



RSTC5 WP.1
Date: 28th July 2019
Original: English

Fourth Regional Steering Committee Meeting for the GEF Pacific
Regional International Waters Project Entitled: *Ridge to Reef –
Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal
Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve
Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries*

Nadi, Fiji, 30th to 31st July 2019

MID TERM REVIEW (MTR) REPORT OF THE REGIONAL IW R2R PROJECT

This document details the recommendations of the Mid Term Review of the Pacific Regional International Waters Ridge to Reef Project.

The RSC is invited to review the recommendations of the MTR and approve the management responses proposed in Annex 2 to this paper.

Basic facts

Project title	Ridge to Reef – Testing the integration of water, land, forest and coastal management to preserve ecosystem services, store carbon, improve climate resilience and sustain livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries
Atlas Award ID	00084701
Project ID	00092601
PIMS ID	5221
GEF ID	5404
Project Period	August 2015 to August 2020
Management Arrangements	Executing Partner – The Pacific Community
Pacific Region, Countries	Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu
UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome	Outcome 2; 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; Output 2.5.2
UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome	Outcome 1: Output 1.4 – Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented: Output 1.4.2
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program	International Waters Strategic Objective 1; and Strategic Objective 3
Project Objective	To test the mainstreaming of ‘ridge-to-reef’ (R2R), climate resilient approaches to integrated land, water, forest and coastal management in the PICs through strategic planning, capacity building and piloted local actions to sustain livelihoods and preserve ecosystem services
Objective Indicator	Extent of harmonization of sectoral governance frameworks for integrated ‘ridge to reef’ approaches achieved through national sustainable development planning
Executing Agency	The Pacific Community
Executing Entity/ Implementing Partner	The Pacific Community
GEF Implementing Agency	United Nations Development Programme
Responsible Parties	National Government Line-agencies in 14 Pacific Island Countries
Acknowledgements	68 persons representing the Implementing and Executing Agencies and National Stakeholders, as listed in Annex 1, provided valuable insights and information to guide the MTR.
MTR Team	David Coates and Ma. Susan (Bebot) J. Lucero
MTR duration	February 20 to May 10, 2019
Field mission	March 13 – April 27, 2019
Draft MTR Report	May 10, 2019
Final MTR Report	xxxxx

Recommendations of the MTR

1. Review and update of logframes

The RPCU, together with National Project Managers, should review and update all current national project LogFrames and ensure that, if not already done so, each is approved at the next national PSC and RSC meetings.

2. Review of/ lesson learned from previous related investments

The RPCU, in collaboration with national agencies, should review the impact of previous IWRM, ICM and R2R (if any) investments, and particularly the GEF IWRM Project, based on current realities and with the objective of deriving further lessons learned, particularly regarding impact, upscaling and sustainability.

3. Linkages with other national activities and processes.

Each national demonstration project should re-evaluate its linkages to and relationships with other relevant projects and activities at local and national level, and with local planning mechanisms and institutional arrangements, to ensure that its activities and outputs are coherent with, and build upon and strengthen, these other activities and governance systems.

4. Mainstreaming R2R

The RPCU in collaboration with national agencies should: (i) map existing national (and regional) sustainable development planning processes (including climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and across all sectors) and related current activities; (ii) identify immediate, short- and medium-term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R approaches into these frameworks; (iii) develop a clear and coherent approach to deliver mainstreaming needs into these frameworks, prioritising immediate opportunities based on existing scientific/ technical knowledge and practical experience (without waiting for IDAs or SoCs); (iv) discourage activities that result in the development of new or parallel "strategic frameworks for R2R" or R2R planning mechanisms or frameworks, and instead build on existing processes; and (v) consider how the intended functions of "inter-ministerial committees" (as per the Project Document) fit with existing planning and coordination processes and governance arrangements and identify measures to deliver IMC functions by, as far as possible, building on existing governance structures and processes and building new ones only where clearly needed.

5. Adopting an Ecosystems Goods and Services Approach

The project should adopt an ecosystem goods and services framework as the foundation of its scientific and technical approach by: (i) integrating ecosystem goods and services indicators into the RapCA, IDA and SoC, not as a "supplement" to existing indicators but as their foundation; (ii) integrating an ecosystem goods and services approach/ context as the basis for all relevant project activities including for R2R planning, mainstreaming and policy; (iii) testing an ecosystem goods and services and valuation approach as the entry point in a limited number of appropriate demonstration projects that have yet to commence or have only recently commenced (subject to country needs and buy-in); (iv) commencing basic training on ecosystem goods and services (including valuation) for national capacity building, including considering a dedicated module on this topic as part of the on-going post-graduate training delivered through an appropriate institution (subject to resources availability).

6. Re-assessing IDA-RAPCA-SOC-SAF-SAP continuum

The project should re-assess its strategy on IDAs and SoCs based on the following criteria: (i) Focus on objectives/outcomes - the IDA or SoC is not an outcome, the outcome required is mainstreaming R2R; (ii) Identify and prioritise existing opportunities to mainstream R2R without having an IDA or SoC (important short-term opportunities are currently being missed); (iii) The absolute priority is capacity building - this in turn determines the impact of an IDA or SoC on policies - this requires ownership of and participation of PICs in the IDA/SoC process; (iv) IDAs/SoCs must be country-driven, where countries see an IDA or "SoC" as a necessary or priority need the process can go ahead, but if this is absent beware of doing the SoC; (v) The priority is for the IDA and/or SoC to be integrated with and build on, add value to, existing activities and processes at national level (notably the State of Environment reporting process and similar undertakings), the process need not necessarily result in a stand-alone "SoC" report but it can achieve its purpose equally as well through integration of information generated into other reports/ processes; (vi) Timing of outputs needs to be compatible with timescales for information needs (particularly for informing on-going policy processes); (vii) Focus on quality not quantity reduce outputs accordingly; (viii) Where all the above criteria are met consider proceeding - where any is not met there is limited justification for the SoC; and (ix) Re-assess the need and opportunities for an IDA and/or SoC in PSCs and re-present the IDA/SoC strategy to the RSC for discussion and review.

7. Mapping R2R contribution to SDGs

The project should, with national counterpart participation, map its potential contributions to the SDGs, identify relevant linkages and interdependencies (including potential indicators currently in use), explore the extent to which R2R is a tool to achieve integrated delivery of, and has already delivered, the natural resources based or dependent SDGs and use this process as a means to: (i) test the relevance of its approaches; (ii) promote visibility and relevance of the project; and (iii) identify and potentially monitor the contribution of the project to sustainable development outcomes.

8. Website structure and purpose

The RPCU should ensure that the website and associated databases developed under activity 4.2.3 is kept as simple as possible, primarily builds on existing efforts, learns from previous efforts, and is limited to the purpose of communicating and sharing lessons learned on R2R and supporting the development of a network (or community of practice) on R2R.

9. Re-assessing multi-focal website features

The project should re-assess the advisability of integrating the integrated results framework for multi-focal GEF projects under the same platform as the communication/ networking platform for R2R. If it continues as such then the ability to separate the two functionalities must be in-built.

10. Delivering Outcome 4.2

The project should identify how it is going to deliver outcome 4.2 (in particular activity 4.2.3) at national level, as required in the outcome description, and present this plan to the next RSC meeting.

"4.2.3 indicator: Pacific R2R network established with at least 100 users registered, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practices R2R technologies, lessons learned, etc."

11. Compiling lessons learned

The RPCU should play a lead coordinating role in developing or compiling lessons learned on R2R, including from the previous IWRM/ICM/R2R investments, including by providing guidance to current R2R projects (STAR and IW R2R Projects) in order for them to begin now to maximise extraction of lessons learned from investments.

12. A no-cost extension

The project should have a no-cost extension subject to implementation of the further recommendations of the MTR.

13. Reporting links and information sharing across the Regional R2R Programme

The Regional Programme Coordination Group (RPCG) should strengthen technical information sharing and reporting links between the implementing agencies and the RPCU.

14. Clarifying RPCU's programme role and programmatic implementation modalities

The Regional Steering Committee (RSC), with the support of the Regional Programme Coordination Group (RPCG), at its next meeting, should clarify what is required from the RPCU regarding programme coordination, and identify the reporting channels and responsibilities between STAR projects, IW R2R national projects, the RPCU and the implementing agencies (UNDP, FAO and UNEP), and specify the modalities through which the desired coordination is to be delivered.

15. Capacity building focus

The project should implement all its activities from a capacity building perspective, even if resulting in compromises on scientific quality and/or timelines.

16. Re-assessing the role and structure of the RSTC

The RPCU and RSC should: (i) re-assess the composition and *modus operandi* of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) in the light of the scientific and technical scope and needs of the project, specifically strengthening its social and economic expertise; (ii) as far as feasible, put more emphasis on opportunities to build scientific and technical capacity among the PICs by providing for improved engagement of national PIC science stakeholders in project/programme science and technology decision making; (iii) explore how the R2R network and platform (component 4.2) might contribute to the sustainability of science and technology support to PICs after the project finishes; and (iv) explore opportunities for expanding interactive workshops and training on the project's science and technology agenda under RSTC oversight.

17. Communications strategy

Communications should be considered and integrated into project activities (e.g. IDA-SOC/R2R, mainstreaming plans etc.) from their very beginning and be used to identify target audiences, influence the nature of data collected and indicators being used and improve the understanding of how constraints to R2R uptake can be reduced to increase the impact of the project on policy.

18. Gender issue

The national demonstration plans and activities that are still currently being prepared should be gender-analysed to ensure on-site project management is gender-responsive in specific ways anchored on the objectives of these plans. The completed RapCAs and IDAs must be gender audited before they are incorporated in the SoC. The SoCs and Strategic Action Frameworks themselves must be gender- audited.

Annex 1. Mid Term Review (MTR) Report

Annex 2: Management responses to the Recommendations of the MTR mission

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response		Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus					
1	<p>Review and update of logframes</p> <p>The RPCU, together with National Project Managers, should review and update all current national project LogFrames and ensure that, if not already done so, each is approved at the next national PSC and RSC meetings.</p>	<p>SPC will advocate for and support national logframe reviews to ensure that outputs (and outcomes) contribute directly to the achievement of the Regional IW R2R project, and plausibly to the GEF Pacific R2R programme outcomes.</p> <p>SPC and UNDP note that review and update of national logframes is determined by national processes and current framework conditions.</p> <p>Revised national IW R2R logframes should be submitted to national steering committees/ project boards for approval no later than 3rd quarter.</p> <p>Available national IW R2R logframes to be submitted to Regional Steering Committee for information.</p>	<p>IW Project Managers, agency heads and stakeholders review and update the national logframe, particularly the end of project targets and corresponding update their MYCWP. This should be presented at the Pre-RPSC meeting in Nadi.</p>	<p>Review and advise on the methods and standards used to estimate quantitative measures and revised targets</p> <p>Review the ‘Theory of Change’ or measurable changes underpinning end of project targets, and provide advice on its technical feasibility and plausible contributions to the Regional IW R2R Project outcomes.</p>	<p>RPCG to determine that each GEF implementing agency (UNDP, UNE and FAO) commit to and promote the GEF Pacific R2R program approach in all Project Steering Committee or Project Board meetings.</p> <p>RPCG to provide the operational clarity required for SPC to effectively coordinate regional IW R2R project indicators requiring inputs from the child projects of the GEF Pacific R2R program,</p> <p>Specifically IAs will convey to the STAR projects (Coordinators and Agencies) the need to proactively collaborate with SPC by providing/ sharing information.</p>	<p><u>Notes</u></p> <p>The original logframes were endorsed at the First Regional Steering Committee in Nadi, Fiji and reviewed during respective national inception workshops.</p> <p>Updating the national logframes has been ongoing. During QTR 2 each national project was asked to reassess the overall relevance of the logframes and targets against current priorities and conditions. Updates are to consider the plausibility and technical soundness of the various planned development measures and potentially recalibrating and/ or adjusting these to respond national priorities.</p> <p>National projects requested to present updated logframes during the pre-RSC workshop. It is fundamental that the logframes are endorsed by the national implementing agency and approved by the respective national project steering committees. RPSC is not the body to approve national logframes.</p> <p>RPCU has compiled the revised targets of the respective national stress reduction targets. This has been reported in the GEF IW Tracking Tool.</p> <p><u>Action requested</u></p> <p>Accept the amended indicators of the Regional IW R2R project and the corresponding, consolidated end of project targets.</p>	
2	<p>Review of/ lesson learned from previous related investments</p> <p>The RPCU, in collaboration with national agencies, should review the impact of previous IWRM, ICM and R2R (if any) investments, and particularly the GEF IWRM Project, based on current realities and with</p>	<p>Agreed. Parallel to the review of national logframes, SPC will document and/ or review lessons learned and best practice from previous separate IWRM and ICM investments considering current realities and opportunities, with the objective of deriving further lessons learned, particularly regarding impact, upscaling and sustainability, and opportunities</p>	<p>Under the guidance of the RPCU, IW national Project Managers and national stakeholders will collect data and information on the impact of previous IWRM, ICM and R2R investments and identify opportunity/ ies for</p>			<p>Endorse the recommendation and SPC’s response.</p>	

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response	Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus				
	the objective of deriving further lessons learned, particularly regarding impact, upscaling and sustainability.	<p>for mainstreaming R2R into national planning and policies.</p> <p>National Project Managers will be provided a unified ToR for mapping and review of investments. SPC will oversee the conduct of the reviews and ensure the technical feasibility of outcomes.</p> <p>Development of lessons learned documents reflected in IW R2R regional project AWP</p>	mainstreaming R2R given current national priorities and resources. The results of this review (report) will be made available in the period August to December 2019.			
3	<p>Linkages with other national activities and processes.</p> <p>Each national demonstration project should re-evaluate its linkages to and relationships with other relevant projects and activities at local and national level, and with local planning mechanisms and institutional arrangements, to ensure that its activities and outputs are coherent with, and build upon and strengthen, these other activities and governance systems.</p>	<p>Agreed while recognising that there is a need to overcome barriers to linkages and relationships between relevant projects and activities at local and national level. These are internal matters but obviously impact on successful implementation of project activities and achieving deliverables.</p> <p>SPC will advocate such review in parallel or consequentially with the implementation of recommendations numbers 1 and 2.</p>	In parallel with recommendation 2, and under the guidance of the RPCU, IW national Project Managers and national stakeholders will determine areas of collaboration with other national projects, ensuring alignment to national priorities. Results of this activity will provide input to the revised logframe and are expected to be incorporated in the MYCWP (see recommendation 1).	Identify strategic areas of regional or external intervention appropriate to better strengthen and improve linkages and relationships with other relevant projects at national and local level. For instance, SPC can collaborate with other CROP agencies and development partners who are implementing similar projects in countries.	<p>RPCG to determine that each GEF implementing agency (UNDP, UNE and FAO) commit to and promote the GEF Pacific R2R program approach in all Project Steering Committee or Project Board meetings.</p> <p>Specifically IAs will convey to the STAR projects (Coordinators and Agencies) the need to proactively collaborate with SPC by providing/ sharing information.</p> <p>Advocate for joint activity plans for STAR and IW projects).</p>	Consider the recommendation in light of SPC's response and the advice of the RSTC and RPCG, and endorse as appropriate.
4	<p>Mainstreaming R2R</p> <p>The RPCU in collaboration with national agencies should: (i) map existing national (and regional) sustainable development planning processes (including climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and across all sectors) and related current activities; (ii) identify immediate, short- and medium-term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R approaches into these frameworks; (iii) develop a clear and coherent approach to deliver mainstreaming needs into these frameworks, prioritising immediate opportunities based on existing scientific/ technical knowledge and practical experience (without waiting for IDAs or SoCs); (iv) discourage activities that result in</p>	<p>Agree, this will be undertaken in parallel with recommendations number 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>SPC will work towards documenting and publishing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PICs strategic plans and planning processes and relevant policies - Opportunities for mainstreaming R2R in the short-medium-long term. - Possible options for actually mainstreaming R2R. <p>The abovementioned information could be the basis for crafting a Regional IW R2R knowledge product: "Options for mainstreaming R2R in Planning and relevant Policies in the Pacific" consistent with Recommendation 4 (iii)</p>	IW Project Managers and STAR Coordinators will facilitate and support the RPCU in the conduct of mapping to determine options for effective national mainstreaming of R2R. The schedule for this activity will be determined after the RPSC meeting.	<p>The Theory of Change WP seeks RSTC endorsement of SPC technical responses to these recommendations.</p> <p>The Committee may discuss and provide advice on technical means by which R2R mainstreaming could be more effective towards the end the project, benefitting from lessons learnt and best practice.</p> <p>RSTC is requested to discuss the proposition that immediate and short or medium term opportunities for mainstreaming R2R can be challenging because of insufficient compelling scientific evidence.</p>	RPCG to determine that IAs will convey to the STAR projects (Coordinators and Agencies) the need to proactively collaborate with SPC by providing/ sharing information.	Consider the recommendation in light of SPC's response and the advice of the RSTC and RPCG, and endorse as appropriate

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response	Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus				
	the development of new or parallel "strategic frameworks for R2R" or R2R planning mechanisms or frameworks, and instead build on existing processes; and (v) consider how the intended functions of "inter-ministerial committees" (as per the Project Document) fit with existing planning and coordination processes and governance arrangements and identify measures to deliver IMC functions by, as far as possible, building on existing governance structures and processes and building new ones only where clearly needed.					
5	<p>Adopting an Ecosystems Goods and Services Approach</p> <p>The project should adopt an ecosystem goods and services framework as the foundation of its scientific and technical approach by: (i) integrating ecosystem goods and services indicators into the RapCA, IDA and SoC, not as a "supplement" to existing indicators but as their foundation; (ii) integrating an ecosystem goods and services approach/ context as the basis for all relevant project activities including for R2R planning, mainstreaming and policy; (iii) testing an ecosystem goods and services and valuation approach as the entry point in a limited number of appropriate demonstration projects that have yet to commence or have only recently commenced (subject to country needs and buy-in); (iv) commencing basic training on ecosystem goods and services (including valuation) for national capacity building, including considering a dedicated module on this topic as part of the on-going post-graduate training delivered through an appropriate institution (subject to resources availability).</p>	<p>Agreed. SPC recognises the value of the EGS approach both in achieving Regional IW R2R project outcomes and GEF Pacific R2R Program outcomes. EGS has been and will be incorporated in various technical studies and science-based initiatives.</p> <p>EGS outcomes will be key to R2R mainstreaming. As a result of the study in recommendation number 4 will guide the entire mainstreaming process of R2R in the Pacific. A knowledge product mentioned in number 4 above would be useful. This will also serve as basis in crafting the Regional Strategic Action Framework (Regional SAF) which is an expected output of the Regional IW R2R project.</p> <p>The experience in the methodologies and tools used for testing stress reduction measures and the other science based initiatives such as IDA, RAPCA, and SOC will serve as inputs and evidence of the project outcomes (assuming the data/ results from testing/ demonstration are available within the project timeframe).</p> <p>This will be undertaken with due consideration of the results from the implementation of recommendations number 1 to 4.</p>	<p>IW and STAR projects will facilitate, make data accessible, and provide inputs to the development of knowledge products depicting experience and lessons from GEF Pacific R2R Program implementation. The framework for joint knowledge products will be made available by the RPCU.</p>	<p>The protection of ecosystem goods and services are central elements of the goal and objective of both the R2R program and R2R IW project.</p> <p>The recommendation is seeking the adoption of an EGS framework as the foundation of the R2R IW project scientific and technical approach, as set out in Recommendation 5(i) – (iv).</p> <p>RSTC to consider and advise on the recommendation in light of the current state of implementing IW R2R project activities.</p>	<p>Consider the recommendation in light of SPC's response and the advice of the RSTC, and endorse as appropriate</p>	

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response	Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus				
6	<p>Re-assessing IDA-RAPCA-SOC-SAF-SAP continuum</p> <p>The project should re-assess its strategy on IDAs and SoCs based on the following criteria: (i) Focus on objectives/outcomes - the IDA or SoC is not an outcome, the outcome required is mainstreaming R2R; (ii) Identify and prioritise existing opportunities to mainstream R2R without having an IDA or SoC (important short-term opportunities are currently being missed); (iii) The absolute priority is capacity building - this in turn determines the impact of an IDA or SoC on policies - this requires ownership of and participation of PICs in the IDA/SoC process; (iv) IDAs/SoCs must be country-driven, where countries see an IDA or "SoC" as a necessary or priority need the process can go ahead, but if this is absent beware of doing the SoC; (v) The priority is for the IDA and/or SoC to be integrated with and build on, add value to, existing activities and processes at national level (notably the State of Environment reporting process and similar undertakings), the process need not necessarily result in a stand-alone "SoC" report but it can achieve its purpose equally as well through integration of information generated into other reports/ processes; (vi) Timing of outputs needs to be compatible with timescales for information needs (particularly for informing on-going policy processes); (vii) Focus on quality not quantity reduce outputs accordingly; (viii) Where all the above criteria are met consider proceeding - where any is not met there is limited justification for the SoC; and (ix) Re-assess the need and opportunities for an IDA</p>	<p>Agreed. SPC has reassessed the Theory of Change for R2R mainstreaming following the IDA-RAPCA-SOC-SAF-SAP technological continuum, as the basis for national testing and demonstration.</p> <p>As a results of the assessment, SPC has prepared a paper for consideration by RSTC (WP6.b). The paper seeks endorsement of the revised strategy (ToC) including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participatory process - R2R mainstreaming - capacity building <p>SPC also notes Recommendation 6 (viii), which states that where any criteria are not met there is limited justification for the SoC, and that in (ix), requiring presenting the IDA/SOC strategy to the RSC for discussion and review.</p>	<p>IW national projects will need to indicate their willingness to support the implementation of the IDA-RapCA-SoC-SAF continuum. The entire process requires that national projects will facilitate and fully support (i.e. in terms of project managers' time and expertise) the formulation process as outlined in the "Theory of Change".</p>	<p>RSTC to review SPC's proposed Theory of Change and advise on its viability/ feasibility in the Pacific context and current project duration and resources.</p> <p>RSTC to consider WP – Theory of Change, and discuss the specific details and methods used, in light of Recommendation 6, which suggests the project should re-assess its strategy on IDAs and SoCs, and maintain focus on delivering R2R mainstreaming as a desired project outcome.</p> <p>RSTC to discuss and provide guidance specific to Recommendation 6 (viii) "Where all the above criteria are met consider proceeding - where any is not met there is limited justification for the SoC"; and (ix) "Re-assess the need and opportunities for an IDA and/or SoC in PSCs and re-present the IDA/SoC strategy to the RSC for discussion and review."</p>	<p>RPCG to determine that each GEF implementing agency (UNDP, UNE and FAO) commit to and promote the GEF Pacific R2R program approach in all Project Steering Committee or Project Board meetings.</p> <p>Specifically IAs will convey to the STAR projects (Coordinators and Agencies) the need to proactively collaborate with SPC by providing/ sharing information</p> <p>Advocate for joint activity plans for STAR and IW projects.</p>	<p>Consider the recommendation in light of SPC's response and the advice of the RSTC and RPCG, and endorse as appropriate</p>

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response	Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus				
	and/or SoC in PSCs and re-present the IDA/SoC strategy to the RSC for discussion and review.					
7	<p>Mapping R2R contribution to SDGs</p> <p>The project should, with national counterpart participation, map its potential contributions to the SDGs, identify relevant linkages and interdependencies (including potential indicators currently in use), explore the extent to which R2R is a tool to achieve integrated delivery of, and has already delivered, the natural resources based or dependent SDGs and use this process as a means to: (i) test the relevance of its approaches; (ii) promote visibility and relevance of the project; and (iii) identify and potentially monitor the contribution of the project to sustainable development outcomes.</p>	<p>Agree. Although this recommendation contradicts the MTR findings (see page 61 line 28 onwards), SPC finds this recommendation appropriate. Mapping the potential contributions to SDG is captured in the Harmonized Results Reporting (HRR) tool, as well as the Aichi Targets.</p> <p>The integrated delivery is and will be dependent on the IMC and/or the national project steering committees including the mandated/focal agencies for reporting SDGs. This is to ensure sustainability (note: exit plan).</p> <p>Points raised in the recommendations related to the project results framework and national logframe targets are relevant in mapping out potential contributions to the SDGs</p>	<p>STAR national Coordinators complete the Harmonized Results Reporting tool which covers the respective project contributions to the SDGs and submits them to RPCU.</p>	<p>RSTC to discuss the project’s potential contributions to the SDGs in light of current progress or may defer consideration to a later stage, when project activities are successfully completed and milestone targets achieved.</p>	<p>Taking account of MTR findings the RPCG may consider the challenges of delivering targets on timelines, and provide advice to the RPSC.</p>	<p>Consider the recommendation in light of SPC’s response and the advice of the RSTC and RPCG, and endorse as appropriate</p>
8	<p>Website structure and purpose</p> <p>The RPCU should ensure that the website and associated databases developed under activity 4.2.3 is kept as simple as possible, primarily builds on existing efforts, learns from previous efforts, and is limited to the purpose of communicating and sharing lessons learned on R2R and supporting the development of a network (or community of practice) on R2R.</p>	<p>Agree. The associated database is a separate platform from the Regional IW R2R project website.</p> <p>Also, the schematic of this website with multi-focal area features was presented to the RSTC and RPCG in Townsville. Both bodies have indicated no objection to the Regional IW R2R project building this website.</p>	<p>IW project provides inputs in populating their respective national sub-pages.</p>			<p>Endorse the recommendation and SPC’s response</p>
9	<p>Re-assessing multi-focal website features</p> <p>The project should re-assess the advisability of integrating the integrated results framework for multi-focal GEF projects under the same platform as the communication/ networking platform for R2R. If it continues as such then the ability to separate the two functionalities must be in-built.</p>	<p>Agreed, but with some modification</p> <p>Following up on recommendation number 8, the multi-focal reporting (Harmonized Results Reporting) is necessary and will be incorporated as an ‘in-built’ feature of the enhanced website.</p> <p>As indicated above the structure and purpose of the website has previously been endorsed by RSTC and RSPC (Townsville).</p>	<p>IW project provides inputs in populating their respective national sub-pages.</p> <p>STAR project submit the completed Harmonized Results Reporting tool (see also recommendation 7).</p>		<p>RPCG to determine that IAs will convey to the STAR projects (Coordinators and Agencies) the need to proactively collaborate with SPC by providing/ sharing information.</p>	<p>Consider the recommendation in light of SPC’s response and the advice of the RPCG, and endorse as appropriate</p>

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response	Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus				
10	<p>Delivering Outcome 4.2</p> <p>The project should identify how it is going to deliver outcome 4.2 (in particular activity 4.2.3) at national level, as required in the outcome description, and present this plan to the next RSC meeting.</p> <p>“4.2.3 indicator: Pacific R2R network established with at least 100 users registered, online regional and national portals containing among others, databases, rosters of national and regional experts and practitioners on R2R, register of national and regional projects, repository for best practices R2R technologies, lessons learned, etc.”</p>	<p>Agree. SPC has initiated the process of establishing the Regional IW R2R project website that will support the achievement of this indicator.</p>	<p>IW projects provide inputs in populating their respective national sub-pages.</p> <p>STAR projects submit the completed Harmonized Results Reporting tool (see recommendations 7 and 9).</p>			<p>Endorse the recommendation and SPC’s response</p>
11	<p>Compiling lessons learned</p> <p>The RPCU should play a lead coordinating role in developing or compiling lessons learned on R2R, including from the previous IWRM/ICM/R2R investments, including by providing guidance to current R2R projects (STAR and IW R2R Projects) in order for them to begin now to maximise extraction of lessons learned from investments.</p>	<p>Agreed. SPC is willing to play this role, but requires full cooperation of STAR to do so.</p> <p>On the basis of existing communication and knowledge management strategies, SPC will develop a discussion paper detailing the anticipated “knowledge products (KP)” that will be developed by the project. The list of KP’s will be presented to the RSTC and RPCG.</p> <p>UNDP notes that information to feed in to lessons for STAR R2R can be accessed through Quarterly reports, MSC stories, PIR reports, technical reports</p>	<p>IW and STAR projects facilitate, make data accessible, and provide inputs to the development of knowledge products depicting experience and lessons from GEF Pacific R2R Program implementation. The framework for joint knowledge products will be made available by the RPCU.</p>	<p>RSTC to review the list of knowledge products (especially those requiring information from the experience of STAR projects in testing and mainstreaming R2R) and provide technical inputs, as appropriate.</p>	<p>RPCG will be requested to provide clear operational decision to ensure sharing of information and maximize extraction of lessons learned from the GEF Pacific R2R Program investments.</p>	<p>Consider the recommendation in light of SPC’s response and the advice of the RSTC and RPCG, and endorse as appropriate</p>
12	<p>A no-cost extension</p> <p>The project should have a no-cost extension subject to implementation of the further recommendations of the MTR.</p>	<p>Agreed. A no-cost extension should be based on MTR recommendations including revised national logframes and the renewed Regional IW R2R project monitoring plan.</p>	<p>IW projects request that SPC extend their national project completion date with the intention to achieve the end of project targets indicated in their respective/ updated national logframes.</p>	<p>RSTC to consider technical implications of a no-cost extension on the implementation of the science-policy interface (theory of change).</p>	<p>RPCG to consider the implications of the overall GEF R2R Programme of an IW R2R extension, or otherwise.</p>	<p>Approval of the proposed amendments to the project indicators, project milestone targets and corresponding indicative workplan (July 2019 including the no-cost extension period), and most importantly the Annual Workplan and budget covering July 2019 to June 2020.</p>
13	<p>Reporting links and information sharing across the Regional R2R Programme</p> <p>The Regional Programme Coordination Group (RPCG) should strengthen technical information sharing and reporting links between</p>	<p>Agreed. SPC will bring this issue to the RPCG will include this in the agenda. SPC believes that all GEF implementing agencies (UNDP, UNE and FAO) should be requested to provide structured reporting of the outputs and outcomes from the implementation of the various child projects under the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program.</p>	<p>STAR projects collaborate with RPCU in fulfilling the programmatic goal of the GEF R2R program. Specifically the STAR projects proactively share data and information, and contribute in jointly developing knowledge products (see</p>		<p>RPCG to determine that IAs will convey to the STAR projects (Coordinators and Agencies) the need to proactively collaborate with SPC by providing/ sharing information.</p>	<p>Consider the recommendation in light of SPC’s response and the advice of the RPCG, and endorse as appropriate</p>

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response	Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus				
	the implementing agencies and the RPCU.		recommendation 11).			
14	<p>Clarifying RPCU’s programme role and programmatic implementation modalities</p> <p>The Regional Steering Committee (RSC), with the support of the Regional Programme Coordination Group (RPCG), at its next meeting, should clarify what is required from the RPCU regarding programme coordination, and identify the reporting channels and responsibilities between STAR projects, IW R2R national projects, the RPCU and the implementing agencies (UNDP, FAO and UNEP), and specify the modalities through which the desired coordination is to be delivered.</p>	Agreed	STAR projects collaborate with RPCU in fulfilling the programmatic goal of the GEF Pacific R2R program. Specifically, provide data and information requested by RPCU, and proactively send copy of progress reports and relevant studies.		RPCG to identify the reporting channels and responsibilities between STAR projects, IW R2R national projects, the RPCU and the implementing agencies (UNDP, FAO and UNEP), and specify the modalities through which the desired coordination is to be delivered.	Consider the recommendation in light of SPC’s response and the advice of the RPCG, and endorse as appropriate
15	<p>Capacity building focus</p> <p>The project should implement all its activities from a capacity building perspective, even if resulting in compromises on scientific quality and/or timelines.</p>	<p>Partly agreed. SPC will implement planned activities with a capacity building perspective while ensuring effective and high quality technical and scientific results.</p> <p>Technical and scientific activities will be conducted using established criteria, such as but not limited to: participatory and gender sensitiveness, capacity and willingness of the PICs to support the application of the full-cycle of the technological/methodological continuum, sub-regional representation and consideration of geophysical characteristics.</p> <p>Both UNDP and SPC contend that the quality of science applied cannot be compromised.</p>	STAR and IW projects and national stakeholders participate in capacity building activities	RSTC to discuss the recommendations in the context of its accuracy, application and impact.		Consider the recommendation in light of SPC’s response and the advice of the RSTC, and endorse as appropriate
16	<p>Re-assessing the role and structure of the RSTC</p> <p>The RPCU and RSC should: (i) re-assess the composition and <i>modus operandi</i> of the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC) in the light of the scientific and technical scope and needs of the project, specifically strengthening its social and economic expertise; (ii) as</p>	Agreed. SPC will present a paper to RSTC proposing review of the Committee’s terms of reference and composition.	STAR projects submit their technical approaches, methodologies and scientific studies for scrutiny by the RSTC thereby enriching the scientific and technical robustness of the results and outcomes.	RSTC to review the ToR (focus on function and composition) of the RSTC, noting specific scope for more socio-economic expertise in the group, and build scientific and technical capacity among PICs through engagement activities, and points set out in (iii) R2R network and	RPCG to discuss the role of RSTC in providing technical and scientific advice to both the Regional IW R2R project and STAR projects.	Consider the recommendation in light of SPC’s response and the advice of the RSTC and RPCG, and endorse as appropriate

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response	Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus				
	far as feasible, put more emphasis on opportunities to build scientific and technical capacity among the PICs by providing for improved engagement of national PIC science stakeholders in project/programme science and technology decision making; (iii) explore how the R2R network and platform (component 4.2) might contribute to the sustainability of science and technology support to PICs after the project finishes; and (iv) explore opportunities for expanding interactive workshops and training on the project's science and technology agenda under RSTC oversight.			platform post project; and, (iv) opportunities for expanding interactive workshops and training project's science and technology agenda		
17	<p>Communications strategy</p> <p>Communications should be considered and integrated into project activities (e.g. IDA-SOC/R2R, mainstreaming plans etc.) from their very beginning and be used to identify target audiences, influence the nature of data collected and indicators being used and improve the understanding of how constraints to R2R uptake can be reduced to increase the impact of the project on policy.</p>	<p>Agreed. The main intention of the communications strategy is to guide the GEF Pacific R2R program and the respective child projects (including the Regional IW R2R project), in crafting both visibility and advocacy plans.</p> <p>Specific to the Regional IW R2R project, promotion of project goal, outputs and activities, and the knowledge gained thereof (from publishable knowledge products) will be based on a clearly defined / established Theory of Change (ToC) concepts and tools which have been agreed by RPSTC and RPSC to be tested or trialled. The two major concepts that are being tested by the Regional IW R2R project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Innovative technologies and related solutions that successfully integrate and mainstream R2R concept across water, land, forest and coastal areas of 14 PICs. <p>The project is currently using a number of tools and methods to deliver on such integration and mainstreaming, and these are technological/ methodological continuum (IDA-RAPCA-SOC-national SAF/SAP-Regional SAF) including the stress reduction measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resource governance dimensions in 	<p>STAR projects collaborate with RPCU in fulfilling the communication goals of the GEF Pacific R2R program. Specifically, by providing data and information requested by RPCU, and proactively providing copies of progress reports and relevant studies.</p>	<p>The RSTC to consider and discuss SPC's response to this recommendation.</p>	<p>Mainstreaming of R2R to ensure sustainable Ecosystem Goods and Services (EGS) will be key to the success of the programmatic approach.</p> <p>An effective communication plan will depend on experiences from the GEF Pacific R2R program and joint knowledge products between STAR and IW will be essential.</p> <p>RPCG to provide clear operational decision to ensure sharing of information and maximize extraction of lessons learned from the GEF Pacific R2R Program investments.</p> <p>See also action requested from RPCG on recommendation 11.</p>	<p>Consider the recommendation in light of SPC's response and the advice of the RSTC and RPCG, and endorse as appropriate</p>

No.	MTR Recommendations	Management Response	Implications of the recommendations for national STAR and IW projects	Action Requested from RSTC	Action Requested from RPCG	Action Requested from RPSC
		UNDP – SPC Consensus				
		<p>mainstreaming R2R aligned with the community to cabinet approach in planning and policy.</p> <p>These concepts will then serves as basis for the Regional IW R2R project communication plan – including the production of knowledge products.</p>				
18	<p>Gender issue</p> <p>The national demonstration plans and activities that are still currently being prepared should be gender-analysed to ensure on-site project management is gender-responsive in specific ways anchored on the objectives of these plans. The completed RapCAs and IDAs must be gender audited before they are incorporated in the SoC. The SoCs and Strategic Action Frameworks themselves must be gender- audited.</p>	<p>SPC is taking account of gender sensitivity rather than gender responsiveness. The IW R2R regional project is a G-0 (gender equality markers) meaning– a gender sensitive (ensuring the ‘do no harm approach and does not reinforce gender inequalities’) and is factoring the roles of men and women in natural resource management. The project has worked to satisfy these requirements by producing Gender Strategy, Action Plans, and Toolkit and tracking participation of stakeholders by recording disaggregated data.</p> <p>To reinforce the current practice of the project, SPC will also conduct gender audits of all R2R guidelines and manuals produced.</p> <p>UNDP proposes that SPC conduct gender assessments</p>	<p>IW projects continuously record sex-disaggregated data and support the conduct of gender-audit, as requested by RPCU.</p>	<p>The RSTC to consider and discuss RPCU’s proposed gender approach. Details in WP.4 (ix) may be relevant in this discussion.</p>		<p>Consider the recommendation in light of SPC’s response and the advice of the RSTC and RPCG, and endorse as appropriate</p>