

# GEF International Waters Pacific Regional Ridge to Reef Project

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

## First Meeting of the Working Group to Guide the Formulation of a Follow-up Project Concept of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme Meeting Highlights

April 21, 2021



## Abbreviations

CC	Climate Change
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EGS	Ecosystem Goods & Services
GEF	Global Environment Facility
ICM	Integrated Coastal Management
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
LME	Large Marine Ecosystems
MoA	Memorandum of Agreement
PICs	Pacific Island Countries
QQT	Quantity, Quality and Time
R2R	Ridge to Reef
RPCU	Regional Programme Coordination Unit
RSC	Regional Steering Committee
RSTC	Regional Science and Technical Committee
RSTC-TC2	Second Consultation of the Regional Science and Technical Committee
S2P	Science to Policy
SAP/SAF	Strategic Action Plan/Framework
SCOT	Social Construction of Technology
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
WG	Working Group

# Working Group Highlights

## Introduction

1. Ten (10) Participants attended the first meeting of the Working Group to guide the formulation of a follow-up project concept of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme. The meeting took place at the R2R Regional Office conference room at Mead Road, Suva, Fiji.
2. The meeting considered appropriate to consider the title of the next project as that suggested by the R2R mainstreaming consultancy team as,  
  
*“Optimizing benefits of R2R mainstreaming by ensuring that natural capital (ecosystems and the EGS they provide) are sustainably transformed into environmental, economic and financial assets based on governance-oriented, holistic, inclusive, sustainable and resiliency-focused processes.”*
3. The Meeting objectives are to discuss the terms of reference of the working group and develop action plan for the formulation of the follow-up project concept of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program.
4. The meeting expected outputs are as follows: -
  - i. Approved terms of reference of the working group
  - ii. Approved terms of reference for the project development consultant.
  - iii. Discuss and agree on the project title for the follow-up project, its overall objectives, and indicative components.
  - iv. Indicative action plan and WG schedule.
5. The Agenda (**Annex 1**) was approved by the WG participants, and the list of participants is provided in **Annex 2**.

## **Session 1: Review and discussions of the ToR for the WG to guide the formulation of a follow up project of the GEF Pacific R2R Program**

6. RPCU presented an overview of the draft Terms of Reference (**Annex 3**) for the RSTC Working Group that will guide the formulation of a follow-up project of the GEF Pacific R2R program. Participants reviewed the ToR and provided inputs to enhancing the ToR. Several observations below: -
  - i. It is expected that selected country participants will be part of this WG and to be reflected in the ToR.
  - ii. Participants reminded that RSTC and RSC had approved the concept note including the formation of the current WG.
  - iii. Maintaining of the name ‘working group’ consistent with prior decision at the RSTC. However, the name “Think Tank” can be mentioned in the *Scope and Function* section of ToR.
  - iv. *Guiding principles* section of the ToR was discussed and resolved that if “war room” type of discussions occurs, as long as a resolution is reached, and mutual

accountability is upheld in pursuit of the Paris Declaration. It is important to be efficient and results oriented.

- v. The working group is not a CROP and therefore our own disciplines not represented but the participants' representation is provision of an advisory role in the next phase.
  - vi. While the WG is a think tank of thematic areas, there is also an element of proposal design that leads to a particular fund. For the purpose of proposal development, the specific source of funding has not been identified yet because the GEF 7 cycle has passed. However, there are other opportunities, and with the WG technical team and RPCU team working together, it is possible to target a particular fund.
  - vii. It was noted that the major cause of failure of projects is in the formulation stage. It is important not to forget stakeholders, as inclusivity is crucial to its success. A good program can be crafted as we are not "starting from zero" (IWRM and current R2R program informs the next phase).
  - viii. Noted that the ToR set out in RSTC is not being replaced but details and mechanics of proposal to be presented at the next RSTC proper to be produced for the RSTC to have an overview.
  - ix. The current discussions come from the momentum of the evolving IWRM, ICM etc. The matrix provided shows the entry points which have similarities to other processes tailor made to the R2R S2P continuum that is GEF focused.
7. Participants were reminded that the WG/Think Tank is not supposed to be constrained to a particular donor/development partner as the Project Development consultant is responsible for scoping out development partners. The specific development partner will be determined in the future.
  8. The meeting noted that there may be a conflict in roles with the inclusion of PICs representatives. The RPCU advised that the current participants in this meeting are to start off the work of the WG. The inclusion of PICs representatives will be formalized in the next RSTC. It was also noted that one of the decisions in 2019 was to invite participating countries representatives to participate in the work of the RSTC in 2019. There were discussions on this topic, and this has already been included in the Project Development consultancy ToR. The goal is to leave no one behind in terms of being part of crafting and design of the next phase of the project.

<b>9. Decision - ToR for WG has been reviewed and approved.</b>
---

**Session 2: Review and discussions of the ToR for a Project Development specialist/consultant who shall lead the formulation and packaging of a project concept**

10. RPCU presented the draft Terms of Reference for the Project Development Specialist (**Annex 4**). The Consultant will be leading the formulation of the project proposal for the next phase of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program.
11. The Participants reviewed and provided comments to enhance the ToR. As an observation, the following points were raised:
  - i. Next phase should have both IW and STAR involvement and not just focused on IW (such difference may affect the relevant stakeholders involved).

- ii. Learning from the experience of the GEF R2R Programme, the next phase should still be programmatic. However, the steering, management, and delivery mechanism will be made more appropriate to ensure effectiveness and efficiency.
  - iii. RSC and RSTC will provide guidance in the final packaging of the next phase proposal.
  - iv. SPC may still be the executing agency of the next project phase.
  - v. Interests of the Pacific Island Countries to participate in the next project phase will be ascertained during the formulation of the project proposal. Hence, the project development consultant should employ participatory programming and ensure thorough consultation with the PICs to achieve higher chance of success and full ownership.
  - vi. The proposal for a programme instead of a project implies that everything has been factored in especially in terms of EGS, CC, etc., with all the complexity described in a programmatic approach.
  - vii. It was noted to be cautiously optimistic when coming up with project design as the current programme was overly ambitious in terms of the goal of trying to meet too many targets. Important to be practical with what is to be achieved by way of outcomes.
  - viii. Countries previously wanted a subregional type of design where common problems and threats would be handled in the project within the subregional distinctions. It is the responsibility of WG to recognize what the countries prefer when regarding the design at the proposal stage.
  - ix. The duration of consultancy was discussed with the WG highlighting what the demands and opportunities were and testing the waters for stakeholders.
12. SPC procurement guidelines will be applied for the Project Development Specialist/ Consultant ensuring competitiveness and transparency.
13. Potential development partners will be consulted by the project development specialist during inception phase to ascertain donors' priority and financing interest. The project proposal may be crafted for consideration by GEF-8 (due by **June 2021**), GCF, European Union Pacific, etc.
14. The detailed indicative processes in project proposal development are outlined in the ToR. The WG members will be consulted throughout the project proposal development process.

15. <b>Decision:</b> Working group endorsed the ToR for approval by RPCU/SPC.
---

### **Session 3: Follow-up discussions of the next phase project proposal**

#### ***Brief input on ToC following the results chain framework***

- 16. The RPCU staff Mr Jose Antonio delivered a brief presentation on Theory of Change and results-based management. The full presentation is attached as **Annex 5**.
- 17. A consolidated matrix of the initial ideas from Participants will be considered in crafting the project proposal for the next phase of the GEF Pacific R2R Program, see **Table 1**.

**Table 1: Consolidated outputs of the workshop participants during the RSTC-TC2 held on February 17, 2021**

WG Group	Key lessons	Opportunities for upscaling	Outputs	Means of Verification
Resource Assessment and modelling	Standardising field methodologies	Develop a template to standardize field methodologies (vegetation, fauna, freshwater & marine) Capacity building (2-Tier: Professional & technical) Improved methodologies for assessments, refine environmental indicators and parameters for assessments	Standard method developed	Science TWG meeting Standardized methodological design
	Island diagnostic Assessment (IDA) based only on stakeholder meetings and perceptions of the community	Ground-truthing of environmental issues to validate community perceptions	Perceptions from relevant stakeholders through consultations undertaken	Stakeholder consultation Validation report through ground-truthing
	Lack of or inconsistency with data recording templates	Development of standardised data recording templates	Standardized data recording templates for each assessment developed	Standardized data recording templates
	Lack of scientific writing skills for resource assessments	Address R & D needs regionally, in-country / regional capacity building Screening national consultants/ qualifications & experience	Reports of quality and standards developed	Qualified reviewer & copy editor
	Species Distribution Modelling (SDM)- hotspot areas for conservation	Mapping priority areas for conservation	SDM for local species	Hotspots areas for conservation under current and future climatic conditions mapped
Resource Management Planning	Identify the framework early	Identification of relevant framework from project design	Resource Management Plan Framework identified	The resource management plan framework
	Availability & reliability of data to set up management plan (Quality of baselines)	Multisectoral approach	Update the current databases (datasets to be approved by Steering Committee)	Minutes of meeting
	Multi-sectoral approach	Establishment of workgroups	MOU/MOA established, Quarterly meeting	MOU/MOA executed, Minutes of meeting
	Inclusion of indigenous & local knowledge (& involvement – bottom up)	Resource assessment to include the cultural/human connectivity	Resource assessment includes ILK	ILK data
	Engage participatory & inclusive approach	Review the existing participatory approach & identify & adopt the new/workable ones	Participatory approach identified	R2R participatory toolkit
Innovative technological solutions and socio-economic package	Lack of social and economic, cultural, environmental considerations in the designs and use of innovative technologies e.g. CT & DLP	Community-led approach	Community-led sanitation program	
	Tailoring interventions to suit local context-application of agroforestry in volcanic and coastal	Spatial prioritization - overlay economic data	Spatial prioritization framework	Country spatial prioritization mapping (map available)
	Traditional knowledge vs science	Using existing institution - Micronesia Conservation Society Simplified end-user interface for decision making	Reforestation	Number of hectares planted
Options for enhancing national and regional policies, inclusive pathways for mainstreaming R2R	Policies and legislation not aligned	Diagnostic/gap analysis of policies and legislation	Diagnostic/gap assessment report	Technical report
	Willingness of govts to get money but not committed, and focus to interest gov - [e.g. agriculture, flooding mitigation]	Focus on benefit derived from mainstreaming R2R Focus on something of value/interest to national government	Clear financial and non-benefits to government	Technical report e.g. economic, social impact assessment report
	Design does not enable collaboration	Inclusive design with process to enable collaboration	Commitment and clear understanding and acceptance by all affected parties to collaborate	MOA (clear articulation of roles)
	Project time doesn't allow cycle to complete	Inception should give opportunity to revisit partners, review (don't leave to mid-term)	Results-oriented project document with clear inception phase	Project document, inception report
	Adequate funding – unrealistic	Sufficient budget and time	Realistic and adequate funding	Approved country allocation

**Table 2:** Results of the brainstorming session regarding ideas to consider in crafting the next phase project proposal

<p><b>Dr. Marika Tuiwawa</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Application of R2R program differs according to the type of island and resource.</b></li> <li>- <b>Methodology on how to carry out the baseline assessment is not the same</b></li> <li>- <b>Standardizing the methodologies (refer to first point)</b></li> <li>- <b>Skills level within the country need to be updated (training)</b></li> <li>-</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mr. Jalesi Mateboto</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity building package (formal and informal) to go with the project implementation</li> <li>- Tested and proven framework that can be adopted to any PICs</li> <li>- Harmonize TEK and science</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
<p><b>Dr. Isoa</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capturing the priorities of various stakeholders in a systematic way.</li> <li>- Adequate financing to support environmental initiatives that ensures sustainability after the 5-years. Mainstreaming within the government system. – sustainable financing (government as source)</li> <li>- Factor Covid 19 in implementing and design of regional initiatives – resource management and biodiversity</li> <li>- Capturing and understanding past experience of regional initiatives that are now mainstreamed.</li> <li>- What is sustainable development in the Pacific Islands.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
<p><b>Dr. Salome Tupou-Taufa</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is sustainable development in the Pacific Islands context</li> <li>- Policy makers will base their decision on evidence that are socially, environmental, and economically sound</li> <li>- Developing guidelines of how natural resources can be utilized in a sustainable manner for optimal benefits</li> <li>- Improvement in the management and the use of natural resources using innovative technological instruments with due considerations to social, environmental, and economic implications</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mr Samasoni Sauni</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the end of the project, an increase production of natural resources by 30%</li> <li>- Improve alternative livelihood opportunities available</li> <li>- Various R2R-climate sensitive- conservation-resource-link technological and socio-economic packages available</li> <li>- Improved community resilience through improved governance and enabling environment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Dr. Fononga Vainga Mangisi-Mafileo</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project will be linking to global and regional process and indicators (SDG, CBD Post 2020 Framework – Aichi 2020+, Paris, Sendai, SAMOA etc.)</li> <li>- Social construction of technology to employ the SCOT approach (socially informed design)</li> <li>- Leveraging lessons learned to inform appropriate design</li> <li>- Provide recommendations for national - global transboundary resource governance and management which may include review of policies and laws, local-global governance, and indicator frameworks to identify challenges and opportunities for harmonization and alignment from national to global for improved cohesion, cooperation and coordination of national, regional and international development efforts.</li> <li>- R2R (land to sea/ocean) frameworks and harmonized and integrated methods are peer-reviewed, and CROP considered and supported.</li> </ul>
<p>Unified/ Summarized statement of desired results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decisions of policy makers based on evidence that are scientifically, socially, environmentally, and economically sound</li> <li>- Policies, legislations, and/or strategic planning documents enhanced using appropriate R2R-climate sensitive resource governance model (informed decision)</li> </ul>

**Table 3:** Results (Output, Use of Output and Outcome) matrix indicating possible components as building blocks in crafting the next phase

Results	RAM	RMP	ITSSP	Upscaling
Outcome	<b>Adoption</b> by academe and other CROP agencies of the peer-reviewed standard field assessment methodologies for specific resource types	<b>Application</b> by PICs of resource management planning procedures, guidelines, guidance	<b>Application</b> of various Tested conservation-resource-link technological and socio-economic packages by PICs and regional stakeholders	Policies, legislations, and/or strategic planning documents <b>enhanced</b> using appropriate R2R-climate sensitive resource governance model
Use of output	Established peer-reviewed-standard field methodologies for assessing different resource types <b>promoted and applied</b>	Tested R2R-climate sensitive, inclusive resource management planning framework <b>promoted and applied.</b>	Tested R2R-climate sensitive-conservation-resource-link technological and socio-economic packages <b>promoted and applied</b>	R2R-climate sensitive, inclusive resource governance models (i.e. atolls, small islands, etc.) <b>applied</b>
Output	Standards for field methodologies for assessing different natural resource types <b>established</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data recording forms and reporting templates <b>developed</b></li> <li>▪ Agreed procedures for assessing different resource types established</li> <li>▪ Unified assessment reporting templates established</li> <li>▪ Testing of prototype standard methodologies conducted</li> <li>▪ ...</li> </ul>	R2R-climate sensitive, inclusive resource management planning framework and procedures <b>established</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Various resource management planning process and procedures <b>reviewed</b></li> <li>▪ Enhanced R2R-climate sensitive, inclusive resource management planning procedures <b>applied</b> in selected PICs</li> <li>▪ ...</li> </ul>	Various R2R-climate sensitive-conservation-resource-link technological and socio-economic packages (e.g. PES, livelihood) <b>implemented</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conservation-resource-link technological and socio-economic packages identified in various R2R-sensitive resource management plans <b>implemented</b> and results <b>monitored</b></li> <li>▪ Conservation-resource-link technological and socio-economic packages <b>available</b></li> <li>▪ ...</li> </ul>	R2R-climate sensitive, inclusive resource governance models (i.e. atolls, small islands, etc.) <b>established</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment/ diagnosis of national / regional resource-related frameworks, policies, legislations, and strategic plans and programs <b>carried-out.</b></li> <li>▪ Socio-economic valuation of various strategic options (e.g. Strategic Environmental Assessment) <b>undertaken</b> as basis for optimal benefits from resource governance</li> <li>▪ Appropriate governance model tested</li> <li>▪ ...</li> </ul>

**Note:** RAM – Resource Assessment & modelling / RMP – Resource Management Planning / ITSSP – Innovative technical solutions & socio-economic package / Upscaling – Options for enhancing national and regional policies, inclusive pathways for mainstreaming R2R.



18. Reflecting on the theory of change process, the initial ideas in Table 1 were further dissected by the working group members. Several observations below from discussion that may be useful to guide the formulation of the next phase project proposal: -
  - i. Streamlining what is technically viable through the Theory of Change
  - ii. Ensure correctness and consistency of the methodologies from the beginning
  - iii. The Theory of Change is reflected with resource assessment modelling being an input for resource management planning which then informs innovative technological solutions and socio-economic package. The demands will then depend on the options for enhancing national and regional policies, inclusive pathways for mainstreaming R2R.
  - iv. One important consideration relates to having local communities participated in the process with the opportunity to provide inputs directly to the project proposal, objectives, and related details.
  - v. It is well known that communities prefer financial resources support small scale economic developments benefitting local populations, rather than funding endless data collection/'science to policy' related activities.
  - vi. The alternative is to do both because good information informs better policy decisions particularly dealing with natural resource management.
  
19. A brief exercise to define the long-term outcome (desired results) of the next phase was undertaken. Participants were given 10 minutes to write their ideas. Table 2 captures the rough ideas presented by the participants.
  
20. RPCU staff consolidated the outcomes of the exercise into simple results chain for better appreciation and ease of understanding, refer to **Table 3**. WG members revised the results and provided additional inputs and corrections to the matrix, examples below: -
  - i. **RAM**
    - Adoption is important and we can have an adoption toolkit that decision makers and policy makers can use.
    - A correction for RAM Outcome – “.... PICs and CROP agencies of the peer-reviewed....”.
  - ii. **RMP**
    - Correction “....by PICs and CROP agencies....”
    - Also noting that the CROP listens to PICs.
  - iii. **ITSSP**

Have a compendium of consolidated technical packages that can be used by PICs to venture into their resources.

Gap assessment is needed to determine benefits from resource governance.

The ITSSP Output is where alternative livelihoods will be determined through its planning process.

If the Fiji Waimanu Catchment Management Plan is successful, we can use that to start implementing ITSSP. Need to make sure there is not much of a time gap between current phase and the next so that momentum is not lost.

SAP/SAF within country can inform policy framework and a regional SAP/SAF conducted to know regional priorities. We are then able to use these to see common preferences across the region and gives us more comfort that our next phase is supported by other regional activities.

### **Next Meeting**

21. The RPCU staff thanked everyone for their inputs in the first meeting of the working group. The Working Group agreed to meet again on April 16, 2021.

## Annex 1: Working Group Meeting Agenda

### *Regional Scientific and Technical Committee of GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program*

#### *Working Group Meeting*

*March 1, 2021, 0900H-1300H, R2R Conference Room, Mead Road, Suva, Fiji*

#### *Provisional Agenda*

**Meeting objectives:** Discuss the terms of reference of the working group and develop action plan for the formulation of the follow-up project concept of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program

**Expected outputs:**

- Approved terms of reference of the working group;
- Approved terms of reference for the project development consultant
- Discuss and agree on the project title for the follow-up project, its overall objectives, and indicative components
- Indicative action plan and WG schedule

Time	Activity	Responsible Person/s
9:00am – 9:10am	<b>Introduction and welcoming remarks</b>	Samasoni Sauni
9:10am – 9:20am	Review/adoption of the provisional agenda and expected outputs	Samasoni Sauni/ All
9:20am – 10:00am	<b>Session 1:</b> Review and discussions of the ToR for the Working Group to guide the formulation of a follow-up project of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program	Shaleh Antonio/ All
	<b>Summary of agreements</b>	
10:00am – 10.45am	<b>Session 2:</b> Review and discussions of the ToR for a Project Development Specialist/ consultant who shall lead the formulation and packaging of a project concept	Shaleh Antonio/ All
	<b>Summary of agreements</b>	
10:45am – 11:00am	Morning tea	
11.00am – 12:50pm	<b>Session 3:</b> Follow-up discussions on the follow-up project	All
	Brief input on Theory of Change (ToC) following the results chain framework	Shaleh Antonio
	Revisit and/or follow-up discussions on the workshop outputs from the four Thematic Groups	Shaleh Antonio/ All
	Summary of discussions and action plan	Samasoni Sauni/ All
12:50pm – 1:00pm	<b>Closing remarks</b>	Isoa Korovulavula
1:00pm – onwards	Lunch	

## Annex 2: List of Participants

Mr Samasoni Sauni	SPC – Regional Programme Coordinator, R2R
Mr Jose Antonio	SPC – Country Coordination, M&E Adviser, R2R
Dr Fononga Mangisi-Mafileo	SPC – Communications and Knowledge Management Adviser, R2R
Ms Rhonda Robinson	SPC – Deputy Director DCRP, GEM Division
Dr Isoa Korovulavula	USP-IAS
Dr Salome Taufa	PIFS
Mr Jalesi Mateboto	SPC-LRD
Mr Marika Tuiwawa	USP-IAS
Mr Ratu George Naboutuiloma	SPC – Science Officer, R2R
Mr John Adams Carreon	SPC – Science Officer, R2R

**Annex 3: Terms of Reference for the Working Group to Guide Formulation of a Follow-up Project Concept of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme**



---

# Terms of Reference for the Working Group to Guide the Formulation of a Follow-up Project Concept of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme

**Version 1.0**

## Contents

Introduction.....	15
Scope and function.....	15
Composition .....	16
Guiding principles .....	17
Frequency of meetings .....	17

## Introduction

The GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program is a program comprising of 15 child projects (14 STAR and one Regional IW) implemented across the 14 Pacific Island Countries. The Program is guided by the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) and the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC). RSC serves as the governance platform while RSTC ensures that scientific and technical aspects of the Program meet international standards.

Providing the secretariat and coordination role of the Program is the Regional Program Coordination Unit (RPCU) of the Regional IW R2R project. RPCU consolidates the information about the program results and lessons learned from implementing various interventions and testing innovative approaches geared towards effective governance of natural resources.

In October 2020 virtual meeting, the Committees agreed that the follow up phase will focus on a streamlined mainstreaming of R2R investments and ICM planning. Specifically, the next R2R project focuses only on priority focal areas supporting research and development (e.g., research to develop regional standards in pollution from animal/human waste), capacity building, and replicating/upscaling innovative technologies and development measures thereby securing ecosystems goods and services following the R2R - Climate resilient approaches and inclusive green economic pathway/s.

A follow-up technical consultation meeting was held in February 15-17, 2021. During this period, a half-day workshop session was devoted to revisit the RSTC/RSC endorsed concept focusing on dissecting lessons learned from implementation and testing of various technical and innovative approaches experienced under the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme initiative (refer to [RSTC-TC2 WP20](#) of the Second RSTC-Technical Consultation). An outcome document can also be found in the link provided - [here](#).

A preliminary/working title for the follow-up project was also presented, see below:

- a. Mainstreaming R2R sensitive, inclusive and climate smart solutions for effective governance of natural resources in the Pacific Region.
- b. Mainstreaming R2R sensitive, inclusive and climate smart solutions for securing ecosystems goods and services in the Pacific Region.

During this half-day session, an agreement to organize a working group (WG) that will provide technical guidance in the formulation of the concept note/ proposal for the follow-up Project.

This Terms of Reference (ToR) outlines the scope, tasks, expected outputs, and composition of the working group members.

## Scope and function

The working group shall provide sound scientific and technical inputs in revising/ enhancing the RSC approved concept note and/or proposal for the follow-up project of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program, and ensuring inclusive, open, fair, transparent processes.

Specifically, as a collegial body mainly task to guide the revision/enhancement of the concept note and/or proposal of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program, the WG shall:

- Ensure open and transparent communication, information, and knowledge exchange between and among the working group members, RPCU, SPC, and the participating countries;
- Share information on but not limited to scientific, technical, and policy as inputs to guide the formulation of the project concept note or proposal for a follow-up project of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program;
- Present, endorse the draft project concept note or proposal to the RSTC for final review, and to the RSC for endorsement to possible development partner/s for financing.



## Composition

The working group will be composed of members of the RSTC who were designated as focal point from the identified thematic areas such as but not limited to: (i) resource assessment and modelling; (ii) resource management planning; (iii) innovative technological solutions and socio-economic package; and (iv) options for enhancing national and regional policies, and inclusive pathways for mainstreaming R2R.

The following designated focal points are listed in the Table below:

<b>Thematic focus</b>	<b>Designated focal points</b>
Resource assessment and modelling	<p><b>Mr Marika Tuiwawa</b>            Curator, South Pacific Regional Herbarium (SPRH) Manager            Biodiversity Centre Institute of Applied Science (IAS)            The University of the South Pacific            Laucala Campus, Suva, Fiji            Tel: +679 323 2970/2966            Mob:            Email: <a href="mailto:marika.tuiwawa@usp.ac.fj">marika.tuiwawa@usp.ac.fj</a></p>
Resource management planning	<p><b>Mr Jalesi Mateboto</b>            Natural Resources Management Advisor            Land Resource Division (LRD), SPC            Mob: +679 860 9971            Email: <a href="mailto:jalesim@spc.int">jalesim@spc.int</a></p>
Innovative technological solutions and socio-economic package	<p><b>Dr Salome Taufu</b>, Resource Economist            Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) Secretariat            Ratu Sukuna Road            Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji            Tel: +679 949 3398            Mob: +679 778 8323            Email: <a href="mailto:salomet@forumsec.org">salomet@forumsec.org</a></p>
Options for enhancing national and regional policies, and inclusive pathways for mainstreaming R2R	<p><b>Dr Isoa Korovulavula</b>            Vice Chair – RSTC            Acting Director – Institute of Applied Sciences            The University of the South Pacific            Laucala Bay Road, Suva, Fiji            Tel: +679 323 2992            Mobile: +679 926 9391            Email: <a href="mailto:korovulavula@usp.ac.fj">korovulavula@usp.ac.fj</a>            Skype ID: esautk</p>

Representative from participating Pacific Island Countries (PICs) will be invited as members of the working group.

The RPCU (led by the Regional Program Coordinator) shall continue to perform coordination/secretariat role, provide technical support, and facilitation for the WG meetings as deemed appropriate.

Specifically, the RPCU shall:

- Led the organization of meetings based on agreed priorities of the working group;

- Draft meeting agenda and arrange for the corresponding logistical support needed by the WG members that ensures effectiveness and efficiency;
- Prepare highlights of meetings and timely circulating the same to the WG members.

The Country Coordination, M&E Adviser (CCMEA) will serve as the RPCU operational focal point.

## **Guiding principles**

The following core guidelines will apply during the working group meetings:

- Be open, respectful, and appreciative to the ideas of other members and participants;
- Acknowledge diverse views and work towards the resolution of matters in a constructive, professional, and timely manner; and
- Promoting transparency, inclusivity (multi-stakeholder, multi-disciplinary and gender sensitive), collaboration, mutual accountability, and results-orientation.

## **Frequency of meetings**

The first meeting of the working group is scheduled on March 1, 2021. Succeeding meetings shall be held on-need-basis and as agreed upon by the WG members in consultation with the RPCU. Cost for organizing the WG meetings shall be charge to the Regional IW R2R project.



---

## **Annex 4: ToR Project Development Specialist**

# Terms of Reference Consultancy to formulate a follow-up Project Proposal of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme

**(MYCWP Regional IW R2R Project – 5.1.5.2)**

**Version 1.1**

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Background .....	3
The Pacific Community .....	3
The Regional International Waters Ridge to Reef Project .....	3
The GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program .....	3
Rationale.....	4
Scope of the consultancy .....	5
Objective .....	5
Expected outputs .....	5
Institutional arrangements .....	5
Duration of the consultancy .....	5
Qualifications of the Consultant.....	6
Technical proposal evaluation grid .....	6
Candidate competencies .....	6
Technical evaluation grid .....	7
Annexes to the TOR.....	8

# Introduction

## *Background*

### The Pacific Community

The Pacific Community (SPC) is an international organisation established by treaty (the Canberra Agreement) in 1947 and is owned and governed by its 26 members including all 22 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs). It is the largest scientific and technical international organisation in the Pacific, working at both the regional and national levels to support members in achieving their development goals. For more than 70 years, SPC has been providing the Pacific Islands region with essential scientific advice and technical services. Its aim is to contribute to achieving genuine and lasting improvement in people's lives, through working with all members, at all levels, in delivering integrated services that advance their progress towards addressing their development challenges and achieving their aspirations.

Pursuant to its mandate, SPC and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) signed a Project Cooperation Agreement providing the legal basis for the implementation of a regional project that would support 14 Pacific Islands Countries (PICs) in maintaining and enhancing ecosystems goods and services of natural resources.

### The Regional International Waters Ridge to Reef Project

The "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" briefly known as Regional International Waters Ridge to Reef Project or Regional IW R2R project, is a five year project funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) which aims 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. An amount of USD10.3 million was made available by GEF to finance the project covering 14 Pacific Island Countries.

### The GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program

Against the backdrop of this Regional IW R2R project is the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program or "Pacific Islands Ridge to Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods". The GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program is a program comprising of 15 child projects (14 STAR and one Regional IW) implemented across the 14 Pacific Island Countries. It is guided by the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) and the Regional Scientific and Technical Committee (RSTC). RSC serves as the governance platform while RSTC ensures that scientific and technical aspects of the Program meet international standards. On top of this, a Regional Program Coordination Group (RPCG) comprising of the GEF implementing agencies – FAO, UNDP, and UN Environment, serves as the coordination platform.

Providing the secretariat and coordination role of the Program is the Regional Program Coordination Unit (RPCU) of the Regional IW R2R project. RPCU consolidates the information about the program results and lessons learned from implementing various interventions and testing innovative approaches geared towards effective governance of natural resources.

The Program aims to maintain and enhance PICs 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. Guided by the Programme Framework Document (PFD), GEF investment amounts to USD 90.4 million with a co-financing of about USD 333 million from the various stakeholders of the 14 Pacific Island Countries. The GEF investment is earmarked to finance measures that contributes to the six focal areas of GEF namely: (1) biodiversity; (2) climate change adaptation; (3) climate change mitigation; (4) international waters; (5) land degradation; and (6) sustainable forest management.

## Rationale

The ever-increasing demand by humans for these Ecosystems Goods and Services (EGS) and the challenges brought about by the impact of climate change, has just tipped-off the scale and requirement for sustainably managing the environment and natural resources. Resource managers needed to be equipped with robust knowledge, expertise, and skills not only in understanding the carrying capacity of the ecosystem to sustainably deliver goods and services, but also in understanding the interconnectedness of the environment and its natural resources. On the other hand, the impacts of climate change dictates and set the new normal for sustainably managing natural resources. With this new normal it become more than necessary, an imperative for national governments in the Pacific Region to review their current land use and natural resources practices and ultimately rethink their strategies for achieving climate resilient and inclusive socio-economic development thereby ensuring sustainably delivery of ecosystems goods and services.

Ridge to reef (R2R) management is an approach to managing all activities within the catchment or watershed and out to the sea to ensure natural resource sustainability. It relies on managing activities of people and their use of natural resources within 'natural boundaries'. The approach also includes ecosystem-based management (EBM) which recognizes nature, and the functioning of entire ecosystems should be managed altogether, rather than focusing on one aspect or sector e.g., a focus on forestry, or agriculture, or fisheries.

SPC is cognizant of this complex and humungous demand and understands the wide-ranging environment management and governance architecture. Through the joint efforts of the GEF Pacific R2R program, resource managers and communities of the participating Pacific Islands Countries are honed to be effective managers. Pivotal to this, is the thorough and comprehensive understanding of the role of and importance of robust scientific data and information as evidence or bases for decisions for natural resources management and governance along the ecosystem continuum.

As one of the 15 child projects under the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program, the Regional IW R2R project provides capacity building support and coordination for consolidating and documenting lessons from mainstreaming ridge to reef in either planning process and/or appropriate policy.

Program implementation and testing of various technological approaches and socio-economic innovative packages were documented, and program results are promising. Program outcomes however are yet emerging as this was heavily affected by the Covid-19 pandemic almost paralysing project management units in providing onsite technical and policy support.

Cognizant of the importance and effectiveness of R2R in sustainable governance of natural resources, an idea of a follow-up program initiative emerged. Hence, a [concept paper](#) was developed.

In October 2020 virtual meeting, the RSC and RSTC agreed that the follow up project proposal will be formulated. The follow-up project will focus on a streamlined mainstreaming of R2R investments and ICM planning. Specifically, the next R2R project focuses only on priority focal areas supporting research and development (e.g., research to develop regional standards in pollution from animal/human waste), capacity building, and replicating/ upscaling innovative technologies and development measures thereby securing ecosystems goods and services following the R2R - Climate resilient approaches and inclusive green economic pathway/s.

A follow-up technical consultation meeting was held in February 15-17, 2021. During this period, a half-day workshop session was devoted to revisit the RSTC/RSC endorsed concept focusing on dissecting lessons learned from implementation and testing of various technical and innovative approaches experienced under the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme initiative (refer to [RSTC-TC2 WP20](#) of the Second RSTC-Technical Consultation).

This Terms of Reference (ToR) outlines the scope, tasks, expected outputs, of the follow-up project of the GEF Pacific Ridge to Reef Program initiative.

## Scope of the consultancy

### *Objective*

Building on the preliminary ideas, concept notes and the decisions of the Working Group tasks to guide the project proposal formulation process, the consultancy aim to formulate a full concept proposal for the follow-up project of the GEF Pacific R2R program with clearly defined strategy (logical framework), steering (governance mechanisms and mainstreaming pathways), cooperation (inclusive yet functional), processes, and learning for national and regional upscaling.

### *Expected outputs*

At the end of this consultancy, the consultant shall submit a consultancy report following the template provided by RPCU. The Concept Proposal for the follow-up project of the GEF Pacific R2R Program will be an important annex of the consultancy report.

### *Institutional arrangements*

The consultant will be directly responsible to, reporting to, seeking approval/acceptance of output from **Mr. Samasoni Sauni**, Regional Program Coordinator of the Regional International Waters Ridge to Reef (IW-R2R) project.

Operationally, the consultant will collaborate with **Mr. Shaleh Antonio**, Country Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser (CCMEA).

### *Duration of the consultancy*

This consultancy shall be carried out for a **maximum of 60-days** (and not to exceed total budget of **USD27,000**) **within the period April to August 2021**.

Below is the indicative time frame of this consultancy. This suggested timeline will be enhanced and finalized during the inception phase.

Indicative schedule	Suggested activity
<p><b>April 1 to April 15, 2021</b></p>	<p><b>Inception phase</b></p> <p>Meetings and discussions with RPCU and the members of the RSTC/WG</p> <p>Gathering of secondary information</p> <p>Desk review of the secondary information, and</p> <p>Conduct <b>virtual</b> (and where appropriate and possible, <b>onsite</b>) informal consultation with relevant stakeholders in the Pacific Region such as but not limited to CROP agencies, academe, relevant development partners and potential financing agencies), and the focal points (project coordinators and managers) of the 14 participating countries of the GEF Pacific R2R program.</p> <p>As an output of the abovementioned exercise is an <b>inception report</b> outlining the process for drafting/formulating the concept proposal. Also, the inception report is expected to already contain information about the interest, appropriateness, and relevance of the envisaged project outcome by the “would-be” participating PICs, including leads as to the possible development partners who shall be willing/ interested to finance this project.</p>
<p><b>April 15 to May 15, 2021</b></p>	<p><b>Implementation of the Inception Report and formulation of concept proposal</b></p> <p>Conduct of virtual or onsite meetings with relevant PICs, and other stakeholders especially those that have positively indicated interests in participating in the follow-up Program.</p>

<b>May 15 to June 15, 2021</b>	<b>Draft concept proposal available</b> Discussions of the initial/draft concept proposal with RPCU and the RSTC/WG.
<b>June 15-30, 2021</b>	<b>Revised concept proposal available</b> Revised concept proposal should already incorporate the inputs from the RPCU and RSTC/WG
<b>August 15, 2021</b>	Consultancy report and the Concept proposal available  Consultancy report (following the RPCU template) should provide detailed accounts of the processes in crafting the concept proposal including the list (attendance sheets for onsite meetings, and recordings & pictures for virtual meetings) of stakeholders provided inputs, comments, and suggestions, etc. thereby strengthening the veracity/integrity and ownership of the proposal.

## Qualifications of the Consultant

The consultant should not only have the following expertise but also have substantial operational experience and proven track record (can provide at least 3 concept proposal and/or project proposal that have been implemented or currently ongoing) in formulating sound concept proposals and project document in the Pacific Region. Specifically, the consultant or team of consultants must:

- be at least Masters in any of the following disciplines
  - o environmental science, or environmental planner,
  - o natural resource management or natural resource governance
  - o development management
- have at least 15 years of track-record and experience in formulating development projects that aims to manage natural resources effectively and sustainably in the Pacific;
- show evidence by providing at least 3 samples of its work (either primary author or co-author) or concept proposal or project proposal that have been implemented in any of the PIC or in the Pacific region;
- have more than 15 years of experience in employing various stakeholder engagement processes, participatory techniques and tools in moderating multi-stakeholder planning, consultation meetings, assessment, workshops, seminars and conferences under the environment and natural resources sector.
- have prior experience working on the Ridge to Reef or environmental governance projects is an advantage but not required.

## Technical proposal evaluation grid

Documents or applications received by the SPC procurement unit shall be evaluated based on the criteria enumerated below.

### *Candidate competencies*

Basis for shortlisting of the consultants based on competencies and qualifications.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score Weight (%)</b>	<b>Total Obtainable Score (Points)</b>
Masters (see qualifications section)	30%	30
have at least 15 years of track-record and experience in formulating development projects that aims to manage natural resources effectively and sustainably in the Pacific;	30%	30



show evidence by providing at least 3 samples of its work (either primary author or co-author) or concept proposal or project proposal that have been implemented in any of the PIC or in the Pacific region	20%	20
have more than 15 years of experience in employing various stakeholder engagement processes, participatory techniques and tools in moderating multi-stakeholder planning, consultation meetings, assessment, workshops, seminars and conferences under the environment and natural resources sector.	10%	10
have prior experience working on the Ridge to Reef or environmental governance projects is an advantage but not required.	10%	10
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Qualification Score</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>70</b>

The technical proposal of those candidates obtaining minimum score of 70 points would be included in the shortlist.

Once a candidate is shortlisted, the candidates will be assessed afresh using the criteria below.

These criteria will serve as bases for the final selection and ranking.

<b>Evaluation grid</b>	<b>Score weight (%)</b>	<b>Total obtainable score (Points)</b>	<b>Minimum score required (Points)</b>
Technical evaluation grid	70%	70	49
Financial evaluation grid	30%	30	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>70</b>

### ***Technical evaluation grid***

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score Weight (%)</b>	<b>Total Obtainable Score (Points)</b>
<b>Completeness</b> Technical proposal with annexes to substantiate the experience of the candidate or showing examples of its work similar to this consultancy	40%	40
<b>Overall quality of the technical proposal</b> - Methodological approach - Clear deadlines of the expected outputs - Feasible schedule of field activities/country visits, inception, briefing, debriefing - Presentation of the results to various stakeholders	60%	60
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Qualification Score</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>70</b>

Only those technical proposals that obtained a minimum of 70 points would be considered for the financial evaluation grid.

With the complexity and the limited budget of this consultancy, it is important that the consultant should at least obtain a minimum accumulative score of 70 points for both technical and financial evaluation grid to be considered. This is to ensure quality of the technical outputs and ensure value for money.

## **Annexes to the TOR**

Links were provided in the ToR for all relevant documents and references mentioned. Additional information can also be obtained from the website <https://www.pacific-r2r.org/>

## **Annex 5: Presentation on Theory of Change**

For a copy of the presentation, please consult the Regional Programme Coordinator [samasonis@spc.int](mailto:samasonis@spc.int)