operational Focal Point | Department of Environment Protection and Conservation, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources | 04/04/2013 |

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

| This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project. | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Agency Coordinator, Agency Name | Signature | Date (Month, day, year) | Project Contact Person | Telephone | Email Address |
| Gustavo Merino Director Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation and Programme Management FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy TCI-Director@fao.org | | | 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

Project outcomes and impacts:

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | End of Project Target | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|---|--|---|---|--|----------------------------|---|
| Objective: To test and implement sustainable and integrated management of forest, land and marine resources to achieve effective ridge-to-reef (R2R) conservation in selected priority watersheds in Vanuatu | | | | | | |
| Component 1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated sustainable land and coastal management. | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Integrated R2R considerations mainstreamed into sector development policies | Indicator 1.1.1: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for channeling tourism income to environmental management | Generalised policy statements exist, but in different sector policy documents and without specific commitments | Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for promoting the channeling of tourism income to environmental management | Tourism policy makes specific commitments for promoting the channeling of tourism income to environmental management | Review of policy documents | Continued Government commitment to ensuring economic development is combined with environmental and social sustainability |
| | Indicator 1.1.2: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services | Several sector policies example agriculture, forestry, land and livestock make broad reference to maintenance of ecosystem goods and services but without specific definitions or commitments | Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services | Agriculture, livestock, forestry and planning policy documents include specific commitments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services | Review of policy documents | |
| | Indicator 1.1.3: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM | Existing Fisheries and Environment policies make generalized references, but lack a vision of inter-sector integration | Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches | Fisheries and planning policy documents include specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches | Review of policy documents | |

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | End of Project Target | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| | approaches | | | | | |
| | Output 1.1.1: Policy proposals for channelling tourism income to environmental management Output 1.1.2: Policy proposals for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services Output 1.1.3: Policy proposals in support of ICZM including protection of coastal and marine ecosystems on which fisheries sustainability and marine biodiversity depend | | | | | |
| 1.2 Environmental planning and decision-making processes take integrated R2R considerations into account | Indicator 1.2.1: Percentage of EIA studies that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics | All EIA studies are site-specific with little or no consideration of landscape-wide dynamics | EIA procedures specifically require consideration of landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics | 50% of EIA studies specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics | Review of EIA studies | Political will and resources to apply planning and decision-making instruments |
| | Indicator 1.2.2: Percentage of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics | No planning decisions to date have adequately considered landscape-wide dynamics | Planning determinations are required to specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics | 50% of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics | Review of planning determinations | |
| | Output 1.2.1: Improved procedures for approving lease applications Output 1.2.2: Improved capacities and regulatory instruments for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) considerations into EIA studies and determinations Output 1.2.2: Land use planning guidelines providing for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) environmental and social processes | | | | | |
| 1.3: Increased financial resources channelled from the tourism sector | Indicator 1.3.1: Amount of financial resources channelled from the tourism | No reliable figures available, but assumed to be negligible | \$75,000/year channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management by project end | \$150,000/year channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management by project end ³ | Interviews with tourism sector actors and Department of Tourism | Political commitment to negotiation with cruise industry |

³ Cruise companies, their passengers and crew spent AUS\$34.6 million (US\$25 million) in Vanuatu in 2013. Using a conservative assumption of growth to \$30 million/year, \$150,000/year would be 0.5% of total spending.

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | End of Project Target | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| to environmental conservation and PA management | sector to environmental conservation and PA management | | | | | Commitment of cruise industry to corporate responsibility Maintenance of tourism levels |
| Output 1.3.1: Corporate social and environmental responsibility commitments from the cruise industry | | | | | | |
| Component 2: Integrated ridge to reef management in priority island localities | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance | Indicator 2.1.1: Area in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners | 0 ha | 50,000ha in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners | 100,000ha in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners | Review of plans | Commitment of stakeholders to resolving environmental issues through dialogue |
| | Indicator 2.1.2: Levels of satisfaction with multi-stakeholder mechanisms among stakeholders in target localities, by category (chiefs, other village members) | No surveys yet carried out of satisfaction with existing decision-making structures | At least 30% of stakeholders in all categories consider that the mechanisms adequately represent them and address their needs. | At least 75% of stakeholders in all categories consider that the mechanisms adequately represent them and address their needs. | Stakeholder surveys/focus groups | |
| | Indicator 2.1.3: Proportion of land area in target localities where management | No relevant provisions have as yet been generated through R2R plans, norms and dialogue mechanisms | On at least 40% of the land affected by management decisions (leases, land use changes) between project mid-term and end, the decisions coincide with provisions of R2R | On at least 80% of the land affected by management decisions (leases, land use changes) between project mid-term and end, the decisions coincide with | Review of outcomes of management decisions | |

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | End of Project Target | Means of Verification | Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|---|---|----------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|---|---|--|
| | decisions (leases, land use changes) coincide with provisions of R2R plans, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms | | plans, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms | provisions of R2R plans, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output 2.1.1: Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management covering all three target localities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output 2.1.2: Norms for resource management practices developed and agreed among stakeholder groups covering target localities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output 2.1.3: Integrated landscape/seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 Farmers, ranchers and fishers are managing resources sustainably, resulting in improved flows of ecosystem goods and services, as a result of increased capacities and awareness | Indicator 2.2.1: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside farming practices are applied | Approximately 13,250ha under cultivation with traditional farming practices @1ha worked/year/family | Area with improved farming practices: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>62</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>1,250</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>1,250</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>750</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>3,312</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha | SW Aneityum | 62 | Middle Bush Tanna | 1,250 | N. Efate | 1,250 | S. Pentecost | 750 | Total | 3,312 | Area with improved farming practices: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha⁴</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>125</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>2,500</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>2,500</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>1,500</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>6,625</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha ⁴ | SW Aneityum | 125 | Middle Bush Tanna | 2,500 | N. Efate | 2,500 | S. Pentecost | 1,500 | Total | 6,625 | Focus groups, farmer interviews and field inspections | Recognition by local stakeholders of the need to address environmental issues Economic and demographic pressures do not exceed the coping limits of the resource management practices |
| | Locality | ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SW Aneityum | 62 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Middle Bush Tanna | 1,250 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | N. Efate | 1,250 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | S. Pentecost | 750 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 3,312 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Locality | ha ⁴ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SW Aneityum | 125 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 2,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 2,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 1,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 6,625 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2.2.2: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside ranching practices are applied | N/A | Area with improved ranching practices: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>25</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>250</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>300</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha | SW Aneityum | 15 | Middle Bush Tanna | 25 | N. Efate | 250 | S. Pentecost | 10 | Total | 300 | Area with improved ranching practices: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>30</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>500</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>600</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha | SW Aneityum | 30 | Middle Bush Tanna | 50 | N. Efate | 500 | S. Pentecost | 20 | Total | 600 | Focus groups, farmer interviews and field inspections | Climate change does not exceed the coping limits of the resource management | |
| Locality | ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SW Aneityum | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 250 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 300 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Locality | ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SW Aneityum | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 600 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2.2.3: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which community-based fisheries | N/A | <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>300</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>500</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha | SW Aneityum | 100 | Middle Bush Tanna | 50 | N. Efate | 300 | S. Pentecost | 50 | Total | 500 | <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>300</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>500</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha | SW Aneityum | 100 | Middle Bush Tanna | 50 | N. Efate | 300 | S. Pentecost | 50 | Total | 500 | Focus groups, interviews and field inspections | | |
| Locality | ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SW Aneityum | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 300 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Locality | ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SW Aneityum | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 300 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

⁴ Assumes 0.5ha/family with sustainable hillside farming practices

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | End of Project Target | Means of Verification | Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|-------|----------|-------|--------------|-------|--|--------|--|----------|---|-------------|-----|-------------------|-------|----------|-------|--------------|-------|--|--------|--|-----------------------|---|-------------|-----|-------------------|-------|----------|-------|--------------|-------|--|--------|---|
| | regulations are effectively applied | | | | | practices | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.2.4: Reef health indices | To be determined at project start | | 10% improvement in index ratings in all sites (to be confirmed once baseline values are determined) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.2.5: Fish catch per unit of effort | To be determined at project start | 5% increase | 10% increase | Interviews with fishers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.2.6: Quantities of firewood used for drying of copra and other agricultural products | Annual consumption (t): <table><tr><th>Locality⁵</th><th>t</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>361</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>7,229</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>7,229</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>4,337</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>19,156</td></tr></table> | Locality ⁵ | t | SW Aneityum | | 361 | Middle Bush Tanna | 7,229 | N. Efate | 7,229 | S. Pentecost | 4,337 | | 19,156 | Annual consumption (t): <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>t</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>343</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>6,867</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>6,506</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>4,120</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>17,836</td></tr></table> | Locality | t | SW Aneityum | 343 | Middle Bush Tanna | 6,867 | N. Efate | 6,506 | S. Pentecost | 4,120 | | 17,836 | Annual consumption (t): <table><tr><th>Locality⁶</th><th>t</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>325</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>6,506</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>5,783</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>3,904</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>16,518</td></tr></table> Overall reduction in year 5 = 2,638t; total reduction over 5 years = 7,914t ⁷ . Total avoided emissions = 517tCO _{2eq} | Locality ⁶ | t | SW Aneityum | 325 | Middle Bush Tanna | 6,506 | N. Efate | 5,783 | S. Pentecost | 3,904 | | 16,518 | Focus groups, farmer interviews and field inspections |
| | Locality ⁵ | t | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SW Aneityum | 361 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 7,229 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 7,229 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 4,337 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 19,156 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Locality | t | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SW Aneityum | 343 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 6,867 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 6,506 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 4,120 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 17,836 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Locality ⁶ | t | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SW Aneityum | 325 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 6,506 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 5,783 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 3,904 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 16,518 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output 2.2.1: Extension modules for agriculture, fisheries, livestock and forestry including integrated R2R concepts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output 2.2.2: Field schools and mechanisms for participatory learning and experimentation in target localities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output 2.2.3: Pilot solar driers for copra and other agricultural products | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.3 Capacities for generation of ecosystem goods and services are permanently restored in | Indicator 2.3.1: Area of degraded lands subject to restoration, with resulting carbon benefits | 0 | | ha | | Field inspections | Commitment to restoration among local stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | SW Aneityum | 100 | SW Aneityum | | | 200 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Middle Bush Tanna | 100 | Middle Bush Tanna | | | 200 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | N. Efate | 100 | N. Efate | | | 200 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | S. Pentecost | 100 | S. Pentecost | | | 200 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Total | 400 | Total | | | 800 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | With resulting carbon | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

⁵ Total fuelwood consumption in Vanuatu in 2007 = 937,203t. Assumed 40% increase to present day gives 1,312,084t, of which 30% (393,625t) is estimated to be for drying of agricultural crops. The target localities contain an estimated 0.09%, 1.84%, 1.84% and 1.10% respectively of the national population; adjusting fuelwood consumption by the same proportions gives an estimated fuelwood consumption of 361, 7,229, 7,229 and 4,337t respectively per locality.

⁶ The introduction of solar driers is expected to reduce consumption of fuelwood for drying of agricultural crops by 10, 10, 20 and 10% respectively in the target localities.

⁷ Assumes a linear annual increase in reductions (20, 40, 60, 80 and 100% respectively at the ends of years 1,2,3,4 and 5 = 528, 1,055, 1,583, 2,110 and 2,638t = 7,914t total).

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | | | End of Project Target | | | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|--------|------------|---|--------|------------|--|--|
| priority areas affected by land degradation | | | | | | benefit from capture of 153,329tCO _{2eq} | | | | |
| | Output 2.3.1: Ecosystem restoration programmes implemented in all three target localities | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4 Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management | Indicator 2.4.1: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable ecotourism | TBD – a number of ecotourism ventures exist but little specific attention to sustainability | | People | Total US\$ | | People | Total US\$ | Focus groups and interviews with community members | Visitor numbers at adequate yet manageable levels Governance conditions in target communities |
| | | | SW Aneityum | 250 | 45,000 | SW Aneityum | 500 | 90,000 | | |
| | | | Middle Bush Tanna | 50 | 30,000 | Middle Bush Tanna | 100 | 60,000 | | |
| | | | N. Efate | 300 | 45,000 | N. Efate | 600 | 90,000 | | |
| | | | S. Pentecost | 50 | 15,000 | S. Pentecost | 100 | 30,000 | | |
| | | | Total | 650 | 150,000 | Total | 1,300 | 300,000 | | |
| | Indicator 2.4.2: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable NTFP extraction | TBD – handicrafts are currently produced but little specific attention to sustainability | | People | Total US\$ | | People | Total US\$ | Focus groups and interviews with community members | |
| | | | SW Aneityum | 40 | 9,750 | SW Aneityum | 80 | 19,500 | | |
| | | | Middle Bush Tanna | 30 | 6,500 | Middle Bush Tanna | 60 | 13,000 | | |
| | | | N. Efate | 25 | 45,000 | N. Efate | 50 | 90,000 | | |
| | | | S. Pentecost | 20 | 15,000 | S. Pentecost | 40 | 30,000 | | |
| | | | Total | 115 | 32,500 | Total | 230 | 65,000 | | |
| | Indicator 2.4.3: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes | 0 | | People | Total US\$ | | People | Total US\$ | Interviews and focus groups | |
| | | | SW Aneityum | 15 | 7,500 | SW Aneityum | 30 | 15,000 | | |
| | | | Middle Bush Tanna | 15 | 5,000 | Middle Bush Tanna | 30 | 10,000 | | |
| | | | N. Efate | 20 | 7,500 | N. Efate | 40 | 15,000 | | |
| | | | S. Pentecost | 10 | 2,500 | S. Pentecost | 20 | 5,000 | | |
| | | | Total | 60 | 22,500 | Total | 120 | 45,000 | | |
| Output 2.4.1: Ecotourism development plans formulated with local participation in each target locality, including carrying capacity studies | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output 2.4.2: Ecotourism initiatives managed by local communities or with provision for generating significant benefits for local communities, | | | | | | | | | | |

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | End of Project Target | Means of Verification | Assumptions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|-------------|----------------------------------|----|----------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------|---------------|--|----------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|--------|----------------|--|--|----------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------------|--------|--------------------|--------------|---|----|---------------------|----|-------------|----|---------------------|----|---------------|----|--------------|----|------------------------|----|----------------|----|--|----------------|----|-----------------------------|----|----------------------------------|----|----------|----|--------------------|----|--------------------|----|------|----|---------------------|----|-------------|----|---------------------|----|---------------|----|--------------|----|------------------------|----|----------------|----|---|--|
| | including provisions for environmental sustainability Output 2.4.3: Plans and norms agreed by local stakeholders in each target locality for sustainable extraction and marketing of NTFPs, incorporating results of ecological studies. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.5 Strengthened protected area network in target localities, filling ecosystem coverage gaps and responding to overall R2R management plans | Indicator 2.5.1: Increase in area coverage of PAs in target localities | Current PA areas: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>3,715</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>4,277</td></tr><tr><td>Gaua</td><td>5,826</td></tr><tr><td>Total:</td><td>13,838</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha | SW Aneityum | 10 | Middle Bush Tanna | 10 | N. Efate | 3,715 | S. Pentecost | 4,277 | Gaua | 5,826 | Total: | 13,838 | Proposed additional areas: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>600</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>400</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>600</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>800</td></tr><tr><td>Total:</td><td>2,400</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha | SW Aneityum | 600 | Middle Bush Tanna | 400 | N. Efate | 600 | S. Pentecost | 800 | Total: | 2,400 | Proposed additional areas: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>2,600</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>1,000</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>600</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>800</td></tr><tr><td>Total:</td><td>5,000</td></tr></table> | Locality | ha | SW Aneityum | 2,600 | Middle Bush Tanna | 1,000 | N. Efate | 600 | S. Pentecost | 800 | Total: | 5,000 | PA registers | Commitment to PAs in among local stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Locality | ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SW Aneityum | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 3,715 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 4,277 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gaua | 5,826 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | 13,838 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Locality | ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SW Aneityum | 600 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 400 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 600 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 800 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | 2,400 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Locality | ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SW Aneityum | 2,600 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Bush Tanna | 1,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. Efate | 600 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Pentecost | 800 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | 5,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.5.2: Management effectiveness ratings of existing and new PAs | <table><tr><td>Mystery Island</td><td>52</td></tr><tr><td>Central Aneityum (proposed)</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed)</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Numusetu</td><td>37</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Tanna CCA</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Tanna MPA</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>ELMA</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>Tanoliu Marine CCAs</td><td>23</td></tr><tr><td>JICA Lelepa</td><td>36</td></tr><tr><td>Lelepa Island Tours</td><td>38</td></tr><tr><td>New Efate CCA</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Bay Homo CCA</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Pentecost CCA</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Lake Letas CCA</td><td>18.4</td></tr></table> | Mystery Island | 52 | Central Aneityum (proposed) | 1 | SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed) | 1 | Numusetu | 37 | Proposed Tanna CCA | 0 | Proposed Tanna MPA | 0 | ELMA | 24 | Tanoliu Marine CCAs | 23 | JICA Lelepa | 36 | Lelepa Island Tours | 38 | New Efate CCA | 0 | Bay Homo CCA | 24 | Proposed Pentecost CCA | 0 | Lake Letas CCA | 18.4 | <table><tr><td>Mystery Island</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Central Aneityum (proposed)</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed)</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Numusetu</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Tanna CCA</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Tanna MPA</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>ELMA</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Tanoliu Marine CCAs</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>JICA Lelepa</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Lelepa Island Tours</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>New Efate CCA</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Bay Homo CCA</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Pentecost CCA</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>Lake Letas CCA</td><td>56</td></tr></table> | Mystery Island | 56 | Central Aneityum (proposed) | 56 | SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed) | 56 | Numusetu | 56 | Proposed Tanna CCA | 56 | Proposed Tanna MPA | 56 | ELMA | 56 | Tanoliu Marine CCAs | 56 | JICA Lelepa | 56 | Lelepa Island Tours | 56 | New Efate CCA | 56 | Bay Homo CCA | 56 | Proposed Pentecost CCA | 56 | Lake Letas CCA | 56 | <table><tr><td>Mystery Island</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Central Aneityum (proposed)</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed)</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Numusetu</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Tanna CCA</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Tanna MPA</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>ELMA</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Tanoliu Marine CCAs</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>JICA Lelepa</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Lelepa Island Tours</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>New Efate CCA</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Bay Homo CCA</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed Pentecost CCA</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Lake Letas CCA</td><td>85</td></tr></table> | Mystery Island | 85 | Central Aneityum (proposed) | 85 | SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed) | 85 | Numusetu | 85 | Proposed Tanna CCA | 85 | Proposed Tanna MPA | 85 | ELMA | 85 | Tanoliu Marine CCAs | 85 | JICA Lelepa | 85 | Lelepa Island Tours | 85 | New Efate CCA | 85 | Bay Homo CCA | 85 | Proposed Pentecost CCA | 85 | Lake Letas CCA | 85 | Interviews with PA managers and community members | |
| Mystery Island | 52 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Central Aneityum (proposed) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Numusetu | 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Tanna CCA | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Tanna MPA | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELMA | 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tanoliu Marine CCAs | 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JICA Lelepa | 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lelepa Island Tours | 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Efate CCA | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bay Homo CCA | 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Pentecost CCA | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lake Letas CCA | 18.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mystery Island | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Central Aneityum (proposed) | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed) | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Numusetu | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Tanna CCA | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Tanna MPA | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELMA | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tanoliu Marine CCAs | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JICA Lelepa | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lelepa Island Tours | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Efate CCA | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bay Homo CCA | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Pentecost CCA | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lake Letas CCA | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mystery Island | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Central Aneityum (proposed) | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed) | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Numusetu | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Tanna CCA | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Tanna MPA | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELMA | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tanoliu Marine CCAs | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JICA Lelepa | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lelepa Island Tours | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Efate CCA | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bay Homo CCA | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed Pentecost CCA | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lake Letas CCA | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.5.3: Area of buffer zones and corridors around | 0ha | 15,000ha | 30,000ha | Interviews with PA managers and community | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | End of Project Target | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|--|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | and between PAs in target localities | | | | members | |
| | Output 2.5.1: MPA and CCA agreements negotiated and signed by government and local communities, with corresponding mapping and demarcation | | | | | |
| | Output 2.5.2: MPA and CCA agreements negotiated and signed by government and local communities, with corresponding mapping and demarcation | | | | | |
| | Output 2.5.3: Buffer zones and corridors established between and around CCAs and MPAs | | | | | |
| | Output 2.5.4: International designations of PAs | | | | | |
| | Output 2.5.5: Management plans for each PA, harmonized with provisions of overall landscape management plans | | | | | |
| | Output 2.5.6: Local PA management committees, functioning with capacities for adaptive management | | | | | |
| 2.6 Sustainable resource management and PA management supported by sustainable financing | Indicator 2.6.1: Annual income for PAs and ecosystems management in target localities | 0 | \$10,000 per year across the target localities | \$20,000 year across the target localities | Interviews with PA managers and community representatives | Commitment and governance in provincial Governments and community organisations |
| | Output 2.6.1: PA-specific financial management and investment plans | | | | | |
| | Output 2.6.2: Local-level financial mechanisms in support of PA management and landscape restoration | | | | | |
| Component 3: Knowledge management | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Best practices and lessons learned are systematized and disseminated | Indicator 3.1.1: Numbers of decision-makers in key institutions reporting access to best practices and lessons learned as being useful | N/A | | Directors of all key Government stakeholder institutions (departments) | Interviews | Openness among decision-makers to using information |
| | Output 3.1.1: Mechanisms for systematisation, dissemination and awareness raising | | | | | |
| 3.2 Decision-making and planning are guided by information on trends in ecosystem conditions | Indicator 3.2.1: Proportions of lease application determinations in target localities that take into account monitoring data | 0 | 50% | 100% | Interviews with Department of Lands, reviews of lease determinations | Openness among decision-makers to using information |

| Outcomes | Indicators | Start of Project Baseline | Mid-term project Target | End of Project Target | Means of Verification | Assumptions |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|--|-------------|
| | on ecosystem conditions | | | | | |
| | Indicator 3.2.2: Proportions of EIA studies in the target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions | 0 | 50% | 100% | Review of EIA studies and determinations | |
| | Output 3.2.1: Systems in provincial government offices for management of information on ecosystem conditions and trends, feeding data to local organisations in target localities Output 3.2.2: Functioning Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) unit in the Department of Forestry | | | | | |
| 3.3 Project management is subject to effective M&E that feeds back into adaptive management decisions. | Indicator 3.3.1: | N/A | All project indicators are measured in a timely and accurate manner and the results fed into adaptive management of the project | All project indicators are measured in a timely and accurate manner and the results fed into adaptive management of the project | Review of project M&E system | N/A |
| | Outputs: 3.3.1 Functioning project M&E system | | | | | |

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

| Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>Noting that 75% of Vanuatu's economy is connected with tourism, it is unclear from the PIF whether there are coordination arrangements in place or planned at Ministerial level to provide strategic guidance on land use particularly at the coast, where STAP assumes most tourism is focused.</p> | <p>As explained in Section 1.1.14, legislative provisions exist for land use planning through the Physical Planning Act, and a national Land Use Planning and Zoning Policy is currently being drafted. There is, however, little capacity or experience to date with applying a strategic, landscape-wide vision to LUP. The project will address this through the following outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.2.1. Improved procedures for approving lease applications - 1.2.2. Improved capacities and regulatory instruments for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) considerations into EIA studies and determinations - 1.2.3. Land use planning guidelines providing for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) biological and social processes - 2.1.1. Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management covering all three target localities |
| <p>The PIF mentions that the root causes of the noted problems include poverty and population pressure linked to low education (and awareness) levels; development pressures, and inferred from the discussion about land leases, lack of enforceable spatial planning from strategic to local level. The project concept, however, does not address these root causes, except rather tangentially. STAP misses, for example, any mention of incentives for engaging in conservation and land improvement.</p> | <p>The project will address the relation between poverty and environmental degradation through Outcome 2.4 “Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management”, which include the following outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.4.1. Ecotourism development plans formulated with local participation in each target locality, including carrying capacity studies - 2.4.2. Ecotourism initiatives managed by local communities or with provision for generating significant benefits for local communities, including provisions for environmental sustainability - 2.4.3. Community-based businesses generating sustainable income from forest products as a motivation for conservation. the following outputs: We need to propose strategies in the ProDoc to address each of these root causes: <p>At local level, the root causes related to land use planning and land leases are addressed through output 2.1.1. “Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management covering all three target localities”.</p> |
| <p>The disjuncture between the parent program (with its goal of maintaining and enhancing ecosystem goods and services through integrated approaches to land, water, forest, biodiversity and coastal resource management that contribute to poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods and climate resilience) and the project is very apparent throughout the PIF. STAP would wish to see how integrated planning involving</p> | <p>The application of the “ridge-to-reef” approach, featuring the integrated management of diverse interrelate landscape elements with the aim of optimizing spatial flows of ecosystem goods and services and addressing spatial flows of threats, is presented in Section 1.4.2 as one of the two main guiding strategies of the project.</p> <p>These “R2R” spatial relations are portrayed graphically for each target locality in Section 1.2.2, together with the indicative locations of the different management units (including protected areas, restoration areas and sustainably managed productive landscapes) that make up the interrelated elements of the target landscapes.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| whole watersheds and landscapes will be implemented as a mosaic of sustainable land and water uses. As it appears in the PIF, the components seem to be separate and largely unrelated sets of activities. | |
| The mention throughout the PIF of various scientific and technically-driven studies and suggestions for interventions is welcome; STAP advises that the provision of this advice should, as far as possible be delivered through local expertise | The project will work with a number of partners through a range of modalities of institutional partnerships. These will include local/national and regional institutions. National expertise for research and technical support is relatively limited. The South Pacific Commission (SPC) and the University of the South Pacific (USP), however are regional institutions which combine high levels of proven technical expertise with the provision of opportunities to involve and develop the capacities of national students and researchers who will subsequently be available for incorporation into national institutions (Government and NGOs). |
| Component 1: In strengthening the national PA network, the project seeks to focus on creating new PAs, without identifying any criteria for selection, given that land is 95% locally owned. STAP would expect to see at least an outline of possible step by step approaches to communities to solicit views on what should be conserved, where and by whom, in order to build a plan for testing against a R2R framework for the selected watersheds. If it is the intention of the project to define PAs through strictly science-led top-down analysis (implied in the PIF by the intention to "promote scientific management of PAs"), then this Component may well fail. Currently the text of this Component reads as if the incentives mentioned will act as compensation for land take from landowners and communities for inclusion in PAs, instead of a benefit derived from community-led R2R planning and management. | <p>The project aims to strike a balance between, on the one hand, maintaining the bottom-up vision of the PA system at present, centred on Community Conservation Areas (CCAs) and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) that are proposed and management by local communities (which has major advantages over more conventional top-down, centrally planned approaches in terms of social acceptance and sustainability, and cost-effectiveness) and, on the other, ensuring that the system is effective in covering globally important environmental values.</p> <p>As now explained in the ProDoc, Outcome 2.5 on the strengthening of the PA network will be achieved through a logical sequential process that will make full provision for local participation at all stages. This will involve i) the prioritization of PAs at provincial and local levels on the basis of combination of technical studies and multi-stakeholder negotiations; ii) the site-specific negotiation and demarcation of the proposed PAs with the full participation of the landowners and other community stakeholders; iii) the participatory development of management plans; iv) the establishment of community-based governance structures; and v) the establishment of mechanisms for financial sustainability.</p> <p>This approach will be fully in line with the innovative CCA model which is provided for in national PA legislation, under which PAs remain fully owned and managed by local landowners in line with customary law.</p> |
| Component 2: Following on from Component 1, this Component also reads as though the proposed integrated management plan will be offered to communities rather than initiated after capacity building of the communities in the selected watersheds, using resources already identified in Component 4. If this is the case then STAP advises that the intervention should be inverted: invest first in | As with the process described above for the prioritization, establishment and management of protected areas, the support by the project to the formulation of integrated landscape management plans (under Outcome 2.1) will be a highly participatory process with a clear logical sequence, consisting of the following elements: i) Participatory discussion of proposals to improve planning and governance and establish or strengthen structures; ii) participatory review of existing social structures with implications for planning, decision-making and landscape management, in order to maximize social relevance and sustainability; iii) participatory formulation of proposals for establishment or strengthening |

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>capacity building, followed by investment in a "planning for real" program within the watershed to obtain a set of structured land use and change suggestions from the communities targeted. Experience elsewhere of top-down promotion of land management techniques and practices (green manures and waste composting are mentioned, for example) underlines the importance of involving the communities at the earliest stage and assisting with incentives and compensation because new techniques involve enhanced risk for local people and dubious economic benefits.</p> | <p>of multi-stakeholder mechanisms; iv) facilitation of the establishment, strengthening and ongoing operation of the multi-stakeholder mechanisms; and v) monitoring, systematization and dissemination of lessons learnt.</p> <p>The development of capacities for sustainable production systems (under Outcome 2.2) will be similarly participatory. In order to ensure social sustainability, it will be based on initial processes of participatory analysis with the target communities (see Output 2.2.1 and 2.2.2): these will examine the relevance and effectiveness of existing extension services, as well as the social, economic and environmental implications of existing management practices. Support to farmers will combine conventional extension support with participatory learning and experimentation, including the use of the Farmer Field School model, adapted as necessary to site-specific cultural conditions: these will serve as opportunities for learning, experimentation and exchange of experiences, with the aim that the farmers themselves will be fully involved in identifying management options capable of meeting the objectives of productivity, viability and sustainability.</p> |
| <p>Component 3: The PIF states that beef production is a major and expanding part of Vanuatu's economy and proposes that in future beef production will in effect be intensified and rotated, implying detailed land use planning requirements, but not apparently connected to the process outlined under Component 2, which is to produce an integrated management plan. STAP requests that the proponents clarify their intentions in the full project brief, particularly to deal with overall food security considerations.</p> | <p>The threats to natural vegetation posed by the potential expansion of pasture areas for beef production will be addressed through a combination of land use planning, governance and technical support. The proposed multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management (Output 2.1.1) will provide the opportunity for the diverse stakeholders in each of the target landscapes to analyse the implications of pasture expansion for their collective and individual interests (taking into account also the technical analyses of potential impacts proposed under Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3); to develop site-specific recommendations for its spatial configuration in the landscape, as one aspect of the proposed integrated landscape management plans (Output 2.1.3); and to exercise social control on pasture expansion through the community-based norms proposed under Output 2.1.2. These mechanisms will apply both to community members seeking to increase their cattle herds and pasture areas, and to outside actors seeking to enter into leases for the establishment of pastures.</p> <p>The above instruments will principally operate at the scale of overall land use categories (e.g. forest vs. pasture). The management practices applied within cattle holdings will also have implications for the status global environmental values, and will be influenced through the provision of technical support as proposed under Outcome 2.2.</p> <p>The project will in addition work at policy level, under Outcome 1.1, aiming to ensure that Department of Livestock policies recognise the need for livestock expansion to occur in a responsible manner that does not undermine environmental and social sustainability, through the incorporation of an integrated landscape and livelihood approach in the definition of priorities for livestock promotion by the Department.</p> |
| <p>Component 4: STAP welcomes the inclusion of capacity building as a core response to root causes</p> | <p>The new Component 3 of the project now focuses specifically on knowledge management. Under this component, Outcome 3.1 focuses on systematization, dissemination and</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| mentioned earlier, but would argue for an addition to this Component to support awareness-raising, including through schools, regarding sound environmental management and the benefits arising from it. | awareness raising, including the incorporation of project models and experiences into the syllabi of national educational institutions; Outcome 3.2 focuses on strengthening capacities for information access and management, in order to inform decision-making and planning processes. |
| Experience from the GEF medium size project on capacity building (GEF ID 3502: "Capacity Building and Mainstreaming for Sustainable Land Management in Vanuatu") should inform the further development of the present project. | <p>Lessons learned from the SLM project, as reported in its Terminal Evaluation Report, are set out in Section 1.4.7 of the Project Document. The project will take these lessons into account through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emphasising the mainstreaming of R2R and environmental sustainability as cross-cutting and integrated concepts both in policy frameworks and at field level. - Promoting coordination and awareness of key issues between departments, through its Steering Committee and in relations in the course of everyday project implementation. - Emphasising the participatory design of field level interventions, with full involvement of traditional authorities and clear arrangements for community engagement (see also the introduction to Component 2). - Promoting commitment and leadership from senior government officials, setting up a well-defined and accepted project inception strategy to guide implementation. |
| STAP advises that knowledge management needs to be built into the project also. | Outcome 3.3 focuses on internal knowledge management within the project. |
| Regional considerations: The project design has relatively weak links to the regional Program as described, and there are significant opportunities to share lessons and ongoing experience at regional level regarding PA community-based management and financing. STAP urges the proponents to set out their suggestions for collaborative work to connect with the regional support project (GEF ID 5404). | <p>On the basis of consultations with the UNDP Regional Coordination Unit in Bangkok, coordination with the regional project will include at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation of in-regional trainings to be coordinated by the Regional R2R program support project - Provision of information to the Regional R2R program support project necessary to report on overall program progress and evaluation (see project Output 3.3) - Coordination with the regional R2R program support project and with other national R2R projects to share experiences and lessons learned (see project Output 3.2). |
| Component 4, covering capacity building, is not linked to a provider in this PIF. STAP advises that capacity building needs of the project should be discussed with the regional support project to maximize outreach to regional capacity building and knowledge platforms. | Under the reformulated component structure, capacity building is no longer a stand-alone component but is instead a cross-cutting element included in both of the other components of the project. |
| STAP recommended in its screening of the regional support project that it should include support for a multi-focal "PacIW:LEARN" for the region, which | Project linkages with PacIW:LEARN are proposed under Output 3.1.1. |

| Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>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 within the Program, but also across the other GEF and non-GEF projects delivering against allied environmental targets. In this connection the inclusion in the present project of knowledge management, as mentioned above, is essential and STAP advises that the project brief should show how it could 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>One of the lessons learned from a related regional project on fisheries (GEF ID 2131 Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific Small Island Developing States) in the region, coordinated through the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), is that each child project in a program through its full project brief needs to detail the support relationship envisaged and responsibilities respectively of the (Vanuatu) project unit and the regional unit.</p> | <p>The relations between the Vanuatu project unit and the regional unit are set out in Section 3.1.2 and under Output 3.1.1 in relation to information management and knowledge sharing; this will be the main area of focus of the relation, in order to allow the regional R2R programme to monitor progress at a programmatic level, and to share information and lessons learned between its constituent projects.</p> |
| <p>As a member of the R2R Program the present project also needs to show how the scientific and technical linkages outlined in the parent program translate into practical action to benefit Vanuatu. STAP has noted that the Mauritius Strategy for Implementation cites the concept of "SIDSTAP", the operationalization of the small island developing States roster of experts. While little progress has been achieved, as noted in regional meetings held prior to the Rio+20</p> | <p>As referred to in other sections above, section 3.1.2 provides details of partners and institutional arrangements identified during project formulation. Vanuatu Department of Forests (DoF) for example, through its Botanical and Conservation Unit has a long standing record of working and establishing technical relationship with research, academic and scientific organisations and institutions working in the area of biodiversity assessment, plant and tree identification and collection and profiling different Vanuatu forest and environment ecosystem. The Fisheries Department and Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) likewise currently have on-going and active research work with technical and academic institutions for example, DEC working and collaborating with the</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| Conference, the present project has the opportunity, at least alongside the cluster of 14 countries represented with the Program, to benefit from a strengthened set of scientific and technical linkages between the PICs, building upon the SOPAC mechanism. The project brief should therefore detail how the Science, Technology and Resources Network (STAR) of SOPAC could assist the present project to draw upon 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>University of Austria in studying breeding, growth and migration of eel fishes in Lake Letes, a current and proposed project site for this project.</p> <p>SOPAC, now moved to SPC and known as SPC GeoScience Division (GSD) has a strong working relation with Vanuatu Ministries and Departments dealing with land, environment, climate change, mining and forestry. SPC GSD is currently working with DEC and Vanuatu DoF in mapping all terrestrial Protected Areas established by the current Vanuatu GEF4 Forestry and Protected Area Management Project. This includes 3D modeling and capacity building in understanding GIS technology, use and applications.</p> <p>In the same light, Institute of Applied Science (IAS) of the USP together with the New York Botanical Gardens have been working with DoF and DEC in documenting flora and fauna in KBA in Vanuatu. All these partnerships and collaboration, supported by targeted field work will help translate scientific and technical linkages including policies into practical actions in project sites and benefiting communities.</p> |
| STAP advises the project proponents to consider the guidance offered through the joint GEF/CBD publication on Marine Spatial Planning in order to maximize the potential of the ICM/IWRM approaches planned to resolve unsustainable trajectories for biodiversity, land and water use within the coastal zones and related catchments concerned. At present one of the key deficits of the parent Program outlined in the R2R documents is the absence of a strategy for assisting the countries with planning within the Ridge to Reef approach towards a realizable and sustainable future, the present project should show how this strategic support will be realized. | The Vanuatu Fisheries Department will be a core member of Vanuatu Government line Ministries and Departments taking lead and implementing field activities under this project. Section 1.3.2 provides a background to current fisheries work and challenges in Vanuatu. Component 2 of the project especially section 2.5.2.1 to 2.5.6.3 highlights activities that the project will carry out to identify PA areas especially MPAs, demarcate and map designated areas, restock degraded coastal stocks, draw up management plans and formerly established the PA areas under some form of legal framework (e.g. CCAs). The activities and work will be guided and closely aligned with the GEF/CBD Marine Spatial Planning. The Fisheries Department's on-going collaboration with SPC at the regional level and JICA/FAO/IUCN at the international level will drive and strengthen work in these areas. |

The GEF Secretariat Comments

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|--|--|--|
| <p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi</i></p> | <p>8/26 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</p> | <p>(28 June 2016)</p> <p>The project's efforts to systematize experiences and disseminated them regionally within the framework or the regional R2R programme and its constituent project are set out under Output 3.1.1. Initial agreement on the need for this information flow has been reached during the PPG phase with UNDP Regional Coordination Unit</p> |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|---|---|---|
| <i>Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i> | 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" | in Bangkok, as leader of the R2R programme. (29 July 2016) (a) & (b): The integrated approaches to IW Objective 3 are evident in the inclusion of coastal and marine areas in the integrated landscapes/seascapes of the target areas. The issue of harnessing results and lessons is addressed in Outcome 3.1, and specifically ProDoc para 282 regarding IWLearn. (c): this is specifically proposed in ProDoc para 344. |
| 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? | (4-4-13) 1. There is no baseline for the creation of new PAs, the effective management of existing ones, or revenue generating mechanisms in PAs. There are 35 PAs found in the UNEP-WCMC's World Database on Protected Areas (12 terrestrial, 23 marine). The GEF Sec expects to see in the baseline project, the investments in the associated with the proposed new PAs, the existing PAs to benefit from improved management, and a brief description of the efforts to be carried out to increase revenue generation. (28 June 2016) OK | (28 June 2016) The baseline for PA establishment and management is explained in section 1.3.2. Given the newness of the institutional and conceptual framework for PAs in the country, and the small size of the overall PA estate, the baseline is in fact small: this is, however, compensated by the clear legal mandate for the PA model and the high levels of interest expressed by local stakeholders in the establishment of Community Conservation Areas (CCAs). The proposed support by the project to increase revenue generation is described under Outcome 2.6. This outcome refers to the financing of environmental investments both inside and outside PAs: given the nature of Vanuatu's PAs as small community-managed initiatives, intimately integrated with the other landscape units, it would be unnecessarily artificial for management and funding of these different land units to be addressed separately, and would run counter to the R2R concept. |
| | (4-4-13) During the project preparation please provide the fraction of the \$200,000 (inkind contribution from the MAQFF) will be used for the management of the PAs (other 4 activities are also listed under the baseline scenario associated | (28 June 2016) For the management of the PAs and other 4 activities listed, 60% of the inkind contribution will be used. MAQFF consists of staff and resources of the Departments of Agriculture, Forestry, Livestock and Fisheries. The project sites and proposed PAs are in |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>with management of PAs. See p. 5.)</p> <p>There are no-baseline for investments in NWFP under Baseline scenarios (p.5).</p> <p>(28 June 2016) OK</p> | <p>islands located in four provinces. In kind contribution will include staff and resources cost at HQ, provincial and local/island level to implement, report and monitor PA activities including in the wider production landscapes (terrestrial and marine). There are investments in NWFP particularly drying of nuts and fruits for local and export markets. However, with unorganised nature of NWFP producers, supply and markets for NWFP remain insignificant if compared to more common agricultural commodities like kava for example. The project will ensure close coordination and implementation of activities with MAQFF.</p> |
| | <p>(8/22/2013 CCM JS)</p> <p>By CEO endorsement request, a site-based estimate of status of forests in the project sites and the effect of the project intervention on the deforestation and degradation rates and CO2 emissions are expected.</p> | <p>(28 June 2016)</p> <p>Please see Annex 6 for explanation of the assumptions in terms of forest status and the effects of the project on deforestation rates.</p> |
| <p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p> | <p>(4-10-13)</p> <p>Component 1. i) Target PAs for creation and increased management were not mentioned. Please clarify the location of the 35,000 ha of new PAs to be created. How will these sites be selected (e.g. threatened species, key biodiversity areas, endemic plant areas)? If this information is not available, please address during the PPG</p> | <p>(28 June 2016)</p> <p>The locations and approximate areas of the target PAs for creation and improved management are set out in Table 4 of the Project Document, under Outcome 2.5. These proposals are as yet still indicative, given that the specifics in terms of locations, boundaries and management objectives will be defined in discussion with local landowners and other stakeholders through the participatory processes proposed under Outputs 2.5.1 and 2.5.2.</p> <p>The sites indicatively proposed in the document have been proposed on the basis of their potential to contribute to the environmental integrity of the R2R landscapes in the target localities, taking into account not only their intrinsic biodiversity values but also their importance for the protection of flows of ecosystem goods and services across the landscape.</p> <p>Additional review of the proposed location of these PAs will be carried out through the provincial-level PA prioritization processes proposed under Output 2.5.1,</p> |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|----------|---|--|
| | | <p>which will combine technical analyses with participatory discussions.</p> <p>Given the nature of the CCA model in Vanuatu, it is not possible or desirable to prioritise PAs exclusively on the basis of externally-defined criteria of global environmental importance; rather the approach aims to strike a negotiated balance between the ad hoc proposal of areas based on the interests of individual communities, and the prioritisation of sites on the basis of their importance for landscape-wide ecosystem goods and services, their national and global importance for conservation, and connectivity needs at sub- and supranational levels.</p> |
| | <p>(4-10-13) Component 1. ii) Conservation trust funds were discussed in Table B and briefly in the PIF. Is the project planning on establishing, funding and making operational specific Trust Funds for each PA? What are the rationale and the role model for this approach? It does not appear as the most cost-effective approach for revenue generation. Why not one at the national level?</p> | <p>(28 June 2016) Based on the results of PPG studies, it is now proposed to use a PA financing model based on a continuous through-flow of funds, with annual expenditures being balanced by regular inputs from sources such as the tourism industry; rather than a “trust fund” model (as originally proposed in the PIF) under which expenditure needs would be covered through interest earned on an initial injection of capital.</p> <p>This “through-flow” model is preferred for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the buoyancy of the tourism industry in the region, the attractiveness of the country for tourism (and the relatively limited degree to which its potential has been realized to date) and the absence of significant concerns over political stability, there is room for a high degree of confidence that the industry will be able to make significant and reliable regular financial contributions to environmental activities in the foreseeable future. - The “through-flow” model is administratively simpler, with lower transaction costs, than the trust fund model. |
| | <p>(4-10-13) Component 1. iii) As mentioned in Table B, what biodiversity products will be marketed and to whom?</p> | <p>(28 June 2016) Examples of currently used and marketed NTFPs are provided in Section 1.1.6 and options of products to be marketed with support from the project are discussed</p> |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|----------|--|--|
| | | under Output 2.4.3. The specific NTFPs that would be marketed will be defined through the participatory analyses proposed under Output 2.4.3. |
| | (4-10-13) Component 2: i) What are the target watersheds for Integrated Land and marine management plans (100,000 ha)? How do these watersheds relate to the existing or new PAs to be created? | (28 June 2016) The “R2R landscapes” on which the project will focus are proposed in Section 1.2.2, together with the relations between the productive landscapes and protected areas that comprise them, based on analyses of flows of environmental goods, services and impacts. |
| | (4-10-13) ii) What baseline activities are currently underway regarding adding value and marketing of these NWFP? | (28 June 2016) Baseline activities regarding adding value and marketing of NWMP are described in Section 1.3.2. |
| | (4-10-13) What NWFP are being targeted through this intervention to need training on harvesting techniques, with increased value-added and marketing? | (28 June 2016) Please see response to question 7 (iii) above on biodiversity products. |
| | (4-10-13) Component 4: i) Please provide an example of the type of M&E for biodiversity currently operating in the regions that would serve as role model for this output. | (28 June 2016) Sovi Basin Protected Area established Protocols for Biodiversity Assessment in Fiji. The Sovi Basin PA is a legally established PA with its own Trust Fund. The FAO implemented GEF4 Forestry Conservation and Protected Area Management Project funded and lead this important work with USP. The same Project (GEF4) has also developed curriculum for biodiversity conservation and PA management for the Fiji Forestry Training Centre. This Training Centre provides capacity building and formal training in forestry management for both Fiji and neighbour countries like Vanuatu. |
| | (4-10-13) ii) Are the landowners trained in this component in addition to the landowners trained for component 2? If so, 250 landowners does not seem sufficient to improve outcomes on 100,000 ha (as mentioned in component 2)? | (28 June 2016) The outcome target for Component 2 was incorrectly formulated. The 100,000ha figure refers to the total area of the target landscapes that will be covered by improved spatial planning and governance. These target landscapes are made up of a number of elements, including protected areas and production landscapes (please see illustrations in Section 1.2.2). While the entirety of this |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|----------|---|---|
| | | <p>area will be subject to improved protection and planning, which will affect land use decisions, the area on which it is targeted that farmers will apply INRM practices in the form of agroforestry and agrosylvopastoral systems is now estimated at 7,225ha (6,625ha of agroforestry and 600ha of agrosylvopastoral systems, please see results framework in Appendix 1 of the Project Document). It is estimated that this require changes in the behaviour of around 6,000 farmers: this will be achieved through a combination of direct training, farmer-led research and experimentation, and farmer-to-farmer dissemination leading to upscaling within and beyond the target communities.</p> |
| | <p>(4/10/2013 CCM JS) Component 3 a. Please clarify what proportion of the total 8000 ha will be restored in riparian zone and the proportion that will be under agroforestry practice.</p> | <p>(28 June 2016) 800ha will be restored in degraded or otherwise vulnerable areas (with a focus on areas where degradation is sufficiently advanced and access of a sufficiently open nature that individual farmers could not be expected to carry out restoration with their own resources. Of the remainder, 6,250ha will be under agroforestry systems and 600ha under agrosylvopastoral systems.</p> |
| | <p>(4/10/2013 CCM JS) b. Please include grass species in the restoration activities where possible or suitable in project areas where erosion is an issue.</p> | <p>(28 June 2016) As explained in Box 4 of the Project Document (under Output 2.3.1), the restoration practices applied to date on Aneityum include the use of vetiver grass contour barriers to slow cross-surface water flow and trap sediment contained in the runoff. The practices to be applied in the other target localities will be confirmed on a site-specific basis but are likely also to use vetiver or other grass species as appropriate.</p> |
| | <p>(4/10/2013 CCM JS) c. Please explain if the activities described under the component are linked with component 1 (PAs).</p> | <p>(28 June 2016) The proposed restoration activities will constitute one element of the integrated management of the target landscapes, complementing the protected areas and the areas under active production that will be targeted through INRM practices. The respective locations of these different elements will be defined through the spatial zoning and management planning proposed under</p> |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|----------|--|---|
| | | Outcome 2.1. Restoration activities will benefit PAs through, for example, reducing the levels of sediment input affecting marine ecosystems where MPAs may be established, and stabilizing the advance of land degradation in order to avoid the displacement of productive activities into PAs. |
| | (4/10/2013 CCM JS) d. It is not clear what will incentivize or enforce the landowners and the communities to cooperate in restoration and to limit extraction of fuelwood. | (28 June 2016) As explained under Output 2.3.1, the proposed restoration activities will constitute pilot “pump-priming” exercises, which will serve to demonstrate to funders the technical feasibility of restoration. The actions of the project under Outcome 1.3 will result in financial commitments from the tourism industry that will include direct contributions to the costs of ecosystem restoration: in Aneityum, for example, this investment will be directly related to the sustainability of their tourism model given the impacts of soil erosion on the water quality and reef health around their target beaches. |
| | (4/10/2013 CCM JS) e. Please develop mechanisms through which leakage (for example unsustainable intensification of agriculture, increased logging in non-project areas) issues associated with the project activities will be addressed. | (28 June 2016) There is a certain degree of unavoidable risk of leakage given that the target localities will not cover the entirety of the islands in question. The net outcomes in terms of environmental impacts will, however be less that in the without-project scenario, given that the project’s actions will not be limited to the target localities themselves. They will also include the strengthening of institutional capacities at national and provincial levels for land use planning, environmental assessment and PA prioritisation, which will be applied beyond the project areas themselves; in addition, the policy work foreseen under Outcome 1.1 will have nationwide benefits in terms of the avoidance of the potential impacts of sector development. It is furthermore expected that the innovative models of multi-stakeholder planning and governance promoted in the target localities will be replicated elsewhere on the target islands and beyond, thereby progressively reducing the extent of the areas in which leakage might occur. The involvement in the |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|----------|--|--|
| | | processes of the councils of chiefs of each of the target islands will have significant implications in terms of island-wide replication of the model. |
| | (4/10/2013 CCM JS) f. More details on the activities proposed under carbon MRV system is expected by CEO endorsement and concrete estimation of the expected increase in carbon stocks is expected along with full consideration of leakage issues. | (28 June 2016) Output 3.2.2 refers specifically to the strengthening of MRV capacities. The project will build upon previous investments (e.g. GIZ support to SPC) in strengthening capacities for MRV, by supporting the establishment of a specific MRV unit in the Department of Forestry. Project support will include the provision of hardware and software, training for Government staff, and payment over the first 4 years of the project of the salary of a recent graduate to get the MRV system up and running, who will subsequently be incorporated as a Government-funded staff member. Please see response above regarding leakage issues. |
| | (4/10/2013 CCM JS) a) Please specify what improving agriculture, fisheries and forestry would entail, and please include measures that would increase C storage and reduce GHG emissions including NOx and CH4 from production landscapes, fisheries and livestock. | (28 June 2016) As explained under Outcome 2.2, improvements to agriculture practices will largely be achieved through facilitating farmer innovation in adapting traditional systems to conditions of increase demographic pressure and climatic stress, through the incorporation of increased numbers of trees in spatial or successional agroforestry combinations, as well as the use of vetiver grass barriers and cover crops as appropriate. The main CC benefits of the project's work on livestock systems will be in terms of increase carbon storage, through the increased incorporation of woody components into production systems in the form of shade trees and live fences. Given that the target localities are dominated by small and medium producers with limited access to external inputs, there is limited scope for reducing CH4 emissions through dietary modifications. |
| | (4/10/2013 CCM JS) b) It is requested to include livestock management in these components as well. | (28 June 2016) Proposed interventions in relation to livestock management are explained in the introduction to Outcome 2.2: these will focus on the use of sustainable agrosilvopastoral systems, with increases in the numbers of trees and shrubs located either in pasture areas as |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|----------|---|--|
| | | <p>shade trees, or around them as live fences, and complemented, as appropriate on a site-specific basis, by other practices such as within-farm rotation of pasture and cut-and-carry systems based on planted fodder banks. These interventions will serve to increase net carbon storage in ranching systems, increase sustainability and thereby reduce the risk of further expansion into forest areas (and corresponding loss of carbon stocks) and reduce soil erosion and other forms of land degradation and their corresponding downstream impacts. These interventions will build on a strong baseline of investment in the improvement in herd genetics and management practices, supported by the National Livestock Programme, which will contribute to productivity and thereby limit land demands.</p> |
| | <p>(4/10/2013 CCM JS) c) Given the concern of water quality in the area, and linkages with N2O emissions, please specify activities targeted to reduce runoff of nitrogenous fertilizers.</p> | <p>(28 June 2016) Water quality concerns are principally focused on increased sediment load due to upstream soil erosion. Fertiliser use in the production systems that prevail in the target localities and in much of the rest of the country is very low, due to a combination of the inherently high fertility levels of the country's young volcanic soils and the difficulties and expense of transporting such agricultural inputs to remote islands relative to the low commercial value of most of the crops grown.</p> |
| | <p>(4/10/2013 CCM JS) d) The UNREDD RPP for Vanuatu is in the final stages of approval, with the World Bank as the main delivery partner. It is noted that MRV is considered in the program but not funded. Please clarify the complementarity and explain how the MRV developed through the FAO proposed project will be utilized at the national scale.</p> | <p>(28 June 2016) As explained in Section 1.3.2, MAQFF (Forestry Department), supported by FAO and others, are working on the development of MRV guidelines and a national framework for REDD+. The main support for this is likely to come from the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and Vanuatu has recently submitted a Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) for funding. Under output 3.2.2, the project will strengthen capacities for MRV.</p> |
| | <p>(8/29/2013 CCM JS) By CEO endorsement please provide mechanisms of coordination and collaboration with the national level MRV processes.</p> | <p>(28 June 2016) The strengthening of MRV will build upon the support provided by FAO, GIZ and others to date, within the national REDD+ framework. Coordination with other</p> |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|---|---|---|
| | | national actors will be coordinated through the National Advisory Board and facilitated by the fact that the National REDD coordinator is based in the Department of Forests, where the MRV capacities will be developed. |
| | (28 June 2016) Under CCM5/SFM1/2 please indicate numbers for carbon stock & GH emissions sequestered | (29 July 2016) Please refer to the number of carbon stock & GHG emissions sequestered provided in the CCM & SFM Tracking Tools, and Project Document Annex: Quantifying Carbon Benefits, all included in the initial submission made on 28 June 2016. |
| | (28 June 2016) Framework: Outputs are mostly processes, vague & unquantified; e.g. how many hectares are going to be restored, etc... | (29 July 2016) The Outputs are all deliverables (nouns) – proposals, procedures, instruments, mechanisms, norms, programmes, plans, agreements – all of these can be “ticked” as delivered and all are essential for delivering the outcomes, which is where the quantification is needed, and is provided. The outcomes are all accompanied by SMART targets. |
| 8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate? | (4/10/2013 CCM JS) b) More concrete estimation in tCO ₂ e (with baseline, projections and leakage) based on site specific information is requested by CEO Endorsement. (28 June 2016) please provide GEBs & quantify them | (28 June 2016) Estimated carbon benefits are quantified in the results framework and explained in detail in Annex 6 of the Project Document. (29 July 2016) GEBs are described in the Project Document and CEO Endorsement Request, and quantifiable targets are provided in the Results Framework indicators and Tracking Tools. A new summary table has been inserted in the ProDoc summarizing the key GEBs (Section 1.4.3, Under para 297, Table 6). |
| 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? | (at PIF, repeated 28 June 2016) While many livelihood improvement activities are mentioned, there is little discussion of connecting conservation actions to livelihood benefits which could help the sustainability of the project. | (28 June 2016) The livelihood improvement activities now proposed under Outcome 2.4 are directly related to conservation actions: they include community-based ecotourism and the sustainable harvesting and sale of NTFPs, in both cases subject to technical studies and participatory planning in order to ensure compatibility with and |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|----------|---------|--|
| | | <p>contribution to conservation goals.</p> <p>(29 July 2016) Paras 15 of the CEO Endorsement Request says: “The livelihood improvement activities proposed under Outcome 2.4, including community-based ecotourism and the sustainable harvesting and sale of NTFPs, are directly related to conservation actions as they will provide direct incentives that will further contribute to local stakeholders’ motivations for supporting conservation. In both cases they will be subject to technical studies and participatory planning in order to ensure compatibility with and contribution to conservation goals.”</p> <p>Outcome 2.4 in the ProDoc says: <i>Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation, sustainable land management and sustainable forest management.</i></p> <p>Para 251: Some land management decisions, while in the overall common interest of stakeholders in the target landscapes, may imply opportunity costs for specific individuals or communities (for example, when a landowner rejects the opportunity to enter into a lease with a rancher in order to avoid damaging an island’s water sources). Para 252: The project will support the development and implementation of livelihood alternatives with the specific aim of offsetting or compensating these opportunity costs, and will thereby be differentiated from and complementary to other livelihood support projects in the target areas that have more general social and economic development objectives. The existence of opportunities for obtaining concrete livelihood benefits has been shown in the past to be a key determinant of communities’ continued buy-in to natural resource conservation strategies, such as restrictions on extractive activities.</p> |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|----------|--|---|
| | <p>(at PIF, repeated 28 June 2016)</p> <p>There is little discussion of ensuring the participation of women.</p> | <p>(28 June 2016)</p> <p>As now explained under Outcome 2.4 in the ProDoc, there are particular opportunities for “conservation-friendly” forms of livelihood support activities to generate benefits for women, especially in the case of ecotourism, where they can earn income directly from the management of visitor accommodation and catering facilities, and NTFPs, given that existing value chains for NTFPs are largely controlled by women. These options compare favourably with the alternative scenario featuring land conversion for agriculture and ranching, the economic and power benefits from which typically accrue mostly to men.</p> <p>(29 July 2016)</p> <p>Paras 15 of the CEO Endorsement Request says: “The livelihood improvement activities proposed under Outcome 2.4, including community-based ecotourism and the sustainable harvesting and sale of NTFPs, are directly related to conservation actions as they will provide direct incentives that will further contribute to local stakeholders’ motivations for supporting conservation. In both cases they will be subject to technical studies and participatory planning in order to ensure compatibility with and contribution to conservation goals.”</p> <p>Outcome 2.4 in the ProDoc says: <i>Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation, sustainable land management and sustainable forest management.</i></p> <p>Para 251: Some land management decisions, while in the overall common interest of stakeholders in the target landscapes, may imply opportunity costs for specific individuals or communities (for example, when a landowner rejects the opportunity to enter into a lease with a rancher in order to avoid damaging an island’s water sources). Para 252: The project will support the</p> |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|---|---|---|
| | | development and implementation of livelihood alternatives with the specific aim of offsetting or compensating these opportunity costs, and will thereby be differentiated from and complementary to other livelihood support projects in the target areas that have more general social and economic development objectives. The existence of opportunities for obtaining concrete livelihood benefits has been shown in the past to be a key determinant of communities' continued buy-in to natural resource conservation strategies, such as restrictions on extractive activities. |
| | Please quantify socio-economic benefits | (29 July 2016) A new table summarizing of quantitative socioeconomic benefits has been added to section B2 of the CEO Endorsement Request, after para 16. |
| 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained? | <p>(at PIF) The role of established NGOs and some CSOs are mentioned. However, it would be helpful to assess how the capacity of these groups will be developed and supported, particularly to manage PAs and sustainable land planning, during project preparation.</p> <p>(at CEO endorsement) OK</p> | <p>(28 June 2016)</p> <p>Project implementation in the target localities will be carried out in close collaboration with NGOs and CSOs, through a range of alternative partnership modalities. On the one hand, this will improve efficiency and take advantage of these organizations established capacities and linkages with local actors; on the other, it will result in the development of the capacities of these organizations through the injection of innovative conceptual models, the generation of concrete experiences of their application, and participation in and/or exposure to the technical studies that will be carried out under the project with inputs from renowned regional academic and research centres as well as high level national and international technical consultants.</p> <p>This 'learning through doing' approach to capacity development will be achieved, for example, through their participation in the PA planning exercises at provincial and local levels proposed under Outcome 2.5, the landscape-wide planning processes proposed under Outcome 2.1, and the processes of technology development and transfer for sustainable resource management, proposed under Outcome 2.2.</p> |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|---|---|--|
| 12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | (at PIF, repeated 28 June 2016) Recommended Actions by CEO Endorsement: Please provide details and areas of cooperation between partner projects that may affect or benefit the proposed project especially the REDD+, landuse planning and MRV development. | (28 June 2016) Details of coordination with other initiatives are provided in Section 3.1.2 of the Project Document. (29 July 2016) Coordination with other institutions and initiatives are provided in ProDoc section 3.1.2. Regarding the REDD+, ProDoc Para 346 is added: “two projects are being initiated in support of MRV and will come into full operation soon. One is the World Bank funded climate change project housed at the Ministry of Climate Change which has a component on REDD+ related activities and is being implemented by Department of Forests. A GIZ Forest Land Restoration addressing REDD+ related issues is also being implemented in collaboration with Vanuatu DEC, DoF and SPC...” |
| 15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | (At PIF, repeated 28 June 2016) More details are needed about project strategies, but the project costs seem reasonable. | (28 June 2016) Additional detail on project strategies has been added to the document. (29 July 2016) Detailed descriptions of project strategies are already provided in the Project Document submitted in the initial submission on 28 June 2016. Please refer to section 1.4.2 (Strategies) in the ProDoc in relation to overall project approach and cross-cutting strategies, and section 1.4.3 (Outcomes and outputs) where detail is provided of the project strategies and activities proposed to support the delivery of each of the proposed outputs. |
| 19. At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | (28 June 2016) No, please do so | (29 July 2016) FAO provided funds summary and activities completed ensured a delivery of CEO endorsement request package, including updated indicator targets, as indicated in para 7 and 8 under CEO Endorsement Request Section A.5 Incremental/Additional Cost reasoning. |
| 21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with | (28 June 2016) Please provide CC TTs | (29 July 2016) FAO had already submitted the CC TT via ftp link in the |

| Question | Comment | FAO Response |
|---|--|---|
| information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | original submission and re-sent it via email. |
| | (28 June 2016) Please substantiate BD TTs with numbers relevant to Aichi targets including # of hectares and sqm protected on land and in sea; # of has reforested , etc. | (29 July 2016) Quantitative data on contribution to Aichi targets has been added to section 1.4.7c (Alignment with GEF focal area strategies) of the Project Document, under para 319. |
| | (28 June 2016) IW TT, please refer to comments made at PIF stage & adjust TT accordingly | (29 July 2016) FAO had already submitted the IW Tracking Tools in the original resubmission incorporating the comments made at PIF stage. |

Council Member from France

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| We globally support this proposal but we would like to suggest articulating the proposed GEF project with an existing project « Restoration of ecosystem services against climate change unfavorable effects – Resccue » (SPC - AFD - FFEM). Indeed, this project seeks to find long-term 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. | Discussions were held with representatives of RESCCUE during the PPG phase. At that time, the activities of RESCCUE in Vanuatu were also under preparation: initial consultations had occurred, and a communications plan and capacity building framework have been prepared. The representative explained that RESCCUE will focus on issues including marine management; supporting capacity to create community management plans for terrestrial conservation; waste management; alternative sources of income generation, e.g. eco-tourism; and better knowledge at local level and in government sectors regarding current legislation. It was agreed that there appeared to be significant scope for collaboration between the GEF project and RECCUE, for example in the form of the exchange of information generated by the technical studies to be supported by the two projects, and through the pooling of resources and sharing of responsibilities for livelihood support activities. The precise nature of the collaboration will be confirmed at project inception. |

Council Member from Germany

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| Germany recommends indicating the linkages to the parent Ridge to Reef Program (GEF ID 5395). | On the basis of consultations with the UNDP Regional Coordination Unit in Bangkok, coordination with the regional project will include at least the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation of in-regional trainings to be coordinated by the Regional R2R program support project |

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of information to the Regional R2R program support project necessary to report on overall program progress and evaluation (see project Output 3.3) <p>Coordination with the regional R2R program support project and with other national R2R projects to share experiences and lessons learned (see project Output 3.2).</p> |
| <p>Germany requests further elaboration on how the ridge-to-reef approach can be better demonstrated in specific watershed areas or zones as the project components still seem not adequately interconnected in terms of implementation arrangements. It might be a challenge in MFA projects to aggregate activities when distinct project components are formulated along the line of the different constituent focal areas.</p> | <p>As explained in Section A5 of this document, the components and outcomes have been restructured so that all of the field level interventions are grouped together in Component 2, which focuses on integrated ridge to reef management. This presents the management of productive landscapes and protected areas, and ecosystem restoration, as interconnected components of overall “ridge to reef” landscapes. The descriptions of the target localities in Section 1.2.2 of the Project Document presents the logical justifications for the delimitations of each of the target localities, including graphic representations of how the different spatial elements of the R2R landscapes relate to each other.</p> |
| <p>Germany recommends consideration of spatial planning on land- and seascape level for entire catchments and the marine protected areas to support a more integrated approach.</p> | <p>Outcome 2.1 of the project is now formulated as “Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance”: the strategies in support of this outcome include the strengthening and facilitation of processes of landscape/catchment-wide spatial planning, based on multi-stakeholder analysis and negotiation of how to optimize landscape-wide flows of environmental goods and services, and supported by the strengthening under Component 1 of capacities and mechanisms for spatial land use planning and EIA.</p> |
| <p>Given the actual human resource capacity and the low number of staff in relevant ministries on the central and decentralized level (risk identified in the PIF), the availability of personnel to implement the proposed activities is crucial. Therefore, Germany asks for an indication of the staff/ human resources who will implement the project and/ or will act as providers of capacity building. In this context, the <i>Pacific Plan Concept</i> of capacity supplementation in case where capacity building is not an option due to lack of individuals for project implementation could be considered as an alternative.</p> | <p>The project will deliver its outputs and achieve its outcomes in relation to capacity building through a combination of direct technical support by members of the Project Management Unit (appointed specifically for project work with salaries covered by GEF funds), and by partners, through a combination of sub-contracts, letters of agreement and “responsible party” arrangements. There is a large number of suitable entities capable of carrying out this capacity development work, including regional educational and research institutions and NGOs (both national, regional and multinational), and candidates have been identified in each of the project’s target localities; arrangements will be formalized at the time of project start in accordance with GEF, FAO and Government rules and procedures.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| In Vanuatu, UNICEF, UNHABITAT and UNFPA has been conducting the project “Community resilience and coping with climate change and natural disasters in Vanuatu” through UN Trust Fund for Human Security since 2011 (approx \$3 million). Japan would like the information of the project No.47 to be shared with the UNICEF office in charge of the above-mentioned project. | Thank you for the comment. The concerned project (UNICEF/UNDP/FAO) closed in August 2015 and Terminal Evaluation Report was published in November 2015. The proposed GEF R2R project will take the lessons learned from the project and will seek synergy with the UNICEF office in Vanuatu. |
| Also, a project “Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction” has been conducted through Japan Policy and Human Resources Development Fund since 2011 (approx.. \$2.99million). Japan would like the information of this project to be shared with the related World Bank office as well. | Thank you for the comment. FAO will share the GEF R2R project information with the World Bank office as advised. |

Council Member from United States

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| Clarify how biodiversity-based goods will be sustained when increased revenue may encourage over-exploitation of these resources. | The project’s approach to the support of NTFP extraction is set out under Outcome 2.4. This includes a number of safeguards against over-exploitation, including prior technical studies of ecology to determine permissible offtake levels and management options (Activity 2.4.3.2) and the facilitation of preparation of resource management and business development plans, including resource monitoring protocols (Activity 2.4.3.3); this will be complemented by the establishment or strengthening of community-based governance frameworks and norms on natural resource management under Output 2.1.2. The highly participatory approach that it proposed for the formulation of these initiatives and governance frameworks, in which the involvement of respected traditional authorities will be ensured, will maximize the probability that rules on permissible extraction levels are respected. |
| Detail how the project will overcome the weaknesses in policy implementation that were cited as one of the reasons for the project. | The investments of the project in policy influence are set out under Outcome 1.1. This will focus on a selection of priority sectors which are of particular significance as potential threats to global environmental values, and where there is at the same time significant potential to achieve incremental environmental benefits through the modification of policy provisions. In this regard the project will recognize the valid motivations of the Government in stimulating the growth of these sectors, as motors of national economic growth: rather than proposing to control their growth, it will therefore focus on promoting the incorporation of considerations of environmental sustainability into sector growth. This will, in the medium and long terms, be positive for the sectors themselves, as it will ensure that they do not undermine the resource base on which they themselves depend, and at the same time will help to increase their resilience to climatic shocks; it will also help to ensure that the growth of individual sectors does not occur at the expense of the general good, undermining the sustainability of development as a whole; at the same time, this focus on sustainability will help to optimize the outcomes of these sectors in terms of their impacts on biodiversity and other global environmental values. |
| Add detail on the adaptation part of the adaptive management plan to incorporate climate | Under Output 2.1.3, it is proposed that the integrated landscape management plans will make provision for adaptation to climate change (CC), based on the results of technical analyses of its likely implications. These analyses will consider how CC may affect flows of ecosystem goods and services (such as hydrological regimes), and the functioning and vulnerability of both natural ecosystems and agricultural or livestock-based production systems, as |

| | |
|--|--|
| variability and change. | well as the importance of different ecosystems (such as mangroves and coral reefs) for ecosystem-based adaptation (EBA). The management options and zoning to be provided for in the plans will be defined accordingly in order to maximize resilience, for example through making special provision for the protection of particularly vulnerable ecosystems or for those with particular EBA potential, and for emphasising resilient production systems in areas with high vulnerability (for example through the inclusion of high densities of trees in cropping systems in order to buffer against drought and storms. |
| The ability of this project to be implemented successfully likely requires dissemination of best practices and lessons (component 5) to include an examination of replication costs. We therefore suggest this to be added to the proposal. | It is proposed under Output 3.1.1 that the proposed systematization will include cost aspects, in order for these be considered when determining the replication potential of the experiences. |
| Establish and operate a systematic way to assess soil compaction from cattle on yields of coconut. A review of current literature may help to identify specific silvo-pastoral systems that do not result in sub-optimal yields of any of the system components. | The formulation of the agrosylvopastoral systems to be promoted through the project will be based on a combination of action research and a review of previous experiences (under Outcome 3.1). There is wide experience in the Pacific (including in Vanuatu), and in South-East Asia (such as the Philippines), with agrosylvopastoral systems involving cattle under both trees and coconuts and a review of literature on these experiences will be a key starting point, not only in relation to cattle under coconuts but also to other intercropping systems to be promoted. Project actions under Outcome 3.1 also include the monitoring and systematization of experiences generated through the project, and this will include the definition of reliable and practical methodologies for assessing the performance of diverse biophysical, socioeconomic and productivity variable under each of the practices promoted. |

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

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

| PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: USD \$ 135,000 | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i> | <i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i> | | |
| | <i>Budgeted Amount</i> | <i>Amount Spent To date</i> | <i>Amount Committed</i> |
| PERSONNEL | | | |
| Salaries Professional: | 7,641 | | |
| Financial management/ analyst | 7,641 | 0 | 7,641 |
| Local consultants | 32,800 | | |
| Expert 1: SFM/SLM Specialist | 16,800 | 15,992 | 808 |
| Expert 2: Fisheries Specialist | 4,000 | 2,903 | 1,097 |
| Expert 3: Biodiversity Specialist | 6,000 | 5,449 | 551 |
| Expert 4: Socioeconomic Specialist | 6,000 | 3,823 | 2,177 |
| International consultants | 37,500 | | |
| NRM Expert Team Leader | 37,500 | 15,695 | 21,805 |
| Total Consultant | 70,300 | | |
| Travel | 47,650 | | |
| National/local travel-DSA | 21,250 | 17,116 | 4,134 |
| International travel | 18,000 | 23,460 | (5,460) |
| Local /regional travel team leader | 8,400 | 32,965 | (24,565) |
| | | | |
| Workshops | 9,409 | | |
| Inception workshop | 3,300 | 3,300 | 0 |
| Terminal workshop | 3,300 | 2,300 | 1,000 |
| PSC meetings, Local consultations | 2,809 | 2,303 | 506 |
| Technical Assistance to field project | 0 | 8,487 | (8,487) |
| Total Budget | 135000 | 133,793 | 1,207 |

⁸ 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