



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: APPLICATION OF RIDGE TO REEF CONCEPT FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION, AND FOR THE ENHANCEMENT OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES AND CULTURAL HERITAGE IN NIUE			
Country:	Niue	GEF Project ID: ¹	5552
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5258
Other Executing Partners:	Ministry of Natural Resources	Submission Date:	28 July 2015
		Resubmission Date:	24 Sept 2015
		Resubmission Date:	22 Jan 2016
GEF Focal Area:	Multi-Focal areas	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>	Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities - Integrated Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood	Agency Fee (\$):	377,538

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD.1 Improve sustainability of Protected Area Systems	Outcome 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of (existing and) new protected areas	Output 1. New protected areas (3) and coverage (7,250 ha) of unprotected ecosystems	GEF TF	2,539,497	4,519,582
BD.2 Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	Outcome 2.1 Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 2 National and sub-national land use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	GEF TF	1,500,000	4,033,954
IW.3 Multi-state cooperation on water uses in trans-boundary surface and ground water	Outcome 1.3 Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection	Output 1.3 Pollution reduction, improved water efficiency	GEF TF	155,365	2,515,064
Total project costs				4,194,862	11,068,600

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

C. Project Objective: <i>To strengthen conservation and sustainable use of land, water and marine areas and their biodiversity by building on their cultural heritage values through integrated national and community actions</i>					
Project Component	Grant type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing (\$)	Co-financing ³ (\$)
Component 1: Catalyzing conservation initiatives at site and landscape / seascape level through Ridge to Reef Approach	TA	New community conservation and national protected areas established at different levels, thus reducing threats and improving biodiversity status of conservation areas through effective community management	Output 1.1 National conservation and protected area system expanded through - (i) a continuous terrestrial conservation area covering 2,550 ha that links traditionally strict protected sites (tapu) and their surrounding landscapes; (ii) a national marine protected area covering 4,500 ha (Beveridge Reef); and (iii) community conserved reefs covering at least 112 ha. Conservation and protected areas formalized through appropriate instruments. (BD)	2,503,562	6,204,006
			Output 1.2 Management plans developed through participatory approaches for: a) expanded terrestrial conservation areas; b) the national marine protected area; and c) community conserved reefs; management plan adopted through appropriate instruments; management plans mainstreamed in development, sectoral and CC adaptation plans/policies; adequate financing identified from budgetary and other sources for implementation of the plans. (BD)		
			Output 1.3 Management plans implemented for all conservation areas through conservation and management activities (concrete measures) at the village, cross-village and national levels, including improvements in water quality in reef areas, protection of the freshwater lens and necessary support activities (soft measures). ⁴ (BD and IW)		
			Output 1.4 Systematic local and national level ecosystems and species level biodiversity monitoring systems established, with data sharing and joint training and survey activities for terrestrial and marine areas and integrated approaches; monitoring and evaluation results are fed to the R2R program through the regional program support project to facilitate lessons sharing and cross-country fertilization. (BD)		
Component 2: Strengthening knowledge, capacities and partnerships for Ridge to Reef concept application outside protected areas	TA	Strengthened community and cross-sectoral involvement of relevant national government departments to promote effective Ridge to Reef management by mainstreaming biodiversity and environmental concerns into plans	Output 2.1 Community level actions on biodiversity and R2R implemented through: (i) establishment of village committees towards participatory management of terrestrial conservation areas and community-conserved reefs; (ii) training on integrated approaches to planning and management focusing on developing clearly-specified roles; and (iii) formulation of innovative instruments to secure support of landowners affected by the terrestrial conservation area and other interventions prescribed by the land-use plan. (BD)	1,482,000	4,157,594
			Output 2.2 Sector-related legal framework, policies and plans support effective R2R conservation and sustainable use within and outside of conservation areas, embedded in (i) community development plans; (ii) cross-sectoral plans such as climate change and mitigation and adaptation, tourism and the plan for achieving		

³ These co-financing figures include both the Government contribution from relevant baseline and that from UNDP as IA.

⁴ See ProDoc Annex 8: Portfolio of proposals arising from consultations during project formulation to help initiate the discussion by the project implementation team for activities under Output 1.3. The proposals included are those that could fit within the scope of the project and GEF guidelines, however, these will again be evaluated during implementation with data and priorities established from the surveys and land use planning investigations under Output 1.1 and identified in the Management Plans under Output 1.2

		and actions	water security; (iii) sector plans such as education, culture, Public Works (particularly on water division and their work on water pollution control affecting the coastal areas and the freshwater lens); and, (iv) increase in sectoral operational budgets by 20% by end of project from baseline. (BD and IW)		
			Output 2.3 Institutional strengthening of the capacity of the Department of Environment, the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and other government agencies for planning and monitoring of PAs and R2R management for linked landscapes for effective environmental management, enforcement and compliance monitoring, including (i) strategic training activities and application of the professional competency standards for staff (to be developed); and (ii) participation in regional R2R trainings through the regional program support project. (BD and IW)		
			Output 2.4 Economic, social/cultural and biodiversity lessons documented and communicated regionally, nationally and locally through: (i) targeted campaigns, publications in local language and English, and also available through dedicated website and the media (also targeting involvement of non-resident Niueans); (ii) mainstreaming environment curriculum and activities in schools; (iii) establishment of in-situ learning sites for biodiversity conservation; (iv) information, know-how, and experience made accessible to other Pacific neighbours to be emulated and replicated as applicable. (BD)		
Sub-total				3,985,562	10,361,600
Project Management Cost				209,300	707,000
Total Project Costs				4,194,862	11,068,600

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	In kind	200,000
National Government	Various Government Agencies	In kind	10,868,600
Total Co-financing			11,068,600

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name	Grant Amount	Agency Fee	Total
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Niue	1,331,702	119,853	1,451,555
UNDP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Niue	932,192	83,897	1,016,089
UNDP	GEF TF	Climate Change	Niue	1,775,603	159,805	1,935,408
UNDP	GEFTF	International Waters	Global	155,365	13,983	169,348
Total Grant Resources				4,194,862	377,538	4,572,400

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

2 Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

A detailed list of consultants' input to project implementation is contained in Annex 2 of the Project Document. The figures below do not include companies that will be engaged in contractual services for technical input.

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	404,000	4,424,629	4,828,629
National/Local Consultants	180,000	5,570,223	5,750,223

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT?

No

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁵

The project's strategic results framework has been refined but there have been no substantive changes from the version that was presented in the PIF.

More specifically, the Project Objective has remained the same, namely, *To strengthen conservation and sustainable use of land, water and marine areas and their biodiversity by building on their cultural heritage values through integrated national and community actions.*

There are still two Components, each of which has given rise to an Outcome as follows:

- i. Outcome 1: *New community conservation and national protected areas established at different levels, thus reducing threats and improving biodiversity status of conservation areas through effective community management*
- ii. Outcome 2: *Strengthened community and cross-sectoral involvement of relevant national government departments to promote effective Ridge to Reef management by mainstreaming biodiversity and environmental concerns into plans and actions*

Between them, the two Outcomes address the result sought by the Objective, namely, stronger conservation and sustainable use of land, water, marine areas and their biodiversity. And this will be achieved by building on cultural values, through integrated national and community actions.

At the Outputs level, all eight original Outputs from the PIF have been carried over into the revised Strategic Results Framework, however, there have been some refinements as follows:

- Under Outcome 1, there is a new Output 1.1 which sets specific targets (totalling 7,162 ha) for the expansion of the protected estate in Niue. Previously, the targets had not been as explicit.
- Original Output 1.1, with its focus on developing management plans is now reflected in new Output 1.2.
- Original Output 1.2 sought actual activities at village level and these are now under new Output 1.3 which seeks the implementation of the management plans.
- Original Output 1.3 with its focus on capacity building is seen as fitting better under Outcome 2 and is now located as new Output 2.1.
- Original Output 1.4 is also more logical under Outcome 2 and is carried over fully as new Output 2.3.
- Original Output 1.5 had a focus on ecosystem monitoring and this is better developed under new Output 1.4.
- Original Output 2.1 is carried over in full as new Output 2.4 which is broadened to include further knowledge management, communication and outreach.
- Original Output 2.2 is carried over into new Output 2.2 with only slight refinement of the text.
- Original Output 2.3 is incorporated with original Output 2.1 into the new Output 2.4.

Annex A shows the Strategic Results Framework, including indicators, baselines (where available) and targets. Further explanation of the components of the Strategic Results Framework, can be found in Section 2.2 of the Project Document.

It needs to be noted that baselines are not always available in Niue at the level required by the project and surveys will be conducted during the inception phase to establish some baselines and departure points.

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

No significant difference from the PIF, however, some further detail has become available during project formulation and is shown in Section 2.7 of the Project Document.

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

⁵ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

No change since the PIF and the “fit” with the GEF focal area strategy and objectives is discussed in Section 2.1.2 of the Project Document.

A.3. The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage

UNDP’s comparative advantage in the implementation of this project was covered in the PIF and the Formulation Team has confirmed this.

In addition, UNDP has finalized its Biodiversity and Ecosystem Framework for 2012 to 2020 (“The Future We Want: Biodiversity and Ecosystems - Driving Sustainable Development”), which will be integrated in the UNDP Business plan and country programmes. Under the Framework, the first Programme is dedicated to integrating biodiversity and ecosystem management into development planning and production sector activities to safeguard biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services that sustain human wellbeing.

Furthermore, UNDP has brought out its Strategic Plan for 2014-17 which recognizes Sustainable Land Management as one of the ways in which natural capital can be maintained and protected. The project aligns with and contributes to two outcomes of the Strategic Plan, namely: Outcome 2 “Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded” Output 2.3 “Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste”; and Outcome 3 “Citizen expectations for voice, effective development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance” and relevant output (3.5) “Transparent and non-discriminatory legal and regulatory frameworks and policies enabled for sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems (in line with international conventions and national legislation)”.

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

The unique Niue environment, its biodiversity and its ecosystem services on which life on the Island depends is under threat from both natural as well as anthropogenic impacts. The small size of Niue Island and the small population create a natural instability, common to many small island environments. Natural disasters such as cyclones can devastate a very high proportion of the land area, and introduced animals or plants may rapidly become pests in an environment of relatively few native species, which cannot provide a counter-balance.

In Niue, the ownership of land and understanding of the land tenure system must be foremost in any efforts to protect and manage the environment, and this has created difficulties in the past particularly as a result of many absentee owners residing in New Zealand and Australia. Traditional mores and customary principles of shared ownership need to be respected and this has created barriers in some instances.

There is a perception among Niueans that traditional forms of conservation can address environmental concerns. However, while these form the important cornerstones, their effectiveness may be diminished by emerging threats. Outside influences and economic pressures are leading to over-exploitation of some resources and the targets of high tourist numbers could exacerbate these pressures if not carefully controlled. Although Niue has been more fortunate than many countries in that it has lost few species and retains large areas of relatively pristine natural habitats, the threats are there and the impacts are likely to increase if nothing is done. Notable among these are examples of land degradation, the degradation of habitats and the over-exploitation of desirable species.

Systematic management of natural resources is not well developed and there are few mechanisms to prevent over-use. The legal framework and procedures are mainly in place but implementation and enforcement are weak due to a shortage of human resources. Capacity, in terms of know-how, is available, although graduates need to be lured back to maintain the level of expertise. However, the small number of people means that the “catchment” is small.

These threats to environmental values of national and global importance will have dire consequences if not adequately addressed. Prominent among these are: reduced tourism earnings, pollution of groundwater, erosion and loss of scarce topsoil, reduced ecosystem services and loss of productive land. In turn, these consequences will give rise to long term impacts such as economic downturn, loss of biodiversity, reduced incomes and depressed welfare and livelihoods. It is obvious that the threats need to be addressed.

In the face of the above threats and in recognition of their potentially serious consequences and long-term impacts, the government has taken a number of mitigation steps, often with the support of external donor agencies. The policy and regulatory response and the institutional response, are detailed in the ProDoc (section 1.4) as are a number of on-going and planned initiatives – these constitute the baseline project which is estimated to be worth over USD10 million. As can be

expected, at the forefront of the Government’s activities are the Department of Environment and the Department of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries, as well as the Ministry of Infrastructure with its work on pollution control. In addition, significant contributions to the baseline of activities have been made by the Department of Community Affairs in its work at Village level as well as Taoga Niue with its input at the cultural and traditional level. The Department of Justice, Lands and Survey reflects its dual role with activities at the legal level on titles and land ownership as well as on survey and land use planning.

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

The Niue baseline project and response has left some gaps which can be remedied through the increment that will be provided by the GEF. The relevant baseline, with the addition of the GEF Trust Fund resources constitutes the GEF Alternative. The table below, summarizes the remaining gaps, lists project activities and outputs which will address the gaps and records the incremental benefits targeted.

CURRENT SITUATION : REMAINING GAPS	ACTIVITIES PUT IN PLACE BY PROJECT	GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS
<p>The values of biodiversity resources in Niue have not been methodically documented. Additionally, the analysis of the value of the island’s biodiversity or its marine biodiversity has not been updated regularly. Information on biodiversity status and hotspots is unavailable. Furthermore, social and cultural values of nature, reflected in traditional knowledge, folklore, and handicraft production related to biodiversity, are being lost.</p> <p>The lack of analysis and documentation of values is largely due to the limited capacity and awareness for ecosystems management in government departments and at community level. This has hampered effective mainstreaming of environmental issues. There is a fragmented sectoral approach to resources management by different sectors without clear cross-agency cooperation and partnerships and the desired positive impacts on the environment have not been achieved. Communities are not fully engaged and the promotion of sustainable activities in the areas surrounding the conservation areas is necessary to reduce threats from outside.</p> <p>The thrust towards tourism would mean increasing the number of island inhabitants from the tourists and the necessary support workers, possibly migrants. As the socioeconomic conditions in Niue further improve, it is also conceivable that Niueans from abroad return to the Island. All these will add pressure on the island’s ecosystem.</p> <p>Under the baseline scenario, sectoral plans have not effectively internalized the multiple benefits achievable through an integrated approach to land, water, biodiversity, and seascape management. Ecosystems management is seen as primarily a sectoral priority (of the Environment Department) and the multiple benefits of integrated production landscape management have not been maximized through targeted support to communities to manage landscape and seascape – especially at those areas that have been considered critical from the perspective of global environmental values. Therefore, biodiversity conservation will continue to be impacted by unsustainable land use practices and the ecosystems and cultural values of such areas will also be negatively impacted through community and other sectoral activities.</p> <p>Any creation of protected/conservation areas needs to be consented by the families and enforced primarily by them. The current approach to village development plans has not included any focus on natural resources management or heritage protection. The traditional practice of setting aside strict protection areas (<i>Tapu</i>) or seasonal closures (<i>Fono</i>), although still practiced, is in danger of dying out as it has not been formally supported by the government. Local communities have not recognized fully the benefits of</p>	<p>Outcome 1 : New community conservation and national protected areas established at different levels, thus reducing threats and improving biodiversity status of conservation areas through effective community management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of past surveys and conduct additional surveys to identify natural resources that merit protection. • New protected areas and conservation areas on land, established through the use of various protection mechanisms. • Marine Protected Area at Beveridge Reef established. • Contiguous conservation areas in the coastal reef environment established. • Management Plans developed for the extended protected areas. • Implementation of various interventions at Village and National level, identified as priorities in the management plans. • Environmental monitoring system established. • Environmental information management system to handle, archive, analyse and make available the processed data for use in management of the protected estate and natural resources in general. <p>Outcome 2 : Strengthened community and cross-sectoral involvement of relevant national government departments to promote effective Ridge to Reef management by mainstreaming biodiversity and environmental concerns into plans and actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional strengthening, capacity building and other foundational elements at the Village Council and community level. • Institutional strengthening and capacity building among key central government entities. • Policy and regulatory reforms at central level but also through by-laws 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National PA system expanded from 5,428 ha to 12,678 ha. - Improved management effectiveness of existing PAs (Huvalu, Anono), covering 5,428 ha. - Extent and quality of globally relevant natural habitats, especially forests, caves, cliffs and reefs, maintained or improved. - Population status of several globally significant species maintained or increased, e.g. Peka, Uga, Lupe. - Improved land and natural resource management by communities inside and adjacent to PAs, resulting in a reduction of land clearance, agricultural chemicals use, degradation of groundwater quality, reef pollution. - Protection and restoration of forest cover, habitat integrity and connectivity across the targeted tapu areas and PAs, and of ecosystem goods and services within and outside PAs, including: non-timber forest products, fish, shellfish stocks and fish recruitment zones on reefs, biodiversity habitat, tourism attractions, soil

<p>conservation actions on their lives and livelihoods and the threats to both marine and terrestrial biodiversity posed by pollution and unsustainable use. Marine areas, in particular, have received less attention for conservation efforts.</p> <p>There is overharvesting of some resources (such as flying foxes and coconut crabs) and while families/communities have set aside areas for protection, they have not been given formal legal designation as protected ecosystems. Additionally, current conservation initiatives have not been implemented in a holistic manner (the ridge to reef approach).</p>	<p>at Village level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacities will be enhanced through the provision of expertise and know-how for land use planning and management, protected area management (including for ecotourism), species protection and management, sustainability. • Information sharing, awareness raising, learning and outreach. 	<p>protection, water quality, carbon sequestration.</p>
---	---	---

The project will build upon and complement the efforts of the Niue Government to conserve and sustain the island’s biodiversity and ecosystem services through integrated land-water-coastal management, while contributing to the implementation of the Pacific Island Multi-focal Area R2R approaches. Building upon the government efforts and with the collaboration of communities and private landowners, the GEF Alternative will provide incremental funding for the provision of technical support to the government and other stakeholders including local communities to create an enabling environment for biodiversity protection and management through integrated environmental planning over the terrestrial and coastal environments, implementing specific protection activities at ecosystem and species level, reducing anthropogenic pressure on land and coastal resources, catalysing sustainable agricultural, water/land use, pollution reduction and habitat conservation. Technical assistance for the application of integrated environment management and awareness communications will catalyse the uptake of ecosystem protection and adaptive resource management methods resulting in a significant improvement of management effectiveness in terrestrial and marine protect areas and governance in managing ecosystem services in Niue.

This project will enhance Niue’s capacity to effectively create and manage protected areas for biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of natural resources, and safeguarding of ecosystem services. It focuses on the expansion of its protected estate on land and on its marine areas through a combination of community conservation areas and government-led protected areas. In Community Conservation Areas, both strict protection and sustainable use zones will be identified and planned carefully, using innovative protection tools recognizing that tenure over most land areas is vested in local communities. This project has been designed to engineer a paradigm shift in the management of terrestrial, coastal and marine protected sites from a site-centric approach to a holistic “ridge to reef” comprehensive approach. Through this approach, activities in the immediate production landscapes adjacent to marine and terrestrial protected areas will be managed to reduce threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services stemming from key production activities (e.g. tourism and agriculture). Additionally, the project also introduces the concept of connectivity between landscape and seascape in Niue. Terrestrial protected areas will include a landscape that links strictly protected community areas (tapu) to each other to enhance their integrity and to form a functional ecological corridor between them. Similarly, the creation of a Marine Protected Area at Beveridge Reef also satisfies the integrated and holistic approach promoted by the project by recognizing the link that is thought to exist between the Reef and mainland Niue through which the former serves as a source of recruitment for clams and other marine species that make up Niue’s coral reefs.

Among the project benefits are a number targeting enhanced institutional and personal capacity and other “soft” results as a foundation for sustainability of its products and achievements. However, there is also a significant number of tangible benefits and these are summarized in the following table.

OUTPUT	KEY IMPACTS/RESULTS/TANGIBLES
Output 1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial conservation area covering 2,550 ha linking traditionally strict protected sites (tapu) and their surrounding landscapes • Marine protected area covering 4,500 ha (Beveridge Reef) • Community conserved reefs covering at least 112 ha • 14 land use plans, one for each District spanning land as well as reef, recognizing ecosystems, distribution of important species and their habitats, heritage/cultural sites, tourist natural attractions, and ecosystem services particularly those with environmental and strategic importance such as the groundwater lens
Output 1.2	<p>Management plans for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expanded terrestrial conservation areas • The new national marine protected area at Beveridge Reef • The community conserved reefs
Output 1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At terrestrial Protected Areas – tracks (including board walks), signage and interpretation, visitor facilities, information kiosks • Management of domestic solid waste • Species Recovery Plans for endangered species • Species Management Plans for threatened species • Improvements in reef water quality (protection from pollution) • At Beveridge Reef MPA - permanent moorings, signage, advisory material at key departure points

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of aquifer through treatment facilities for septic tank effluent (extra capacity in hospital wastewater treatment facility) • Assessment of carrying capacity for tourism • Recording of traditional ways of managing and protecting natural resources • Sustainable land use and climate change adaptation • Ecosystem-friendly enterprises
Output 1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Information Management System (EIMS) • Environment Monitoring System (EMS)
Output 2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R2R Network for professionals and practitioners (including Village Council members) • Mainstreaming of environment, biodiversity and the R2R approach in the curriculum in the schools • Environmental monitoring by senior students • An <i>in situ</i> land and forest conservation learning area as part of the planned new Cultural Centre and Museum • An <i>in-situ</i> reef conservation learning centre as a focus for the Western Reef Conservation Area

In summary, the funding dimensions of the project are as in the following table.⁶

OUTCOME	COFINANCE BASELINE	GEF TRUST FUND	TOTAL PROJECT COST
1. New community conservation and national protected areas established at different levels, thus reducing threats and improving biodiversity status of conservation areas through effective community management	6,204,006	2,503,562	8,707,568
2. Strengthened community and cross-sectoral involvement of relevant national government departments to promote effective Ridge to Reef management by mainstreaming biodiversity and environmental concerns into plans and actions	4,157,594	1,482,000	5,639,594
TOTALS	10,361,600	3,985,562	14,347,162

A.6.Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks

The expanded risks and mitigation measures identified in the PIF are discussed in the ProDoc, Section 2.3 and the following table provides a summary.

RISK	RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES
Low population and low capacities for project implementation	Moderate	Niue has an extremely small resident population and project design has taken this into account to reduce the severity of this risk. The implementation framework applies the R2R approach (comprehensive and integrated) and uses existing human resources from many sectors – within government, at the Village Councils and communities level, as well as from NGOs and the private sector. This could lead to challenges for effective coordination and timely implementation. The project will ensure that roles and responsibilities of different sectors in the project are clear and unambiguous. It will also reach an understanding that non-delivery will mean that the sector will have to be relieved of its role. In an effort towards the long term remedy of this risk, the project will assign priority to the engagement of Niueans (including those residing abroad), but in the interest of project integrity will seek input from the international market if required. In such an event, international experts will be required to mentor and partner local experts, enhancing their capacity. UNDP will provide support to the government as a responsible party for the project.
Complex land tenure will make declaration of community conservation area difficult	Moderate	Land tenure is vested in families, and as many are non-residents, decision making on land allocation for long term conservation may require time and consultations to ensure that there is support for such actions. The project will ensure that proper consultation (including with absentee owners) and tenure clarification (through review of the regulatory base) is undertaken. Ownership of the Project by the communities will mitigate against this risk.
Significant distance between the island and Beveridge	Moderate	Beveridge Reef is 200 km from Niue and it therefore not possible to manage the MPA as actively as the terrestrial Pas and the community reefs. However, project

⁶ Project management costs are in addition to these figures.

Reef will make it very difficult to ensure it is protected from passing ships / yachts		design has allowed for this and the Management Plan will focus on education and information as well as a code of ethics for boaties. Periodic visits by DAFF staff will monitor the effectiveness of this approach. Partnerships with regional institutions, specifically SPC, will be developed in undertaking the ecological survey of the area. SPC has better capacity in this kind of work. For tourism, in addition to the awareness campaigns, Niue will work with tourism firms to ensure eco-friendly practices.
Climate variability and change – especially natural disasters	Low	Extreme weather events affect Niue and are difficult to predict. However, this is a natural phenomenon which has affected Niue ecosystems and increased their resilience. The project will ensure that actions taken (towards conservation and sustainable use) will lead to rapid recovery of the ecosystems in the aftermath of such events.
Coral bleaching and seawater acidification as a result of climate change	Low	Niue has been fortunate to escape with minor incidents of oral bleaching and seawater acidification in the past, when compared with other localities. However, these phenomena could impact ultimate sustainability and the monitoring system proposed by the project and the formulation and implementation of management plans for reef areas which will arise from the project, will reduce incremental impacts and additional stresses from fishing pressure, pollution, sedimentation and other human activity.

Further consideration and updating of risks will be carried out by the project during the Inception Phase. Furthermore, the UNDP ATLAS base for this project will set up a Risk analysis and assessment system which will be reflected in the relevant section of the annual PIRs for the project.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

In the unique situation in Niue, coordination with other relevant projects is essential and the project will be well coordinated with ongoing GEF financed projects. The Director General of the Ministry of Natural Resources (DG-MNR) has oversight over all projects and activities carried out under DAFF, DOE and MET and this captures all GEF, FAO, FFA, SPC, and similar projects and donor inputs. The DG-MNR is also the GEF Operational Focal Point. More specifically, a monthly scheduled meeting deals with project coordination, collaboration, synergies, etc, and there are also specific meetings around project updates and on-going work, both as scheduled in project work plans and as required by the DG.

Furthermore, and in an effort to achieve a high level of coordination, project steering committees across MNR projects and across government, include high level participation/representation by key relevant departments and stakeholders to ensure there is cross-sectoral collaboration and cooperation. This is linked to efficiency targets and to maximising outcomes from project investments.

Finally, there are two high level coordination processes. The first involves the Secretary of Government and Directors General who meet to consider these matters, with cooperation, collaboration and synergies very much as the main focus. The second is the aid coordination unit in the Premier’s Office which is now identified as a key mechanism for coordination of development assistance.

Among the more important initiatives that this project will be coordinated with, are the following:

Pacific Ridge-to-Reef Programme: The project will build on and benefit from close collaboration with the R2R Regional Programme through the umbrella project, as well as other R2R national projects being implemented by Niue’s Pacific neighbours. The goal of the Regional Programme as in the conceptual framework outlined in the Program Framework Document (PFD) of the programmatic approach is to “*maintain and enhance Pacific Island countries’ ecosystem goods and services (provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural) through integrated approaches to land, water, forest, biodiversity and coastal resource management that contribute to poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods and climate resilience*”. The project development has also benefited from a number of completed and existing initiatives/processes related to biodiversity conservation and adaptive management.

Biodiversity Enabling Activity: This initiative is supporting the updating of the NBSAP and 5th National Report to the CBD. Funding support is from the GEF and implementation is through UNEP. This proposed GEF/UNDP Ridge to Reef national project will build on the analysis and recommendations emerging from this updating process, whilst the updating of this important document will also benefit from the recommendations and discussions which arose from key stakeholders in the design this R2R project.

GEF-FAO PAS Forestry and Protected Area Management Project: (and other FAO projects) aims to enhance the sustainable livelihoods of local communities living in and around protected areas. The project is mainly focused on institutional PA arrangements, capacity development and income generation activities to improve the livelihoods of local communities, terrestrial biodiversity conservation and sustainable land and forest management. The R2R project, which addresses some of these issues but with a much broader and deeper scope, will take advantage of the momentum created by the PAS project and will build on some of its activities, increasing the scale and sustainability of its impact. In particular, the R2R project would, in addition to the activities planned in the PAS project, (i) expand and connect the existing and newly created PAs, (ii) integrate the management of marine PAs and the link between marine and terrestrial PAs, (iii) develop the capacities required to manage the registered PAs and consolidate the conservation steering committees, (iv) guarantee the financial sustainability of the PAs, (v) ensure a fair distribution of benefits to the communities and landowners, (vi) provide additional support for raising public awareness, (vii) complement the educational programmes at primary school (PAS Project) with the integration of environmental education in the curriculum of the secondary school (R2R), and (viii) support the approval of the laws and their effective enforcement. The PAS project commenced in August 2013 and this R2R project will explore the specific scope for collaboration during its inception phase. FAO is also supporting other relatively small agriculture and fisheries projects in addition to this GEF-PAS project.

UNEP-GEF PAS Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species in the Pacific Islands: This project is supporting the development of a National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan, as well as the development of National guidelines for incorporation of IAS in the policy and legislative framework, harmonised regionally. The project also envisages the creation of a National Invasive Species Multi-stakeholder Committee, which may also serve as the main advisory committee for this R2R project as well. The R2R project has activities dealing with invasive species such as those addressing the problem of feral pigs and the invasive plant species in Huvalu Conservation Area. Collaboration between the two initiatives will lead to mutual gain.

IUCN / EU Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Programme (BIOPAMA) recognises that appropriate information and adequate technical capacity are fundamental to ensuring that national and regional development decisions to address these challenges are sustainable in the long-term and do not compromise the natural resources and ecosystem services that are the basis for livelihoods and survival. The project is supporting, delivering and developing a variety of capacity development opportunities including vocational training, thematic workshops, on-line resources, regionally appropriate tertiary curricula and mentoring. The R2R project will explore areas of potential collaboration and mutual gains with the BIOPAMA project, in particular in the areas of education, training and capacity building.

SPREP / IUCN / GIZ Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Management in Pacific Island Countries and Atolls Project (MACBIO): MACBIO is still not fully active in Niue and the R2R project will discuss how it could become involved in the marine spatial planning activities since its activities for the Western Reef and Beveridge Reef are very relevant.

Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project: This project, which is now complete, laid a good foundation for some of the work which will be carried out by the R2R project. Its aim was to enable Niue to address sustainable land management and complement the NAP process and implementation. It aimed to contribute towards the achievement of a long term goal - *sustainable land management of Niue's unique terrestrial resources while at the same time promoting sustainable productive systems contributing to the social well-being of its present and future generations*. It worked through a targeted practical participatory "bottom up" approach having established a productive farm for the Mutalau community based on SLM principles and serving as a training site for all land user stakeholders in SLM practices. According to the Terminal Evaluation Report - A key challenge has been the declining interest on the part of the host community - the result of a declining and aging population. This is probably the most critical among other lessons to be learnt from this project and applicable to the R2R project which aims to build on the experience.

Other projects that could be relevant, even if only indirectly, include: a) The Agriculture Sector Plan 2013, which is being assisted by SPC, will provide an overarching plan covering all agriculture initiatives in Niue and takes into account all levels of agricultural development, from subsistence to commercial, with a multistakeholder approach; b) the Soil Management Plan and the Resource Manual, which are at the proposal stage developed by SPC and Landcare New Zealand, will provide supplementary information on soil maps and other related information; c) the Coastal Management and Development Plan which is in its final stage of drafting, will provide guidance particularly on the protection and sustainable fishing of coastal resources and developing coastal fisheries to maximise benefits for Niue's local communities.

As the latest to be implemented, this project will benefit from advice, experiences and lessons arising from the other projects, recently finished or underway. Conversely, this project will be able to influence positively those projects which are at the initial stages and ensure that their specific activities on the ground are in harmony with and complement this project. It may also be possible to achieve economies of scale in areas such as transport, the purchase of goods and services, and in survey and monitoring.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 Stakeholders role in project implementation

STAKEHOLDER	ROLE AND/OR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PROJECT	RELEVANT PROJECT COMPONENT
PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS		
1) Environment Department (DoE)	The Environment Department was the lead government department for the development of the NBSAP. It also ensures that waste and pollution management are carried out and it also deals with issues of biosafety and invasive species. This department is seen as one of two lead agencies for the implementation of this project.	As a key department of the Ministry of Natural Resources which will serve as Executing Agency, DoE will be involved in work across both Outcomes and particularly under Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.2, and 2.3
2) Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF)	The department is primarily responsible for ensuring increasing agricultural productivity through agronomic research and extension as well as by supporting livestock rearing activities. Their role also includes promoting sustainable land management and forestry. Its work on marine areas is largely focused on sustainable fisheries, promotion of fish aggregating devices and marine protected areas (MPAs). This department is seen as one of two lead agencies for the implementation of this project.	As a key department of the Ministry of Natural Resources which will serve as Executing Agency, DAFF will be involved in work across both Outcomes and particularly under Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2 and 2.3
3) Department of Community Affairs	This department is the key government agency that works on local development through the Village Councils, which are locally elected local development committees. The department is currently supporting the development of sustainable development plans at the village level.	The Department will facilitate the involvement of Village Councils who are key partners at the local level involved in Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.1
4) Village Councils	The 14 Village Councils are locally elected bodies with a three year term. They are responsible for developing local development plans and their implementation. They are also legally empowered to make local by-laws. They receive a small grant annually from the national government, much of which is spent on beautification of the villages. Normally, each council has five members. The Village Councils are key partners together with DoE and DAFF. The project will empower them to work as equals on project activities and achieve mutual gains.	
5) Tāoga Niue - Culture and Heritage	Tāoga Niue will partner the project so as to ensure that traditional knowledge, cultural traditions and special sites are identified and respected. The project will work closely with Tāoga Niue to ensure that conservation activities complement cultural heritage sites management, particularly around identified traditional village areas, which have been abandoned. The project will work with Tāoga Niue to educate and inform on traditional approaches to natural resources management	In addition to serving as the project's advisor on heritage, tradition and culture, Tāoga Niue will be involved specifically in Outputs 1.1, 1.4, 2.3 and 2.4
6) Education Department/schools	The department will lead in ensuring that the school curriculum in both primary and secondary schools includes modules on the ridge to reef concept for conservation and sustainable use tailored for the Niuean context to raise awareness and to build environmental management as one option for future career development of Niuean students. The Department will also work with the project to involve/ mobilize students in relevant conservation actions such as survey and monitoring	Students will be involved in work under Outputs 1.1 and 1.4, whereas the Department will be involved primarily under Outputs 2.3 and 2.4
7) Ministry of Infrastructure	This Ministry, more specifically The Public Works Department (Water Section) has been involved in promoting integrated water resources management, amongst other activities. Their role in the project will be to ensure that water pollution minimization strategies are put in place and some relevant pollution reduction technologies are demonstrated to reduce pollution of both the underground water lens and marine areas (reefs)	The Ministry will be involved in Outputs 1.3, 1.4, 2.2 and 2.3
8) Justice, Lands & Survey (L&S)	The department plays a critical role to resolve land tenure disputes, and has GIS capabilities and data for mapping, survey, GPS database, etc. These will be important in the creation of protected areas and their effective management. L&S will work with the project in its efforts to set up an Environmental Information Management System.	The main involvement of L&S will be under Outputs 1.1 and 2.2 for land boundaries, and Output 1.4 for data management
9) Niue Tourism Authority	The Tourism Authority is finalizing its Tourism Strategy Plan which aims to increase substantially the number of arrivals over time. The Authority recognizes that the Niue environment (broadly defined) is the drawcard for	Involved mainly under Outputs 2.2 and 2.3

	visitors to the Island and is therefore committed to its protection.	
SECONDARY STAKEHOLDERS		
10) Chamber of Commerce and the private sector	The Niue private sector is somewhat modest in its size, but it is very important in the island's economy. Main components of the private sector include the tourism industry, and the agriculture and fisheries sectors. The project will help the private sector in its efforts to work within the constraints required to maintain the quality of the environment on a sustainable basis. Working through the Chamber of Commerce and in collaboration with the Tourism Authority, the project will provide capacity building to the private sector particularly for the application of the EIA Process.	Under Output 1.3, and particularly under 2.2
11) Niue Island United Association of Non-Government Organizations (NIUANGO)	Niue has a number of NGOs and all are affiliated with NIUANGO. Some of the more active NGOs in Niue include the National Women's Council, which has been actively promoting women's economic empowerment, and the Youth Council which has been promoting youth involvement in spiritual and other development. The Association and its members can provide technical support to local communities and for different project activities – including surveys, monitoring and awareness raising.	Involvement will be across the spectrum of project scope, but especially under Outputs 1.1, 1.3, 2.1 and 2.4
12) Niue Island Organic Farming Association	The association is promoting organic Vanilla and Noni farming for export as a viable economic alternative to other farming that uses agrochemicals. Their approach could be promoted to additional farmers for sustainable land and environment management to reduce pollution as well as to increase household incomes.	Under Output 1.3
13) University of the South Pacific (USP)	The University of the South Pacific operates a small campus in Niue primarily as a distance learning centre. In addition to its library facilities and mentoring and guidance for students, the campus also has an effective teleconferencing facility. The project may support interested students, including post-graduates, in their research activities.	Under Outputs 2.1 and 2.4
14) Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)	The SPC provides support and advice to DAFF and DoE on a number of aspects of conservation and management of natural resources. SPC has been identified as a contractor to carry out the survey, research and investigations into the importance of Beveridge Reef as a source of recruitment of organisms for the reefs of Niue Island. It is also planned for SPC to assist DAFF to build the case for declaring Beveridge Reef as a Marine Protected Area and draw up the first management plan.	Under Outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

The above table which is the result of extensive discussions and presentations, serves as the draft Stakeholders' Participation Plan. Formal letters of support and cooperation from key stakeholders are in Annex D. The final Plan will be produced during the Inception Phase by the project team in consultation with stakeholders for approval by the Project Executive Board.

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

The project has a number of national socio-economic benefits foremost of which is the paradigm shift from a fragmented approach to a comprehensive (R2R) approach to environmental management which better reflects the small size of the Island and the consequential impacts that can arise particularly on ecosystem services such as the provision of freshwater. The project will also foster better and more effective collaboration between the national government and Village Councils, as equal partners, for the protection and management of biodiversity and natural resources and this reflects the fact that in Niue, ownership of land and resources is vested in families and communities.

The project will leave a legacy of stronger institutions and enhanced capacities in the DoE and the DAFF directly, and in Infrastructure, Tāoga Niue, Tourism and Education less directly. However, institutional strengthening and capacity building by the project will also be very visible at the Village Council and communities levels.

A further national benefit of the project is the turnaround which is expected through the development and implementation of Species Recovery Plans and Species Management Plans for species which are of high traditional value and which are considered at risk. These and other species will benefit from the extensions to the forest protected estate to be achieved by the project. The forest also yields edible ferns, medicinal plants and minor wood products and these are expected to increase and become more sustainable through the project.

In parallel, the project's advice to landowners in collaboration with DAFF, will build on the foundation laid by the earlier SLM project and lead to better use of land for the production of marketable (possibly for export) products. This is expected to lead to an increase in those carrying out farming activities, targeting youth in particular.

The uniqueness of Niue's natural environment has been realized and it is now being marketed as an eco-tourism and adventure tourism destination. The project will extend protection of the natural environment thus enhancing the tourism attractions which

in turn will increase income and employment opportunities. Ultimately, these could lead to an increase in population through the return of some of those Niueans who sought a better life in New Zealand.

Gender equality and women’s and youths’ empowerment will be mainstreamed into project activities, ensuring that women and youth have a real voice in project governance as well as an active role in implementation. Women and youth will participate equally with men in any dialogue or decision-making initiated by the project and will influence decisions that will determine the success of the project and ultimately the future of their families (see section 2.6, Table 6).

Ultimately, in a small place like Niue, the benefits of the project will reach into every one of the 14 villages and all Niueans will gain, mostly directly, from the project. This will be through improved quality of life, better employment opportunities, and improvements to the entire economy.

Socio-economic and other benefits will serve as the foundations for the protection of natural resources and biodiversity. This is particularly so because in Niue 99% of land is privately owned. The greater appreciation of the value and vulnerability of biodiversity and natural resources will lead to the establishment of protected and conservation areas on private land as well as on community reefs with their concomitant global environmental benefits.

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

The existing approach is based on isolated and discrete interventions addressing specific impacts as they arise. This sectoral approach is not effective in addressing the threats to various sectors or ecosystems (forest, agriculture, coastal/fisheries, water, etc.) which are all interlinked. Especially for small island countries such as Niue, the Ridge-to-Reef approach which is comprehensive, integrated and island-wide is more appropriate and much more cost-effective. The R2R intervention is necessarily an island-wide approach as can be seen in the outputs and activities.

The cost effectiveness of this project will be further ensured by the following elements that have been included in project design.

- The project approach involves the development or refinement of policies, legal mechanisms, approaches, processes and other tools at the upstream level in a participatory approach. These will then be tested at the local level, where land and natural resources are under community ownership, before they are rolled out for adoption nationwide. In this way, wholesale adoption of these tools and approaches will only take place after they have been tried and tested and are therefore both more reliable and more acceptable.
- The project will focus its interventions on localities selected because of identified values or threats of degradation. This will maximize the visible impacts and allow the beneficiary locations to act as models for the protection and management of biodiversity and natural resources nationwide. The project will implement on-the-ground interventions in cohesive and contained localities, rather than in geographically dispersed areas, and this will reduce operational costs significantly.
- The project will place equal emphasis on assisting compliance as well as enforcement which will require less intense and less costly levels of monitoring and prosecution. This will allow the project to work effectively with local communities and stakeholders to share management responsibilities and costs, as well as to develop sustainable economic activities that can benefit these partners and generate revenue streams from wise use of natural resources. This is more cost effective than an exclusionary strategy which is likely to be unacceptable by the majority, costly to enforce and unlikely to be sustainable.
- Close coordination with on-going projects such as those funded by UNDP, the EU and FAO (see A.7 above). Some of these projects have only recently closed or are still under implementation and have accumulated practical experiences with aspects of natural resource use which are going to be invaluable for this project. While the focus on a ridge to reef approach is unique to this project, many of the experiences and models developed by these other projects are still relevant.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN

The following M&E Plan and Budget will be reviewed during the Inception Workshop, adjusted as necessary and adopted by the Project Executive Board.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
----------------------	---------------------	---	------------

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP MCO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: 10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP GEF RTA/R2R PM will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by R2R PM ▪ Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R2R PM and team ▪ UNDP MCO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R2R PM and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R2R PM and team ▪ UNDP MCO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 20,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R2R PM and team, ▪ UNDP MCO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : 24,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R2R PM and team ▪ UNDP MCO ▪ local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Project Audits and HACT Assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP MCO ▪ Project Team 	30,000 (Audit) 5,000 (HACT)	Following UNDP finance regulations and rules
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP MCO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 89,000	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT AND GEF AGENCY

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT: (Operational Focal Point endorsement letter attached)

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Sauni Tongatule	Director	Department of Environment	7 AUGUST 2013

B. GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION

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

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator		22 Jan 2016	Jose Erez Padilla	+66 2 304 9100 Ext 2730	jose.padilla@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the UNDAF Outcome for the Pacific Sub-region 2013-2017 – Outcome Area 1: Environmental management, climate change and disaster risk management					
UNDP Strategic Plan Outcome: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded (Outcome 1)					
UNDP Strategic Plan Outputs:					
Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.					
Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation					
GEF BD Objective 1: Improve Sustainability of PA Systems, and Outcome 1.1 - Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas					
GEF 5 BD2 Objective: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors					
Output 2: National and sub-national land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation					
GEF Outcome Indicators:					
Indicator 1.1: Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool					
Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool					
Indicator 2.2: Policies and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at End of Project	Source of verification	Assumptions and Risks
Project Objective⁷ <i>To strengthen conservation and sustainable use of land, water and marine areas and their biodiversity by building on their cultural heritage values through integrated national and community actions</i>	Impact 0.1 Incorporation of cultural and traditional values and approaches in natural resources protection and management	Cultural values and constraints are reported as being eroded away	Culturally significant species, habitats and methods of conservation are identified, recorded and being built upon	Publication of Report by Tāoga Niue arising from research and survey work	Assumptions: The Objective assumes that the strengthening of the protected estate can be built on cultural heritage values, and that this can best be done through the integration of national with community level actions. Risks: There is a risk that heritage and traditional values will in fact work against the project Objective if landowners assert their traditional ownership rights. There could be a reluctance at community level to cooperate with the project if this is seen as an abrogation of ownership rights. The project will protect itself from this risk by gaining the confidence of communities and their Village Councils through its genuine recognition of ownership rights and its efforts to safeguard them.
	Impact 0.2 The freshwater lens safeguarded in the long term	Freshwater lens at risk from agricultural chemicals, and septic tank effluent	Biodegradable or certified organic agri-chemicals used exclusively; and at least 80% of septic tank effluent treated, such that risk of contamination of the freshwater lens controlled or removed	Regular monitoring by Ministry of Infrastructure	
	Impact 0.3 Terrestrial and reef species are being utilized on a sustainable basis to an increasing number of community members	Some reef species such as <i>Tridacna</i> sp., and <i>Holothuria</i> sp., have been reported as diminished ⁸ . Peka, Lupe and Uga	Access or utilization by communities for food and other uses increased by 25% but on a sustainable basis	Ministry of Natural Resources State of the Environment Report	

⁷ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

⁸ Tamakautoga main sea track, 2013 survey, mid-tidal area results: *Tridacna* sp = 0 per 0.25m², *Holothuria* sp = 0.08 per 0.25m²

		populations have declined ⁹ ; utilization rates to be established during the first year			
Outcome 1¹⁰ <i>New community conservation and national protected areas established at different levels, thus reducing threats and improving biodiversity status of conservation areas through effective community management</i>	Impact 1.1 Extent of the protected estate in various forms and through different protective mechanisms	Tapu areas are many but not all are known or acknowledged; Huvalu Forest Conservation Area (5,400 ha) and Namoui Marine Reserve (27.67 ha) are the only Protected Areas	Additional 2550 ha of terrestrial ecosystems; additional 4500 ha of marine ecosystem; and, additional 200 ha of reef, protected by various instruments by the end of the project	Ministry of Natural Resources State of Environment Report	Assumptions: That there will be an appreciation of the intrinsic value to Niue of the protected estate, hence the desire to extend the protective/managed status. Likewise there will be an acceptance that Uga and Peka and other species are at risk and that action needs to be taken to ensure their sustainability. It is also assumed that a way will be found to provide legal recognition of Tapu while simultaneously safeguarding the private ownership. Risks: The risk is that the project timescale is somewhat short for some of the project benefits to manifest themselves, resulting in a lack of appreciation. The project will mitigate against this by putting in place a robust information and participatory strategy whereby stakeholders will share the project challenges as well as its benefits. The selected Indicators will serve to record beneficial results from project activities or confirm whether a good enough foundation has been laid for such results.
	Impact 1.2 Efforts in place for the recovery of species at risk	Hega (blue-crowned lory) and the olive small-scaled skink are considered endangered Uga and Peka are currently considered as threatened. Both are being harvested unsustainably.	Species Recovery Plans for Hega and the olive small-scaled skink formulated, adopted and being implemented. Species Management Plans for Uga and Peka formulated, adopted and being implemented.	Ministry of Natural Resources State of Environment Report	
	Impact 1.3 Status of completion and adoption of management plans for various conservation areas	Huvalu Conservation Area and Beveridge Reef – no Management Plan; Reefs covered somewhat by Coastal Management Plan	Huvalu Conservation Area, Beveridge Reef MPA, Western Reef Conservation Area, and new Confluence Conservation Area, all with management plans adopted and being implemented	Plans adopted and being implemented	
	Outputs: <i>Output 1.1 National conservation and protected area system expanded through - (i) a continuous terrestrial conservation area covering 2,550 ha that links traditionally strict protected sites (tapu) and their surrounding landscapes; (ii) a national marine protected area covering 4,500 ha (Beveridge Reef); and (iii) community conserved reefs covering at least 112 ha. Conservation and protected areas formalized through appropriate instruments</i> <i>Output 1.2 Management plans developed through participatory approaches for: a) expanded terrestrial conservation areas; b) the national marine protected area; and c) community conserved reefs; management plan adopted through appropriate instruments; management plans mainstreamed in development, sectoral and CC adaptation plans/policies; adequate financing identified from budgetary and other sources for implementation of the plans</i> <i>Output 1.3 Management plans implemented for all conservation areas through conservation and management activities (concrete measures) at the village, cross-village and national levels, including improvements in water quality in reef areas, protection of the freshwater lens and necessary support activities (soft measures)¹¹</i>				

⁹ Experienced hunters of Peka and lupe suggest a huge decline in numbers. 2014 Uga survey shows breeding population is at risk - only 1.9% and 24.5% of females and males respectively were found to be over the legal harvest limit of 36mm thoracic length. The average size of females and males determined from the 2014 survey were 26mm and 31mm thoracic length respectively. This was a decrease from 27mm and 33mm from the 2008 survey for females and males respectively.

¹⁰ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.

	<p>Output 1.4 Systematic local and national level ecosystems and species level biodiversity monitoring systems established, with data sharing and joint training and survey activities for terrestrial and marine areas and integrated approaches; monitoring and evaluation results are fed to the R2R program through the regional program support project to facilitate lessons sharing and cross-country fertilization</p>				
<p>Outcome 2 <i>Strengthened community and cross-sectoral involvement of relevant national government departments to promote effective Ridge to Reef management by mainstreaming biodiversity and environmental concerns into plans and actions</i></p>	<p>Impact 2.1 Promotion of R2R approach by Village Councils and Government departments</p>	<p>There is currently no comprehensive, holistic approach applied by Village Councils or Government Departments to natural resources management</p>	<p>New Village Development Plans, and reviewed existing ones, showing an explicitly comprehensive (R2R) and integrated approach towards land, water and natural resource management. Corporate Plans, Annual Work Plans and similar key documents, showing an explicitly comprehensive (R2R) and integrated approach towards land, water and natural resource management; together will collaboration across departmental boundaries.</p>	<p>Examination of Village Development Plans Review of relevant documents; annual reporting by Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>Assumptions: The Outcome assumes that stronger community and cross-sectoral involvement will lead to mainstreaming biodiversity and environmental considerations into key plans and actions and that this in turn will lead to effective R2R management. Risks: Unfortunately, the assumption may be only partly correct since mainstreaming could take place on paper and lip service can be paid to biodiversity and environment by hollow references in plans and actions (which is what the first three indicators look for). However, the critical mass of signs of mainstreaming targeted by the project and the public survey that will gauge awareness and understanding, will mitigate against this risk.</p>
	<p>Impact 2.2 The extent to which biodiversity and natural resources are taken into account in central and local planning, management and daily life</p>	<p>Neither sector plans nor Village Development Plans can be said to have mainstreamed biodiversity considerations</p>	<p>Biodiversity considerations become an explicit element in policies, plans, strategies and similar instruments</p>	<p>Review of relevant documents; annual reporting by Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	
	<p>Impact 2.3 Level of awareness, sensitivity and understanding of the value and vulnerability of natural resources</p>	<p>There is a certain level of awareness but it is not deep. The baseline will be established through survey at the Inception Phase</p>	<p>An improvement of 20-50% in awareness and understanding as measured by a repeat survey.</p>	<p>Public survey</p>	
	<p>Outputs: <i>Output 2.1</i> Community level actions on biodiversity and R2R implemented through: (i) establishment of village committees towards participatory management of terrestrial conservation areas and community-conserved reefs; (ii) training on integrated approaches to planning and management focusing on developing clearly-specified roles; and (iii) formulation of innovative instruments to secure support of landowners affected by the terrestrial conservation area and other interventions prescribed by the land-use plan <i>Output 2.2</i> Sector-related legal framework, policies and plans support effective R2R conservation and sustainable use within and outside of conservation areas, embedded in (i) community development plans; (ii) cross-sectoral plans such as climate change and mitigation and adaptation, tourism and the plan for achieving water security; (iii) sector plans such as education, culture, Public Works (particularly on water division and their work on water pollution control affecting the coastal areas and the freshwater lens); and, (iv) increase in sectoral operational budgets by 20% by end of project from baseline. <i>Output 2.3</i> Institutional strengthening of the capacity of the Department of Environment, the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and other government agencies</p>				

¹¹ See ProDoc Annex 8: Portfolio of proposals arising from consultations during project formulation for examples of possible activities. Actual activities will depend on priorities which arise from the survey and land use planning investigations under Output 1.1 and identified in the Management Plans under Output 1.2.

	<p>for planning and monitoring of PAs and R2R management for linked landscapes for effective environmental management, enforcement and compliance monitoring, including (i) strategic training activities and application of the professional competency standards for staff (to be developed); and (ii) participation in regional R2R trainings through the regional program support project</p> <p>Output 2.4 Economic, social/cultural and biodiversity of Niue's environment documented and communicated nationally and locally through: (i) targeted campaigns, publications in local language and English, and also available through dedicated website and the media (also targeting involvement of non-resident Niueans); (ii) mainstreaming environment curriculum and activities in schools; (iii) establishment of in-situ learning sites for biodiversity conservation; (iv) information, know-how, and experience made accessible to other Pacific neighbours to be emulated and replicated as applicable.</p>			
Process indicators of effective implementation and mainstreaming of UNDP strategic goals	Process Imp 1 Participation at village level	Opportunities for participation at village level will be maximised according to Table 7 and Table 8.	Village level participants and their role in implementation planned in AWP and recorded in PIRs	
	Process Imp 2 Cost effectiveness	The Government contribution in kind will be utilized to keep costs to a minimum. Likewise, preference will be given to local expertise who will be engaged at a lower cost. These actions will be taken without placing the project's success in jeopardy.	Co-financing will be tracked and recorded and reported. The PM will carry out individual staff performance assessments annually	
	Process Imp 3 Involvement of women and youth	Implementation of the Gender and Youth Strategy as in Section 2.6 with gender considerations mainstreamed and embedded in the project implementation process.	To be measured by the ratio of women and youth participating according to AWP and PIRs	
	Process Imp 4 Human rights	Recognition and respect of land ownership rights, including the rights of absentee owners.	To be measured by survey of Village Councils as representatives of their communities	
	Process Imp 5 Governance	Institutional capacity strengthening at central government and local village level leading to enhanced governance of natural resources management.	This will be covered by the various capacity building activities under the mainstream Outputs and Activities	
UNDP IRRF Outcomes and Outputs Indicators	IRRF Sub-Indicator 1.5 Hectares of land that are managed sustainably under <i>in-situ</i> conservation, sustainable use, and/or Access and Benefits Sharing (ABS) regime	Baseline to be defined at project inception through land use/ ecosystem surveys under Output 1.1	Refer to target for indicator related to Impact 1.1	Sources of verification will be the PIRs and other annual project reports. To be identified more accurately at project inception
	IRRF Sub-Indicator 2.5.1 Extent to which legal, policy and institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems	Refer to baselines for indicators related to Impacts 1.3 and 2.2	Refer to targets for indicators related to Impacts 1.3 and 2.2	Review of relevant documents; annual reporting by Ministry of Natural Resources
	IRRF Sub-Indicator 2.5.2 Extent to which capacities to implement national and local plans to protect and restore the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems, have improved	Refer to baseline for indicator related to Impact 2.1	Refer to targets for indicator related to Impact 2.1	Examination of Village Development Plans Review of relevant documents; annual reporting by Ministry of Natural Resources

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).

B.1 Comments from STAP

STAP welcomed the proposed project and its recommendation to GEFSec and UNDP was for CONSENT. More specifically, it made the following comments:

COMMENT	RESPONSE
1. STAP welcomes this well researched project containing a precise baseline assessment indicating clear drivers of biodiversity and ecosystem degradation, and concrete species and ecosystem-level indicators that can serve as a basis for monitoring of the success of the proposed interventions. STAP also highlights the value of the intention to empower local communities and build on their cultural heritage, and the outline of a useful set of interim expected outputs and indicators. The GEF MSP addressing land degradation, ‘Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in NIUE’ (GEF ID 3213), together with the proposed project is capable of providing a good balance of support to Niue.	The good elements noted by STAP have been brought into the project design and enhanced during the Formulation Phase. A strong relationship has been signalled between this project and earlier ones, in particular the SLM project.
2. STAP notes that the present project is the first full size GEF project proposed for Niue and that it is a child project under the regional ridge to reef Program (GEF ID 5395), which should enable Niue to obtain targeted expert support for ridge to reef actions. STAP also appreciates the references in the PIF to coordination and linkage to the other regional GEF-supported projects on adaptation to climate change and IWRM, and to the commitment to cross fertilize lessons and good practices between projects within the ridge to reef Program and Niue	The indications and commitments made at the PIF stage have been explored fully in the Formulation Phase resulting in a more robust project design. Some of these projects have already been completed and the Niue R2R project will coordinate with the broader Pacific R2R program.
3. In the screening reports on the parent Program and support projects (GEF IDs 5395 and 5404) STAP made strategic recommendations regarding regional support for capacity building and learning exchanges as well as the potential for the CBD-supported Marine Spatial Planning (MSP). In this regard the intention to apply ridge to reef concepts to adjacent terrestrial and near shore marine areas and immediate catchments would be compatible with the more holistic contextual approach offered by MSP, therefore the full project brief should consider STAP’s advice in this regard	The holistic R2R approach in Niue will be applied by this project to the whole island rather than to discrete catchments and there will be a strong link with all relevant regional interventions in an effort to overcome the limited capacity and know-how available on the Island. The R2R approach to be employed by the project on the Western Reef and at Beveridge Reef reflects Marine Spatial Planning as clearly noted in the ProDoc under Outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.
4. STAP notes that the indicators for success of the community-empowering aspects are less well defined than the biophysical indicators. It also calls the attention to the fact that, under the risks of global environmental change, there is no mention of coral bleaching associated to warming and decreased colony accretion rate as a result of ocean acidification. Although the country does not lie on the areas of the ocean where these phenomena have been projected to be the most critical, they should be addressed in a project where the protection of high-diversity reefs plays an important part	These suggestions have been borne in mind as the detailed scope of project interventions was developed. Community joint ownership of the project is part of the project foundation and the project has also adopted process indicators that specifically address participation at village level, the involvement of women and youth and human rights. And, while not addressing coral health directly because it is outside the project’s scope, the creation of Reef Community Conservation Areas with their respective management plans, will alleviate the concern noted by STAP.

B. 2 Comments from Germany and the USA, as forwarded by GEFSec

COMMENTS by GERMANY	RESPONSE
Germany welcomed “ <i>this well researched project which is the first full sized GEF project for Niue under the regional R2R program ... the focus of this project, the empowerment of local communities for R2R implementation and management, fits the national and local contexts well and will enhance the capacities required for R2R</i> ”, endorsed the STAP comments and suggested the following improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:	
The final project document should clearly identify how other relevant regional actors and supporting institutions such as the SPC, SPREP and IUCN will contribute to project implementation and capacity development	While retaining its distinct identity, the project will, by necessity, be implemented with the full collaboration and valuable contributions of regional institutions. SPC will be involved directly with the activities that will lead to the declaration of Beveridge Reef as a Marine Protected Area. SPREP and IUCN have most recently been involved primarily with energy projects (e.g. PIGGAREP and PACC) and while these projects have ended, their results, lessons and experiences will be invaluable for the R2R project.
Germany suggests that contact should be made with IUCN on the EU-funded BIOPAMA project and with the GIZ on the BMUB-funded MACBIO project (e.g., concerning methods on Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) and conservation planning), as well as on the BMZ-funded Climate Change Adaptation Program, to explore	These initiatives and others are identified and potential collaboration explored in section 2.10 of the Project Document and section A.7 above. Of the three mentioned, BIOPAMA appears to have the most relevant and immediate opportunity for collaboration; MACBIO is still not fully active in Niue and the R2R project will discuss how it could become involved in the marine spatial planning activities since its activities for the Western Reef and Beveridge Reef are very relevant. It has not been

options for cross-project collaboration and experience exchange	possible to establish a link with the Climate Change Adaptation Initiative, but the R2R project will persevere during the inception phase.
COMMENTS by USA	RESPONSE
The United States is supportive of this project proposal – <i>“By discrete application of the Ridge to Reef Approach (R2R), this project will yield important models and examples of environmental protection and marine resource governance and should produce significant global environmental benefits. We are pleased to see that this project is integrated well into ongoing regional GEF- supported projects”</i> . To further strengthen this proposal prior to GEF CEO Endorsement, the USA proposed that:	
the United States requests that the UNDP respond to all of the STAP recommendations	See above, project design has taken into account all the STAP recommendations.
We welcome additional discussion in the full proposal for how risks to project implementation will be mitigated.	Risk assessment was a major element in project preparation. See section 2.3 in Project Document.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹²

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

None

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

The PPG Grant resources made available by the GEF were used more or less as predicted and all four groups of activities were carried out in full. Investigations and research were carried out by a team of two experts, one national and one international. Extensive consultations were held with a wide scope of identified stakeholders. Expressions of interest and pledges of collaboration were obtained from key partners. The result of this work is the set of required documents namely, the Project Document, this CEO Endorsement Request, a number of annexes and the BD and IW Tracking Tools.

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD140,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$) 140,000</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A	35,000	35,000	-
Component B	35,000	26,797	8,203
Component C	25,000	4,139	20,861
Component D	20,000	5,250	14,750
Component E	25,000	-	25,000
Total	140,000	71,186	68,814

¹² If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.