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Issue Date: [1 July 2020]
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PART 1 – INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS AND PROPOSAL CONDITIONS

1.1. About IUCN

IUCN is a membership Union uniquely composed of both government and civil society organisations. It provides public, private and non-governmental organisations with the knowledge and tools that enable human progress, economic development and nature conservation to take place together.

Headquartered in Switzerland, IUCN Secretariat comprises around 950 staff in more than 50 countries.

Created in 1948, IUCN is now the world’s largest and most diverse environmental network, harnessing the knowledge, resources and reach of more than 1,300 Member organisations and some 10,000 experts. It is a leading provider of conservation data, assessments and analysis. Its broad membership enables IUCN to fill the role of incubator and trusted repository of best practices, tools and international standards.

IUCN provides a neutral space in which diverse stakeholders including governments, NGOs, scientists, businesses, local communities, indigenous peoples organisations and others can work together to forge and implement solutions to environmental challenges and achieve sustainable development.

Working with many partners and supporters, IUCN implements a large and diverse portfolio of conservation projects worldwide. Combining the latest science with the traditional knowledge of local communities, these projects work to reverse habitat loss, restore ecosystems and improve people’s well-being.

www.iucn.org
https://twitter.com/IUCN/

1.2. Summary of the Requirement

IUCN invites you to submit a Proposal for the Preparation of GCF Full Proposal Documents for the Melanesia-Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Resilience Programme. The detailed Terms of Reference can be found in Part 2 of this RfP.

1.3. The procurement process

The following key dates apply to this RfP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RfP Issue Date</th>
<th>[1 July 2020]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Intention to Bid</td>
<td>[15 July 2020]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4. Conditions
IUCN is not bound in any way to enter into any contractual or other arrangement with any Proposer as a result of issuing this RfP. IUCN is under no obligation to accept the lowest priced Proposal or any Proposal. IUCN reserves the right to terminate the procurement process at any time prior to contract award. By participating in this RfP, Proposers accept the conditions set out in this RfP.

Proposers must sign the “Proposer’s Declaration” and include it in their Proposal.

1.5. Queries and questions during the RfP period
Proposers are to direct any queries and questions regarding the RfP to the above IUCN Contact. No other IUCN personnel are to be contacted in relation to this RfP.

Proposers may submit their queries no later than [17.00 h Fiji time, 21 July 2020].

As far as possible, IUCN will issue the responses to any questions, suitably anonymised, to all Proposers. If you consider the content of you question confidential, you must state this at the time the question is posed.

1.6. Amendments to RfP documents
IUCN may amend the RfP documents by issuing notices to that effect to all Proposers and may extend the RfP closing date and time if deemed appropriate.

1.7. Proposal lodgement methods and requirements
Proposers must submit their Proposal to IUCN no later than [24.00 h Fiji time] on [1 August 2020] by email to: Kenneth.kassem@iucn.org. The subject heading of the email shall be [RfP – [M-CMERP Design] - [Proposer Name]]. Electronic copies are to be submitted in PDF and native (e.g. MS Word) format. Proposers may submit multiple emails (suitably annotated – e.g. Email 1 of 3) if attached files are deemed too large to suit a single email transmission.

IMPORTANT: Submitted documents must be password-protected so that they cannot be opened and read before the submission deadline. Please use the same password for all submitted documents. After the deadline has passed and no later than [24.00 h Fiji time] on [1 August 2020], please send the relevant password to the same email address as used for submitting your Proposal. This will ensure a secure bid submission and opening process. Please DO NOT email the password before the deadline for Proposal submission.

Proposals must be prepared in English and in the format stated in Part 3 of this RfP.

1.8. Late and Incomplete Proposals
Any Proposal received by IUCN later than the stipulated RfP closing date and time, and any Proposal that is incomplete, will not be considered. There will be no allowance made by IUCN for any delays in transmission of the Proposal from Proposer to IUCN.

1.9. Withdrawals and Changes to the Proposal
Proposals may be withdrawn or changed at any time prior to the RfP closing date and time by written notice to the IUCN contact. No changes or withdrawals will be accepted after the RfP closing date and time.

1.10. Validity of Proposals
Proposals submitted in response to this RfP are to remain valid for a period of 90 calendar days from the RfP closing date.

1.11. Evaluation of Proposals
The evaluation of Proposals shall be carried out exclusively with regards to the evaluation criteria and their relative weights specified in part 3 of this RfP.
PART 2 – THE REQUIREMENT

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) is the Green Climate Fund Accredited Agency leading the development of the Melanesia Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Resilience Programme full proposal. This project is being developed in partnership with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and will be implemented by IUCN and SPREP in Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. The Concept Note was approved in early 2020 and a Project Preparation Facility grant was awarded in April 2020.

Within IUCN, the project is coordinated by the Oceania Regional Office (ORO), based in Suva, Fiji. ORO is supported by the IUCN Global Marine Programme and the GEF and GCF Coordination Unit based in IUCN’s Headquarters in Gland, Switzerland.

IUCN now wishes to award a consultancy contract to lead the preparation of the relevant feasibility studies resulting in the production of a draft GCF Funding Proposal for the M-CMERP. The Consultant will be required to work according to the detailed Terms of Reference contained in the following sections.

Background

The Project Preparation Facility (PPF) request was approved in April 2020. The PPF grant is now available for the preparation and delivery of the full project documentation.

The objective of the “M-CMERP – Melanesia Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Resilience Programme” is to “Enhance the resilience and adaptive capacity of Melanesian Pacific Island people to climate change by protecting, restoring and managing coastal and marine ecosystems and the services they provide”

Coastal and marine ecosystems and the services they provide are the basis for Pacific island countries’ (PICs) climate resilience, livelihoods, economic growth and cultural identity. They are currently under threat from climate change and its interaction with other forms of environmental degradation. A paradigm shift is needed from ad-hoc, stand-alone climate change adaptation initiatives that often focus on single issue, hard infrastructure adaptation responses, towards a holistic, long-term and integrated ecosystem-based system of resilient development.

M-CMERP will provide resource, technical and capacity support to enable holistic, long-term, effective and efficient climate resilient development planning, decision making and investments through:

Component 1: Prioritisation and integration of ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) in national planning and decision making, including long term (30-50 year) climate future climate impact and resilience scenarios and sharing information, best practices, and tools;

Component 2: Grants (Melanesia Blue Impact Facility) for EbA and resilient development investments.

Underpinning the approach to be taken by the M-CMERP is the Pacific Islands Framework for Enhancing Coastal Resilience which was endorsed by the 26 SPREP Member countries and territories as a key framework for building resilience to climate change in the region.

Key milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Timeline after contract signing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report / 1st Steering Committee meeting to confirm tasks, timelines, milestones and deliverables.</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft of Funding Proposal</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft ESMS Framework / Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duties and deliverables of the assignment

The Consultant, under the direction of IUCN as the implementing agency, in partnership with SPREP, and the GCF National Designated Authorities of Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu will have the following duties / produce the following specific deliverables:

1. Inception report – detailing minutes of first Steering Committee meeting, workplans, budgets, and results of first rounds of consultations.

2. Steering committee meeting minutes – at least 2 Steering Committee meetings. These can be face-to-face or virtual meetings.

3. Relevant consultation reports – At least 2 consultation trips are expected per country. Consultations should follow a strategy determined at inception but should engage relevant government stakeholders, potential partners, and a selection of local communities.

4. Ecosystem-based adaptation feasibility study for Component 1:

   Component 1 will facilitate a transformation in each country away from fragmented and reactive approaches to climate change adaptation planning and decision making to integrated holistic and long-term strategic approaches. The existing approach tends to focus on individual sectors, development agendas and thematic responses separately. The M-CMERP approach will focus on comprehensive analytical frameworks and scenario planning, appropriate to the dimensions of predicted future climate change impacts in each country, with a focus on ensuring proper consideration and integration of ecosystem services. Component 1 will be guided by the principles and methodology set out in the Pacific Islands Framework for Enhancing Coastal Resilience, to be applied in a tailored way for each participating country. The resulting impact of Component 1 activities will be to i) support and catalyse future and widespread enhanced planning and decision making for resilient development, across all sectors and levels of government (including local and traditional resource owners), and ii) provide a framework for the identification and delivery of high impact investments to be financed and supported via the Blue Impact Facility (Component 2.) Component 1 will ensure that national and local governments, as well as local communities, have access to tools and methodologies and data to support optimised ecosystem-based resilient development decisions.

   This study must include, at least,

   a. climate analysis and justification of need of action (see 6a below)
   b. assessment of key coastal and marine ecosystem services that underpin/critical national development and climate change adaptation
   c. assessment of ecosystem-based adaptation national and regional policies, current action on the ground, and needs in the three countries
   d. assessment of data availability for vulnerability assessments and capacity availability,
   e. assessment of national and subnational understanding of scenario planning methodologies
   f. mapping existing EBA projects in the three countries, lessons learned and management capacity on the ground

5. On-granting mechanism feasibility study to support the establishment of the Blue Impact Facility (Component 2)

   This component will deliver on-ground ecosystem-based adaptation and resilience building initiatives that conserve, restore and promote the sustainable management of priority ecosystems that are critical for enhancing resilience to climate change impacts. It will administer and support the delivery of small
to medium sized grants to Melanesian governments, communities, private sector and regional partners. The Melanesian Blue Impact Facility (M-BIF) grants will make available much needed resources to support actions at national, sub-national and community levels that support the overall objectives of the M-CMERP, and that also align with GCF investment priorities. The development and operation of the M-BIF will draw on IUCN’s existing granting capabilities, best-practice guidelines, and processes, based on IUCN’s and SPREP’s granting accreditation from the GCF.

Importantly the investment of M-BIF resources will be informed and delivered within the strengthened national ecosystem-based resilient development priorities, framework and capacity established through Component 1 of the Programme, determined by national priorities within a broader programme context. Initial grants are planned to utilise existing national ecosystem priorities and recognised no-regret investments. Then, as they are developed, the more comprehensive and longer time-frame ecosystem priorities identified through the processes outlined in Component 1 will inform M-BIF investments. The strengthened institutional and policy frameworks established in Component 1 will also support the sustainability and success of the projects the M-BIF invests in.

Research has shown that the most effective and high impact proposals often originate through community and nationally based organisations in response to calls for proposals. M-BIF grants will focus on supporting a range of community, non-government and government actors to deliver high impact actions that will provide clear climate change resilience benefits such as:

- restoring priority mangrove, sea grass, coral reef and marine ecosystems
- establishment or extension of protected or managed area systems (including community managed areas) as part of a climate resilience strategy
- implementation of natural resource management enforcement mechanisms
- building a cohort of expertise in resiliency across all the participating countries

This study must include, at least,

a. Desktop analysis and synthesis report summarizing on-granting mechanisms in the Pacific and beyond with lessons learned
b. Identification of mechanisms and build links to innovative and blended EbA finance options in the region
c. Draft BIF operations manual including operational guidelines and management structure
d. Assessment of capacity to absorb funding
e. Recommendations for initial BIF projects and grants
6. Draft Full Proposal document – following the template and guidance from GCF

IUCN recognises the workload and expertise required to successfully deliver the Funding Proposal document, which will require a number of different specialists and inputs.

The technical composition of the proposer’s Project Team and its balance of international and national / local experts are for the proposers to determine.
The following expertise is expected to be available between the experts comprising the proposer’s Consultant Project Team:

- Participatory project design
- Stakeholder engagement;
- Climate change impacts on tropical coastal ecosystems and communities
- Ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change impacts
- Scenario planning methodology for environmental and development change
- Granting mechanisms and/or blended finance for ecosystem projects
- Socio-economic and gender analysis and knowledge of social and environmental safeguards;
- Fluency in English (written and spoken)
- Senior members of the project team should have significant experience working in Melanesia. Members of the team will ideally be based inside the proposed Coronavirus Pacific Travel Bubble.

The Team Leader should be an expert in one or more of the above disciplines, with at least 15 years of professional expertise following a higher academic qualification (MSc or PhD), and 5 years of experience in multilateral-funded project design and/or implementation (GEF, GCF or similar).

Each other identified expert(s) should have at least 10 years of professional expertise following a suitable academic qualification (BSc or higher). It is anticipated the experts identified within the proposer’s proposed project team will each cover multiple disciplines in relation with the project.

Across the project team, at least one team member must have experience in GCF project design and/or implementation.

The project team will include a part-time local-liaison consultant in each of the focal countries.

Period of Consultancy

The consultancy is expected to start on 15 October 2020 and be completed by end of 30 November 2021. The submission of the feasibility studies and the Funding Proposal documentation to IUCN is expected to be completed by 1 November 2021.

Schedule of Payments

The detail of the financial proposal is to be submitted in the tables in Section 4. The required details include the daily or weekly rate of each member of the project team, the estimate of the number of days/weeks of input required, the unit costs of flights and estimate of the number of flights, and an estimate of the number of days of in-country with unit daily subsistence costs.

The following schedule of payments relates to the total fee estimate only:

- Contract signature: 40%
- Completion of first draft of Feasibility Studies and technical approval by IUCN: 40%
- Completion of Funding Proposal and initial technical approval by IUCN: 20%

Travel

The contract will require the Consultant team to travel to Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu as agreed with IUCN. The costs of travel should be included in the consultancy proposal. At least 2 consultation workshops are expected per country with at least one consultation with selected, representative set of local
communities per country. Consultations in each country should include national governments and representative local governments and communities. A full consultation strategy will be finalized at inception.

PART 3 – THE EVALUATION MODEL

The selection criteria will consist of a technical and financial component. A weighting will be provided to each component as follows: **Technical Weighting Factor 70%, Financial Weighting Factor 30%**, with the total score a combination of these two percentages.

The technical component involves an evaluation of the following four criteria based upon the information provided in the submitted proposal documentation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience in coastal climate change, ecosystem-based adaptation, and coastal natural resources management, and on-granting/financing and investments opportunities (including co-management approaches)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated experience in successful GCF and/or multinational funded project preparation (incl. socio-economic analysis, stakeholder engagement, gender and safeguards)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated in-depth experience with the Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, and/or Vanuatu</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and clarity of approach and methodology to the tasks as outlined in the project methodology, activity work plan and staffing work schedule</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only technical proposals achieving at least 70% of the maximum possible score for each criterion will be taken forward. Proposals scoring less than 70% will be discarded from the tender evaluation process.

Technical proposals scoring at least 70% of the maximum score in each technical criterion will be normalised by dividing their percentage by the highest-scoring technical proposal percentage, and converting this value into a percentage to give the Normalised Technical Score. Thus: highest technical score = X%; bid A’s technical score = Y%; bid A’s normalised technical score = (Y / X) * 100%

The financial evaluation will be based upon the full professional fee value submitted in the proposal, including expenses (travel & subsistence et al.) as defined by the proposer in their proposal. All proposal prices will then be normalised by dividing the lowest bid price value by that bid’s price value, and this value turned into a percentage (Financial Score). Thus: lowest bid value = USD X; bid A’s value = USD Y; bid A’s normalised financial score = (X / Y) * 100%

The Normalised Technical Score will be multiplied by the Technical Weighting Factor (70%), the Financial Score multiplied by the Financial Weighting Factor (30%) and the two weighted scores added together to provide a Final Weighted Score for each bid excluding those that achieve less than 70% on one or more Technical Criteria.

The contract will be awarded to the highest scoring bid, subject to the Proposal Conditions in Part 1 above.
PART 4 – INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY PROPOSERS

By participating in this RfP, Proposers are indicating their acceptance to be bound by the conditions set out in this RfP.

This Part details all the information Proposers are required to provide to IUCN. Submitted information will be used in the evaluation of Proposals. Proposers are discouraged from sending additional information, such as sales brochures, that are not specifically requested.

Each of the following must be submitted as a separate document, and will be evaluated separately.

4.1. Declaration

Please read and sign the Declaration in Annex 1 and include this in your proposal.

4.2. Technical information/Service Proposal

Proposers are required to submit the following details in their technical proposal:

i. Project Methodology – describing in adequate detail how the Consultant intends to undertake the project delivery, justifying the approach described (maximum of 4 pages);

ii. Project Team – identifying Team Leader and supporting experts;

iii. CVs of all project Team Members (maximum 2 pages per CV that highlights for each member their assigned tasks and work undertaken that best illustrates capability to handle the assigned tasks);

iv. Activity Work Plan – using weekly/monthly intervals for the activities and tasks identified in the Project Methodology;

v. Staffing Work Schedule – identifying days/weeks of input of staff identified in the Project Team, for the activities identified in the Activity Work Plan in the weeks/months they are estimated to occur;

vi. Evidence of similar projects undertaken within the last 5 years – where this experience is provided by sub-consultants this needs to be clearly identified as such;

vii. References – contact details of 3 referees familiar with the proposer’s experience relevant to the PPF.

These details should be linked to the 4 evaluation criteria listed in the above evaluation model (see Part 3 above)

4.3. Pricing information

The maximum budget available for this project is USD 350,000.

Prices include all costs

Submitted rates and prices are deemed to include all costs, insurances, taxes, fees, expenses, liabilities, obligations, risk and other things necessary for the performance of the Requirement. Any charge not stated in the Proposal as being additional, will not be allowed as a charge against any transaction under any resultant Contract.

Applicable Goods and Services Taxes

Proposal rates and prices shall be exclusive of Value Added Tax.

Currency of proposed rates and prices

Unless otherwise indicated, all rates and prices submitted by Proposers shall be in USD.

Rates and Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Description</th>
<th>Day/Week Rate</th>
<th>Total Input</th>
<th>Days/Weeks</th>
<th>Sub-Total Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IUCN will meet all costs of workshop venue hire, local stipends of delegates, catering, etc.

### 4.4. Non-price commercial information

Proposers are required to provide the following:

- Certificate of registration of company
- Evidence of taxation system the company is governed under
- Where sub-consultants are to be used, clearly identify the individuals involved by providing letters of intent or association signed by both parties; and
- Evidence of subconsultants being covered by the lead company professional insurances
- A copy of last year’s audited financial statements or equivalent
PART 5 – PROPOSED CONTRACT

Below is the proposed Contract for [name of project/requirement]. IUCN reserves the right to amend the proposed Contract prior to signature but, in submitting a Proposal, Proposers acknowledge that this is a standard IUCN contract template and will only be amended at IUCN’s discretion.

CONSULTANCY AGREEMENT
(the “Agreement”)

between

IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, an international organisation with headquarters located at Rue Mauverney 28, 1196 Gland, Switzerland operating in Fiji through its Oceania Regional Office with its offices at 5 Ma’afu Street, Suva, Fiji (hereafter “IUCN”).

and

[full legal name of other party], established under the laws of [name of country], with headquarters located at [address], [country] (hereafter “Consultant”)

IUCN and the Consultant shall be referred to herein individually as a “Party” and together as the “Parties”.

PREAMBLE

Whereas the mission of IUCN is to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable;

[OPTION 1] Whereas IUCN has received a donation from [name of the Donor] (hereafter the “Donor”) to implement the Project [insert the name] (the “Project”) and wishes to benefit from certain skills and abilities of the Consultant with the aim of providing IUCN with assistance and support in [describe the activities for which support is expected from Consultant].

[OPTION 2] Whereas IUCN wishes to obtain advisory and consulting services from the Consultant [for XXX or in the area of XXX] and the Consultant agrees to assist IUCN with such services under the terms and the conditions set forth in this Agreement.

Whereas the Consultant has represented to IUCN that it has the required expertise and experience;

Now therefore the Parties agree as follows:

1. SERVICES

1.1 The Consultant will [short description of the services], perform the tasks and deliver the deliverables no later than the agreed deadline(s) as set out in the terms of reference attached as Annex I (the “Services”).

1.2 The Consultant will assign [name of the person(s) and title(s)] (the “Key Personnel”) to the performance of the Services on behalf of Consultant. The replacement of any Key Personnel must be approved in advance by IUCN in writing.

1.3 IUCN reserves the right to request any reports (progress, financial or otherwise additional to those required under the Agreement), which could be considered to be reasonably required to evidence satisfactory performance under the Agreement.
1.4 The Consultant shall not subcontract the Services to third parties without the prior written consent of IUCN. However the Consultant may under its own responsibility use the services of others provided such services are of an auxiliary or clerical nature.

2. TERM

This Agreement comes into effect on [date] [or] [upon its signature by both Parties] (the “Effective Date”) and will expire on [date] (the “Expiration Date”).

3. INDEPENDENT STATUS

3.1 The employees, directors or shareholders of the Consultant shall not be entitled to any pension, bonus or other fringe benefits from IUCN.

3.2 The Consultant shall have no authority to enter into contracts or to incur any other legally binding commitment on behalf of IUCN.

3.3 No employee, director or other representative of the Consultant shall hold him or herself out or permit itself to be held out as having authority to do or say anything on behalf of or in the name of IUCN.

3.4 The Consultant shall be solely and exclusively liable for any and all taxes, levies or dues required to be paid in any of the countries where this Agreement applies, on any amounts paid to the Consultant by IUCN and has sole responsibility for declaring such amounts to the relevant tax authorities.

4. OBLIGATIONS

1.1 The Consultant shall carry out its duties in an expert and diligent manner and to the best of its ability and shall promptly and faithfully comply with all lawful and reasonable requests which may be made by the IUCN Contact Person.

1.2 The Consultant shall give written or oral advice or information regarding the execution of the Services as and when required by IUCN.

1.3 In the case of illness or accident or a case of Force Majeure as described under clause 14.3 preventing the Key Personnel from performing the Services, the Consultant shall promptly notify IUCN in writing of impediment.

5. REMUNERATION

5.1 As full remuneration for the Services performed under the terms of this Agreement, IUCN shall pay the Consultant a fixed and firm lump sum of [currency/amount in numbers (amount spelled out in letters)] (“the Remuneration”) based on [number of days] days of work at a daily rate of [daily rate] as follows:

5.1.1 A first instalment of [currency/amount in numbers (amount spelled out in letters)] corresponding to 30% of the Remuneration upon receipt of a signed copy of this Agreement together with a first invoice;

5.1.2 A second instalment of [currency/amount in numbers (amount spelled out in letters)] corresponding to 30% of the Remuneration [please indicate what task(s)/deliverable(s) will trigger payment]; and

5.1.3 A third and last instalment of [currency/amount in numbers (amount spelled out in letters)] corresponding to remaining 40% of the Remuneration upon satisfactory and timely completion and IUCN written acceptance of all Services as specified in Annex I.

5.2 If the tasks defined in the Agreement are not fulfilled to the satisfaction of IUCN within the requested time limit, IUCN reserves the right to withhold any further payments and recuperate any funds already paid for unfulfilled Services.

5.3 IUCN shall make payments to the Consultant’s bank account (to be opened in the name of the Consultant in the place where Consultant is established or where the Services are provided) as follows:
Complete Account name: [xxx]
Account type and currency: [xxx]
Bank name: [xxx]
Bank address: [xxx]
Account No.: [xxx]
SWIFT Code or other bank routing code: [xxx]
IBAN No: [xxx]

5.4 Funds that remain unused at the Expiration Date or termination date of this Agreement must be returned to IUCN within sixty (60) days following either of such dates, as applicable.

6. TRAVEL EXPENSES

6.1 Travel expenses in connection with this Agreement shall not exceed [currency/amount in numbers] [(currency and amount in words)]. All travel has to be approved by the IUCN Contact Person before any reservation is made.

6.2 The IUCN Travel Policy (June 2015) shall apply to all travel expenses and is available at [https://www.iucn.org/corporate/finance/procurement/iucn-travel-policy](https://www.iucn.org/corporate/finance/procurement/iucn-travel-policy).

6.3 A financial report with receipts (e.g. transportation, accommodation, meals and incidentals) must be submitted in the currency of the Agreement to the IUCN Contact Person in order for reimbursement to be made.

7. CONSULTANT’S WARRANTIES AND UNDERTAKINGS

7.1 The Consultant warrants that its performance of the Services under the terms of this Agreement will not infringe on the rights of any third party or cause the Consultant to be in breach of any obligation towards a third party.

7.2 The Consultant shall maintain at its sole expense liability and any other relevant insurance covering the performance of this Agreement. IUCN may require the Consultant to provide to a certificate of insurance evidencing such coverage.

7.3 The Consultant represents and warrants that no part of the Remuneration shall be provided to, or used to support, individuals and organizations associated with terrorism as identified on any sanction list published by the European Union, the United States Government, the United Nations Security Council or other relevant agency or body.

8. CONFIDENTIALITY

8.1 The Consultant will not disclose or use, at any time during or subsequent to this Agreement, any confidential information of IUCN or any other non-public information relating to the business, financial, technical or other affairs of IUCN except as required by IUCN in connection with the Consultant’s performance of this Agreement or as required by law. In particular, but without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, the Consultant shall keep confidential all Intellectual Property and know-how disclosed to him/her by IUCN, which becomes known to it during the period of this Agreement or which it develops or helps to develop in providing the Services to IUCN.

8.2 The Consultant shall:

8.2.1 not disclose to third parties without express prior written consent of IUCN the results of work performed as part of the provision of the Services;

8.2.2 disclose know-how and other confidential information of IUCN which is provided by IUCN to the Consultant for the purpose of carrying out the Services only to those persons necessary to accomplish the Services and only to the extent necessary for the proper performances of the Services.

8.3 The Consultant agrees to immediately notify IUCN in writing if it becomes aware of any disclosure in breach of the obligations of this clause 8. At the request of IUCN, the Consultant will take all steps necessary to prevent further disclosure.
9. PROPERTY OF RESULTS

All notes, memoranda, correspondence, records, documents and other tangible items made, by the Consultant in the course of providing the Services will be and remain at all times the property of IUCN. At any time, even after the termination of this Agreement, the Consultant shall, upon request, promptly deliver to IUCN all such tangible items which are in its possession or under its control and relate to IUCN, its business affairs and clients and/or the Services and Consultant may not make or retain copies.

10. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

10.1 Intellectual Property rights are any and all rights and prerogatives, registered or not, arising from the Swiss and international legislation on the protection of notably patents, design, trademark, as well as know-how and trade secrets.

10.2 All Intellectual Property rights conceived or made by the Consultant in the course of providing the Services will belong to IUCN and the Consultant hereby agrees to assign to IUCN or its nominee, with full title guarantee, all rights in and to any Intellectual Property resulting from the provision of the Services for the full duration of such rights, wherever in the world enforceable.

10.3 The Consultant confirms that IUCN shall have all rights of development, manufacture, promotion, distribution and exploitation in relation to the projects undertaken and products developed in the course of the provisions of the Services and the Intellectual Property created or arising from the provision of the Services.

11. LIABILITY

The Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold IUCN harmless from any and all losses and damages that IUCN may incur as a result of Consultant’s actions or omissions in rendering the Services or the breach of any of the Consultant’s obligations contained in this Agreement.

12. COMMUNICATION AND NOTICES

12.1 All correspondence and notices in connection with the implementation of this Agreement must be directed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IUCN Contact Person</th>
<th>Consultant Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[name]</td>
<td>[name]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[title]</td>
<td>[title]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[name of IUCN Programme/Office]</td>
<td>[address]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[phone]</td>
<td>[phone]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[email]</td>
<td>[email]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2 In case the Contact Person is being changed, the authorized representative of each Party shall notify the other Party in writing (email accepted).

13. FRAUD, CORRUPTION AND ETHICS

13.1 The Consultant shall comply with the terms of IUCN’s Code of Conduct and Professional Ethics for the Secretariat, available at http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/code_of_conduct_and_professional_ethics.pdf, which by signing this Agreement, the Consultant confirms it has reviewed and accepted.

13.2 The Consultant shall comply with the standards of conduct set forth in IUCN’s Anti-fraud Policy, available at http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/anti_fraud_policy.pdf, which by signing this Agreement, the Consultant confirms it has reviewed and accepted.
14. TERMINATION

14.1 Termination for cause

14.1.1 IUCN reserves the right to terminate this Agreement in whole or in part, upon written notice with immediate effect in the event that the Consultant:

i. has falsified or provided inaccurate, incomplete or misleading information in any documentation provided to IUCN;

ii. defaults in carrying out any of its obligations under this Agreement;

iii. has engaged in illegal acts, including, without limitation fraudulent or corrupt actions as defined in Code of Conduct and Professional Ethics for the Secretariat and IUCN's Anti-fraud Policy (hereafter referred to as a "Fraud");

iv. enters into liquidation or dissolution other than for the purpose of an amalgamation or reconstruction; or

v. ceases to carry on business, has a receiver or administrator appointed over all or any part of its assets or undertaking, enters into any composition or arrangement with its creditors or takes or suffers any similar action in consequence of a debt or other liability, or undergoes any process analogous to the foregoing in any jurisdiction throughout the world.

14.1.2 If it is determined that the Consultant has committed Fraud in competing for or in the performance of this Agreement, all expenditures incurred under this Agreement shall be undue and the Consultant shall promptly reimburse IUCN for all expenditures incurred in the performance of this Agreement.

14.2 Termination for lack of Donor funds

IUCN shall have the right to terminate this Agreement with immediate effect and without any liability for damages to the Consultant in case the agreement between IUCN and the Donor is terminated and/or the Remuneration funds become unavailable to IUCN.

14.3 Termination for force majeure

The performance of this Agreement by either Party is subject to acts of God, war, government regulations, disaster, strikes (excluding strikes of respective Parties’ personnel), civil disorders, curtailment of transportation facilities, or other emergencies making it illegal or impossible for either Party to perform its obligations. This Agreement may be terminated unilaterally without compensation for any one or more of the foregoing reasons by written notice from one Party to the other.

14.4 Effects of Termination

In the event of termination under this article, the Consultant shall within thirty (30) days of termination, and at IUCN’s request:

14.4.1 to the extent possible, complete the Services subject to the Remuneration made available until the date of termination and stop all ongoing activities;

14.4.2 refund to IUCN any advance payments received in excess of the total expenditure incurred as evidenced in the invoices submitted to IUCN;

14.4.3 reimburse IUCN for any expenditures made in breach of the terms of this Agreement and

14.4.4 submit final technical and financial reports and any other materials, deliverables, works or other outputs created as at the date of termination under this Agreement.

15. APPLICABLE LAW AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

15.1 The Parties to this Agreement shall make every effort to resolve through dialogue any disputes arising from the execution, interpretation and implementation of this Agreement.
Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Agreement, or the breach termination or invalidity thereof, shall be settled by arbitration in accordance with the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules as at present in force.

a. The number of arbitrators shall be one.

b. The place of arbitration shall be [insert town and country].

c. The language to be used in the arbitral proceedings shall be [English].

16. ANNEXES

16.1 All annexes form an integral part of this Agreement.

17. GENERAL PROVISIONS

17.1 This Agreement is the complete understanding between IUCN and the Consultant and replaces all other agreements and understandings in reference to the subject matter of this Agreement.

17.2 Any modification or amendment of this Agreement shall be in writing and shall become effective if and when signed by both Parties.

17.3 This Consultancy Agreement is non-exclusive. IUCN is free to consult other experts in the Consultant’s field of specialization.

17.4 This Agreement is personal to IUCN and the Consultant, and neither Party may sell, assign or transfer any duties, rights or interests created under this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other.

17.5 Either Party waives all and any rights of set-off against any payments due hereunder and agrees to pay all sums due hereunder regardless of any set-off or cross claim.

17.6 All provisions that logically ought to survive termination of this Agreement shall survive.

18. COUNTERSIGNING

18.1 This Agreement may be executed:

(a) in two or more counterparts all of which shall be deemed originals but which together constitute one and the same instrument;

(b) by facsimile or email copies signed by the parties provided that forthwith after transmission of the executed copy of this agreement such party will forward to the other the original executed copy for the purpose of forming counterparts referred to above.
In witness whereof, the undersigned, being duly authorized to do so, have executed this Agreement in the English language in two (2) originals.

IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

[full name of OTHER PARTY]

Date: __________________________ Date: __________________________

[Name of representative] [Name of representative]

[Position of representative] [Position of representative]

ANNEXES

[please list all annexes named in the agreement]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Means any contract or other legal commitment that results from this Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Means the entity that forms a Contract with IUCN for provision of the Requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions</td>
<td>Means the instructions and conditions set out in Part 1 of this Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>Means IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Contact</td>
<td>Means the person IUCN has nominated to be used exclusively for contact regarding this Request for Proposals and the Contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Means a written offer submitted in response to this Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposer</td>
<td>Means an entity that submits, or is invited to submit, a Proposal in response to this Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Means the supply to be made by the Contractor to IUCN in accordance with Part 2 of the RfP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RfP</td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept Note

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) is seeking high-quality projects or programmes.

The Accredited Entity is encouraged to submit a concept note, in consultation with the National Designated Authority, to present a project or programme idea and receive early feedback and recommendation.
The maximum number of pages should **not exceed 12 pages**, excluding annexes. Proposals exceeding the prescribed length will not be assessed within the indicative service standard time of 30 days.

As per the Information Disclosure Policy, the concept note, and additional documents provided to the Secretariat can be disclosed unless marked by the Accredited Entity(ies) (or NDAs) as confidential.

The relevant National Designated Authority(ies) will be informed by the Secretariat of the concept note upon receipt.

NDA can also submit the concept note directly with or without an identified accredited entity at this stage. In this case, they can leave blank the section related to the accredited entity. The Secretariat will inform the accredited entity(ies) nominated by the NDA, if any.

Accredited Entities and/or NDAs are encouraged to submit a Concept Note before making a request for Programme preparation support from the Programme Preparation Facility (PPF).

Further information on GCF concept note preparation can be found on GCF website [*Funding Programmes Fine Print*](#).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Programme / Programme Information (max. 1 page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1. Programme or Programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.3. Is the CN submitted in response to an RFP?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.5. Indicate the result areas for the Programme/Programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.6. Estimated mitigation impact (tCO2eq over lifespan)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.8. Indicative total Programme cost (GCF + co-finance)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.10. Mark the type of financial instrument</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A.11. Estimated duration of Programme/Programme: | a) disbursement period: 2021-2026  
   b) repayment period, if applicable: | A.12. Estimated Programme/Programme lifespan | 5 years (first phase) |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| A.13. Is funding from the Programme Preparation Facility requested? | Yes ☒ No ☐  
   Other support received ☒ If so, by who: USAID Climate Ready; Plan International | A.14. ESS category | ☐ A or I-1  
   ☒ B or I-2  
   ☐ C or I-3 |
| A.15. Is the CN aligned with your accreditation standard? | Yes ☒ No ☐  
   If no, specify the status of AMA negotiations and expected date of signing: | A.16. Has the CN been shared with the NDA? | Yes ☒ No ☐ |
| A.17. AMA signed (if submitted by AE) | Yes ☒ No ☐  
   If no, specify the status of AMA negotiations and expected date of signing: | A.18. Is the CN included in the Entity Work Programme? | Yes ☒ No ☐ |

Coastal and marine ecosystems and the services they provide are the basis for Pacific Island countries’ (PICs) climate resilience, livelihoods, economic growth and cultural identity. They are currently under threat from climate change and its interaction with other forms of environmental degradation. A paradigm shift is needed from ad-hoc, stand-alone change adaptation initiatives that often focus on single issue, hard infrastructure adaptation responses, towards a holistic, long-term and integrated ecosystem-based system of resilient development.

The objective of the **Melanesia Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Resilience Programme (M-CMERP)** is to “Enhance the resilience and adaptive capacity of Melanesian Pacific Island people to climate change by protecting, restoring and managing coastal and marine ecosystems and the services they provide”.

M-CMERP will provide resource, technical and capacity support to enable holistic, long-term, effective and efficient climate resilient development planning, decision making and investments through:

a) Prioritisation and integration of ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) in national planning and decision making, including long term (30-50 year) climate future climate impact and resilience scenarios and sharing information, best practices, and tools

b) Grants (Melanesia Blue Impact Facility) for EbA and resilient development investments

It will be underpinned programmatically by the regional *Framework for Enhancing Coastal Resilience*, with national on the ground actions and investments developed during the PPF, informed and driven by national level contexts and priorities.

Key project partners are IUCN (AE), SPREP (Executing Entity) and for each of the 3 participating countries, the national executing partners will be outlined in the separate country project proposals that emanate from the project preparation phase. Implementing and co-financing partners include the Pacific Community (SPC), USAID and PLAN International. Partnership discussions with other entities including National Development Banks and the World Bank Pro Blue multi donor trust fund, are currently under way or being planned.

---

### B. Programme / Programme details (max. 8 pages)

#### B.1. Context and Baseline (max. 2 pages)

**Climate change is threatening ecosystems which underpin community resilience for Pacific Islands:**

Over the last 100 years the global climate has warmed by approximately 0.74°C and is expected to rise a further 1.3 to 1.8°C by the end of the century. Corresponding with the rise in global temperatures are a host of changes in other climate and physical processes including changes in total and seasonal precipitation, altered ocean currents, and sea level rise. This projected rise is primarily in...
response to anthropogenic greenhouse warming. Across the Oceania Region, the average temperature is expected to rise by 0.80°C by 2030 relative to a 1980 to 1999 baseline. Corresponding with the rise in global and regional temperatures are changes in other climate and physical processes including more extreme rainfall days during the wet season and expected intensification of cyclones. In addition, the region can expect altered ocean currents and a rise in sea level of between 4 and 15 cm by 2030 and up to 0.7 m by the end of the century.

The people and ecosystems of Pacific Island countries (PICs) are highly vulnerable to these effects due to an inherently high exposure as well as a relatively low adaptive capacity. The projected future rise in the severity of climate change impacts will result in physical changes to coastal landforms, endangering coastal populations and infrastructure, as well as threatening many coastal and marine ecosystems. For example, the combination of sea level rise and ocean acidification presents a dire threat to the survival of coral reef ecosystems and the biophysical and socio-economic benefits that they provide, not just to coastal communities but to entire countries through fisheries, tourism and coastal protection. This could also worsen existing developmental and sustainability challenges, and, in some cases, even threaten the long-term inhabitation of entire islands. There is an urgent need to strengthen their adaptive capacity and improve their resilience to deal with these impacts.

Coastal and marine ecosystems and the services they provide are the basis for Pacific resilience in terms of livelihoods, economic growth, and cultural identity. Many inhabitants live in rural areas along island coasts where there is an abundance of protein-rich marine food and fertile lowlands suitable for agriculture or within small coastal cities and towns. The health of marine systems is vital to many subsistence and artisanal fishing communities, and is a primary source of livelihood and protein for a majority of the population living in coastal rural communities, and increasingly as a source of food for growing urban populations, which now average more than 50% of Pacific island populations. In the Pacific Islands the consumption of fish protein is almost 1.5 times the global average. As such, the fishery sector plays a critical role in the economic, social and cultural fabric of those communities. In 2010 the total economic value (TEV) of Pacific island coral reefs was estimated to be US$3.8 billion per year, including about US$1.3 billion contributed from indirect or non-use values. Similarly, the TEV of PICs mangrove forests were estimated to be worth US$3.9 billion annually. In 2014 coastal fisheries in Fiji were estimated at F$73 million of GDP and in 2011 shark watching tourism contributed US$42.2 million to the Fiji economy. By 2009 the value of whale watching to the economy of Tonga had risen to US$5 million per annum. Coastal ecosystems, particularly intertidal wetlands and reefs, also play a critical role in reducing the vulnerability of rural and urban coastal communities through their multiple roles in wave attenuation, sediment capture, vertical accretion, erosion reduction and the mitigation of storm surge and debris movement. Even under good management, coral cover is expected to decrease from the present-day maximum of 40% to 15-30% by 2035 and 10-20% by 2050, matching the rate of decline over the past 30 years as a consequence of climate change impacts. Changes to coral reefs and other fish habitats, and the direct effects of CO2 emissions on fish and invertebrates, are likely to reduce harvests from small-scale, coastal fisheries by up to 20 percent by 2050, and by up to 50 percent by 2100. A key strategy for mitigating fisheries losses due to climate change impacts is to ensure other threats to coral reefs are reduced to a minimum while simultaneously increasing the incentives for sustainable fishing so that over-fishing alongside coral reef decline does not completely destroy the fisheries sector. It is therefore essential to sustain healthy functioning coastal and marine ecosystems for as long as possible as a strategy for supporting the resilience of PICs in the face of increasing climate change impacts.

The Pacific Ocean is a vast area of 21 independent countries and territories spanning both poles and the coasts of Asia, North America, and South America. Within this vast basin the Pacific Island countries are made up of a diverse group of high islands, volcanic islands, atolls, reef islands and uplifted limestone islands. Marine and terrestrial species richness is generally considered to drop from global pinnacles in the western part of the Pacific to lower levels of richness but extremely high levels of endemism in the east. The largest landmasses are concentrated in the Melanesian countries of Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, and Fiji. The countries of the Pacific are often linked through shared cultural affinities, including reverence for the Pacific Ocean and marine species. Politically, the Pacific Island countries are part of several regional organisations lead by the Pacific Islands Forum. Through the Forum, the countries share resources of several agencies (known at the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP)) including the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the Pacific Community (SPC), Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and the University of the South Pacific (USP). The countries are frequently divided into three subregions that reflect their proximity, cultural affinities, biogeography and size of islands.

The CMERP will work within the 3 subregions of Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia on separate but similar and concurrent projects. These subregions are based primarily on ethnogeographic divisions linked to migration and settlement patterns by genetically distinct groups of people. While they all fall within the Central and Eastern Indo-Pacific biogeographic realms, they can be more finely grouped by marine biogeography into ecoregions that group coastal and marine areas in similar areas of marine biodiversity and ecoregions. These include 2 ecological provinces comprising Melanesia, 2 ecological provinces comprising Micronesia, and 4 provinces comprising Polynesia. Melanesia is characterized by higher species richness and has larger and higher islands than either Micronesia and Polynesia, although all three subregions have the full range of island types and all are characterised by high levels of species endemism.

The participating PICs, although their geographic scales differ, share many general and specific criteria that underpin their priority focus for the project:
At the instigation of the GCF, SPREP and IUCN engaged with PICs through the GCF regional dialogues, through other regional forums, and in numerous bilateral discussions, to develop the broad concept outlined here, an ambitious, regional, ecosystem-based adaptation approach to climate change adaptation, one that provides a paradigm shift from the existing piecemeal, sectoral, and largely ‘grey infrastructure’ focus in the region, to one that embeds an integrated, long-term, nature-based solutions approach.

**Investing in ecosystem resilience is a key climate change resilient development strategy:**

There is global recognition that healthy ecosystems help build societal resilience to climate change impacts. Healthy ecosystems deliver goods and services such as food, fuel, and clean water while also providing protection from a range of climate-related impacts, disasters and hazards. Ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation and resilient development have a focus on valuing, utilising, and maintaining ecosystems for their provisioning, protecting and regulating functions.

The participating Melanesian PICs all have significant coastal and marine resources and there is a general high-level of recognition in the region of the importance of EbA approaches. This is demonstrated by all participating countries having included EbA in their National Development Strategies, Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), Joint National Action Plans (JNAPs) and other sectoral policies. M-CMERP recognises these existing policies and programs and is focussed on complementing and enhancing these.

A summary of the policy context for each country is attached to this concept note.

In addition to strong policy frameworks at the national level the three participating countries have joined with the rest of the Pacific region to create a strong regional policy framework. The Forum Leaders Communiques, Framework for a Pacific Oceanscape, Regional Framework for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas 2014-2020, as well as sectoral policies such as the Regional Roadmap for Sustainable Pacific Fisheries and the New Song for Coastal Fisheries all recognise the role ecosystems play in climate change adaptation.

Most recently in 2016, following four years of extensive and inclusive engagement process with national and community stakeholders to regional and international level, the Pacific adopted the “Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (FRDP) 2017 -2030”. Under the FRDP, the incorporation of ecosystem-based services and functions in resilience building is one of ten key principles to guide the implementation of the strategy. Another key principle is to strengthen and develop partnerships across countries and territories. The M-CMERP is designed to help many of the priority activities of Goal 1 (Strengthened Integrated Adaptation and Risk Reduction to Enhance Resilience to Climate Change and Disasters).

Underpinning the approach to be taken by the M-CMERP is the “Pacific Islands Framework for Enhancing Coastal Resilience” (Attachment B to this concept note) which was endorsed by the 26 SPREP Member countries and territories as a key framework for building resilience to climate change in the region.

There are also a number of existing and emerging related initiatives, aimed at supporting ecosystem conservation and resilience in the participating PICs, including:

- **Pacific EU Marine Program (PEUMP)**, a €45 million investment in ecosystem and fisheries management, to support regional and national level activities (2018-2023)
- **Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change Project (PEBACC)** funded by the German International Climate Initiative integrating EbA into development, climate change adaptation and natural resource management policy and planning processes in Fiji, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. (2015-2020)
- **Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)**, empowering civil society to protect the East Melanesian biodiversity hotspots (2013-2021)
- **EU ACP Support Programme for ACP Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Coastal Countries, Pacific component**, focusing on coastal biodiversity conservation

M-CMERP will build upon, address gaps and integrate with these projects:

- **M-CMERP** will build on PEBACC work in Vanuatu and Solomon Islands (noting its finish in 2020), and will support additional countries to integrate EbA into climate adaptation policy and planning, and can provide funding support for EbA underpinned climate adaptation investments identified through PEBACC. Key lessons from the PEBACC in the Solomon Islands province of Choiseul with indicative examples of potential projects for the BIF can be found in Attachment 9.
Integrate with the PEUMP’s Key Result Area 5 on sustainable utilisation of the coastal and marine biodiversity, including its activities on coastal climate adaptation. It is noted that SPREP is the lead agency for this KRA of the PEUMP thus facilitating integration. Given that the PEUMP covers 15 countries across the Pacific and 6 KRAs, it is anticipated that there will be limited areas of direct overlap with the M-CMERP.

B.2. Programme / Programme description (max. 3 pages)

M-CMERP supports the overall vision of the FRDP as agreed by Pacific Islands Leaders in 2016: “We aspire for our Pacific People, our societies, economies, cultures and natural environment to be resilient to changing conditions and extreme events resulting from climate change, climate variability and geological processes, to enhance the well-being of our people and to promote their sustainable development”. To support this vision the objective of M-CMERP is to: Enhance the resilience and adaptive capacity of Melanesian people to climate change through Ecosystem-based Adaptation strategies to protect, restore and manage coastal and marine ecosystems and the services they provide.

M-CMERP provides a paradigm shift from ad-hoc, stand-alone adaptation initiatives that often focus on single-issue, hard infrastructure adaptation responses, towards a holistic, long-term and integrated ecosystem-based system of resilient development as articulated under the FRDP. M-CMERP will deliver resilience benefits both for ecosystems and the community livelihoods and national economies that depend on them, as well as providing mitigation co-benefits which will be monitored and reported where appropriate.

M-CMERP will be underpinned programmatically by the regional Pacific Islands Framework for Enhancing Coastal Resilience, with tailored design and delivery for participating PICs, informed and driven by national level contexts. These country specific, national investment profiles will be defined during the PPF process, addressing key priorities aligned with country work programmes and other broader strategic needs, to ensure they maximise the benefits through the GCF support. Regionally, countries will benefit from regional exchanges, peer-to-peer learning, and learning networks.

M-CMERP will also focus strongly on complementing and building on existing projects, initiatives and planning processes. and is based around three broad components:

**Component 1: National priorities and governance for ecosystem-based resilient development planning and decision making.**

This component will deliver integrated holistic, long-term consideration of ecosystems and their services into planning and decision making at national and local levels. It will help safeguard vulnerable ecosystems that provide climate resilience (as well as other non-climate specific services), and more fully utilise ecosystems for their resilience value. This component:

- supports the availability and use of information about ecosystems
- determines the current and future climate vulnerabilities and associated opportunities
- prioritises and designs ecosystem-based resilience and climate adaptation investments,
- strengthens the governance system that influences how ecosystems are used and managed

Component 1 will facilitate a transformation in each country away from fragmented and reactive approaches to climate change adaptation planning and decision making to integrated holistic and long-term strategic approaches. The existing approach tends to focus on individual sectors, development agendas and thematic responses separately. The M-CMERP approach will focus on comprehensive analytical frameworks and scenario planning, appropriate to the dimensions of predicted future climate change impacts in each country, with a focus on ensuring proper consideration and integration of ecosystem services. Component 1 will be guided by the principles and methodology set out in the Pacific Islands Framework for Enhancing Coastal Resilience, to be applied in a tailored way for each participating country. The resulting impact of Component 1 activities will be to i) support and catalyse future and widespread enhanced planning and decision making for resilient development, across all sectors and levels of government (including local and traditional resource owners), and ii) provide a framework for the identification and delivery of high impact investments to be financed via the Blue Impact Facility (Component 2.) Component 1 will ensure that national and local governments, as well as local communities, have ready access to tools and methodologies and data to support optimised ecosystem-based resilient development decisions.

**Outcome 1.1: Melanesian Governments and local communities have increased capacity to assess and map critical ecosystem services.** The foundation of ecosystem-based adaptation rests on understanding the ecosystems within a country and their value and utility to the communities that depend upon them. There is some (but limited) capacity within the participating countries to identify and describe the ecosystems that are critical to supporting resilient development. This outcome will support relevant agencies and communities to strengthen existing and develop new ecosystem information mapping and information management capacities with a focus on understanding the ecosystems that are critical to their resilient development pathways. *Outputs would include: a) natural resource / ecosystem values and dependency map* (and mapping capacity) for each partner country (and at sub-national levels where
Outcome 1.2: Melanesian governments and communities have increased capacity to assess ecological and social vulnerabilities and opportunities. Ecosystems and their services to communities provide value and utility that is not fully realised by resilient-development planners and decision makers. This outcome will help planners and decision makers to draw on available ecosystem and their resilient development value data and information (Outcome 1.1), when considering all aspects of resilient development policy, planning and implementation, and empower them to interpret that information to make the most appropriate and cost-effective resilient development decisions. Outputs may include producing (and provide training and other capacity building support to produce) ecosystem and community vulnerability and opportunity assessments, integrating improved data and information from Outcome 1.1, to help planners, decision makers, and communities to identify opportunities to protect and restore critical ecosystems and their services through the lens of climate change resilience. A second output will be the identified opportunities to help inform applications for investments under the Blue Impact Facility (Component 2).

Outcome 1.3: Melanesian Governments have increased capacity to evaluate future (30-50 year) climate resilience scenarios. The ability to assess the vulnerability of ecosystems and societies to climate change over the medium-long term (30-50 years) is a critical element in being able to prioritise and determine planning and development decisions. The future vulnerability of a system to climate change is also determined by the interaction of other social, economic, and cultural factors. This Outcome will support countries, at national, provincial and local levels, to develop their resilient development and planning capacity to take into account future climate scenarios, accommodating other social, economic, cultural factors and trends, thus optimising resilient planning options and resilient development pathways. Combined with other outputs and outcomes in Component 1, this will provide a basis for participating Melanesian stakeholders to make informed decisions about the planning and future use of their ecosystems, and the investment decisions associated with this. Key outputs will include: a) collated existing and new potential climate scenarios based on key drivers, including: extent and intensity of projected climate change impacts; predicted frequency of severe weather events and other natural disasters; accommodating social, economic and other pertinent trends, using participatory approaches and b) scenarios assessed, evaluated and integrated into national and sub-national planning options.

Outcome 1.4: Melanesian countries integrate ecosystem priorities into strategic planning and decision making for resilient development, including through strengthened national and sub-national policy, regulatory and legal frameworks. This Outcome will review, strengthen and harmonise the strategic planning and decision-making frameworks, including policy, regulatory and legal frameworks that support and bring effect to ecosystem management priorities and outcomes. Often, investments in ecosystem restoration, conservation and management are undercut by the regulatory settings across other sectors, or in neighbouring jurisdictions. Drawing from identified priority ecosystems and vulnerabilities (Outcomes 1.2-1.3) this Outcome will produce a) review of relevant legislative, regulatory and other policy settings which may undermine and/or can be strengthened to support ecosystem-based resilient development; b) the design and implementation of a medium-long term regulatory, policy, legislative reform programme designed in consultation with key government and non-government agencies at national and sub-national levels; and c) support for the integration of coastal and marine ecosystems within key national planning documents and decision making processes, including National Determined Contributions or similar complementary international policy frameworks to which countries are a party.

Outcome 1.5: Strengthened governance and institutional frameworks required to design and implement effective resilience and adaptive responses ecosystems. This Outcome will establish the broader governance and institutional settings required to support sustained uptake of Outcomes 1.1 to 1.4, as well as to provide a broader reaching strengthening and reform programme of support aimed at ensuring the vision, mandate and operational procedures of national, sub-national, and traditional bodies/institutions responsible for managing coastal and marine areas are strengthened. The outputs will include a) training, education and awareness programmes on climate change risk - understanding threats, options and responses designed and implemented with all relevant institutions and stakeholders. This will be directed towards key staff from government and non-government Institutions, observatories, local communities, and the private sector; b) development and delivery of decision support tools and methodologies with associated training to allow better decision making; c) implementation of organisational operations and procedures (internal governance) recommendations based on expert organisational review of key agencies.

Outcome 1.6: National Governments have ready access to tools and methodologies and data to support optimised ecosystem-based resilient development decisions. While there is increasing evidence for ecosystem-based adaptation and EbA Programmes are starting to proliferate, it remains site specific and there is still much to learn about how best to approach design and implementation. In part this is because of fragmented and incomplete data and information, and in part this is because of a lack of awareness of, and access to tools and methodologies for, planning and undertaking EbA. Outcome 3.1 will provide complimentary and coordinated...
support to promote consistency in approaches, will support the collation of existing sub-national and national level data to regional levels, and will support data collation at the regional level. This will provide benefits across the region, to better understand and integrate EbA into planning and decision making. It will also support south-south exchange, and the development of management and decision support tools and methods that can be adopted and used by all PICs to support on-going ecosystem-based approaches to resilient development. Outputs would include: a) technical support for the consolidation and further development of national and regionally based ecosystem database management systems; b) a selection of monitoring and research activities that further develop the underpinning scientific and technical evidence base needed to support ongoing decisions around ecosystem management for resilience and c) a programme of regional knowledge sharing, awareness raising, and coordination where possible tapping into existing regional platforms to help promote coherent and complimentary approaches (including technical and governance).

**Component 2: Grants - Melanesian Blue Impact Facility**

This component will deliver on-ground ecosystem-based adaptation and resiliency building initiatives that conserve, restore and promote the sustainable management of priority ecosystems that are critical for enhancing resilience to climate change impacts. It will administer and support the delivery of small to medium sized grants to Melanesian governments, communities, private sector and regional partners. The Melanesian Blue Impact Facility (M-BIF) grants will make available much needed resources to support actions at national, sub-national and community levels that support the overall objectives of the M-CMERP, and that also align with GCF investment priorities. The development and operation of the M-BIF will draw on IUCN’s existing granting capabilities, best-practice guidelines, and processes, based on IUCN’s and SPREP’s granting accreditation from the GCF.

Importantly the investment of M-BIF resources will be informed and delivered within the strengthened national ecosystem-based resilient development priorities, framework and capacity established through Component 1 of the Programme, determined by national priorities within a broader programme context. Initial grants are planned to utilise existing national ecosystem priorities and recognised no-regret investments. Then, as they are developed, the more comprehensive and longer time-frame ecosystem priorities identified through the processes outlined in Component 1 will inform M-BIF investments. The strengthened institutional and policy frameworks established in Component 1 will also support the sustainability and success of the projects the M-BIF invests in.

Research has shown that the most effective and high impact proposals often originate through community and nationally based organisations in response to calls for proposals. M-BIF grants will focus on supporting a range of community, non-government and government actors to deliver high impact actions that will provide clear climate change resilience benefits such as:

- restoring priority mangrove, sea grass, coral reef and marine ecosystems
- the establishment or extension of protected or managed area systems (including community managed areas) as part of a climate resiliency strategy
- the implementation of natural resource management enforcement mechanisms
- building a cohort of expertise in resiliency across all the participating countries.

The M-BIF will be designed and developed through the PPF process, and it is planned to incorporate the ability for co-contribution and investment from development partners, governments, international and national development banks and the private sector. The M-BIF will deliver the following outcomes:

**Outcome 2.1 Priority, coastal and marine ecosystems and ecosystem services are conserved, sustainably managed and restored in order to enhance the climate resilience of communities.** Specific objectives will be developed per country during the PPF process with expectations that they will include areas of key ecosystems managed or restored and measures of livelihoods strengthened to be climate proof. Investment and action, together with policy, is needed at local and multi-sectoral levels to deliver actions that conserve, protect and sustainably manage ecosystems to sustain livelihoods and provide adaptation options. Communities and local NGOs, particularly those focused on environmental management, often have a good understanding of local issues and the options to address the issues. The M-BIF will harness this local knowledge and mobilise the resources needed to undertake such actions. It will direct resources to areas, priorities and ecosystem types that have been identified (Component 1 and existing sources such as National Adaptation Plans and NBSAPs) as being particularly climate vulnerable and / or providing valuable climate resilience ecosystem services. Potential projects may include mangrove management and restoration, coral reef management and restoration, and beach vegetation management and restoration as well as livelihood projects that will reduce pressures on threatened ecosystem services or enhance ecosystem services. In some cases, invasive species are a major threat to ecosystems and biodiversity and may be the focus of the EbA project. Livelihood projects may include improved value chains for fisheries products that will ultimately reduce fishing pressures on coral reefs, or establishing women’s savings clubs that provide support for small-scale enterprises that diversify family incomes and reduce dependence on threatened ecosystems.

Key outputs of this Outcome will include: a) establishment of the M-BIF with rigorous administrative and delivery arrangements in place, with a regional model delivering investments to national projects, similar to the Action Component of the EU funded BIOPAMA programme. This will include all M-BIF specific call-for proposals templates with associated criteria, highly accessible submission processes; steering committee membership and ToRs established; all due diligence and probity assurance mechanisms in
Impact Potential: Given the dependency of PICs on coastal and marine ecosystems and their services, M-CMERP has the potential to provide a large, broad scale positive impact in terms of enhanced coastal ecosystem resilience and enhanced resilience of vulnerable coastal communities to climate change impacts. For example, an average of 27% of households in PICs derive their first or second income from coastal fisheries.

The specific number of beneficiaries will be calculated through the PPF, however it is expected that M-CMERP will support a significant percentage of the population within countries to increase their resilience. It is also anticipated that the majority of beneficiaries will be those most vulnerable to climate change, due to the typically higher dependency on natural resources of the lower income, rural and coastal dwelling, women, and subsistence-based populations. The impact potential of a coastal and marine EbA Programme relative to the population will also be dependent upon the size of the island in relation to the length of exposed coastline and the proportion of that country that resides within the coastal zone. For example, approximately 30% of the population of Papua New Guinea live within the coastal zone, this figure rises as the land masses of countries gets smaller. Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu all have many communities on living on small islands with little access to land-based resources. The impact potential is enormous by Pacific Island standards and will be monitored, evaluated and reported against core GCF (and other) indicators as part of the monitoring, evaluation and learning of M-CMERP. Key GCF impacts that the Programme will contribute and report against include:

- **Increased resilience of approximately 157,500 direct beneficiaries**
- **Increased resilience for over 2.7 million indirect beneficiaries**
- **Increased resilience over 805,000 ha of coastal and marine ecosystems services valued at $48,830,000**

While M-CMERP is focused on adaptation and resilience building, the design process will also ensure that where possible, the mitigation results will also be reported on as a co-benefit. It is envisaged that these mitigation results will increase as our capacity to monitor against them does. At present countries and donors are developing programmes that measure coastal “blue carbon”, including the potential to generate carbon offsets. The tools and policies supporting mitigation outcomes, including mapping, measurement, reporting and verification systems, will also support ecosystem management and broader outcomes. As these programmes come on line, there could also be an opportunity to look at establishing a carbon credit/offset type aggregation and trading function as part of the M-BIF at a later stage.
Paradigm shift potential: M-CMERP will support a shift in the paradigm from the delivery of ad-hoc, stand-alone adaptation initiatives that have often focussed on single issue, infrastructure adaptation responses, towards a holistic, long-term and integrated system of resilient development as articulated under the FRDP. This new paradigm will focus not only on a more holistic adaptation response, but also on the co-benefits of sustainably using and conserving ecosystems and the services they provide. In this context, M-CMERP will help drive systematic changes in the planning, policy, regulatory, legal and decision-making frameworks to support resilient development, creating an enabling environment across and within regional, national, and local scales. In doing so M-CMERP will catalyse future, and more effective EbA interventions through the establishment of the necessary enabling environment.

Implementing EbA is part of a paradigm shift from a disproportionate focus on high capital cost, hard infrastructure approaches for “on ground” coastal adaptation responses that dominate in the Pacific Islands and elsewhere. To date EbA responses and investment in ecosystem resilience are a very small fraction of climate investment, with an estimated <3% of adaptation finance in the Pacific Islands spent on ecosystem protection, and globally less than 4% of multilateral development banks (MDBs) adaptation funds are allocated to ecological resources. This is despite EbA approaches often having much lower costs than “hard engineering” coastal protection approaches, plus numerous co-benefits. There are several reasons for this including the relative newness of EbA, with a smaller evidence base and a not usual reticence to adopt new techniques. Another is the currently relatively dispersed nature and small financial scale of most EbA programmes. Whilst lower costs are an obvious benefit, in practice the small financial scale of EbA programmes often means that they are too small to be easily managed by large funding bodies such as MDBs, or are overlooked when large (financial) adaptation programmes are considered. For major donors it easier to issue a single contract for a $10 million sea wall or a large-scale drainage program, than it is for the financial equivalent of over 100 spatially dispersed mangrove planting, reef protection and restoration activities.

However, a key purpose of M-CMERP is to develop and demonstrate a model that is applicable across the Pacific Islands and elsewhere, and that demonstrates that EbA approaches and resilience focused development planning can be implemented at all appropriate spatial, social and cultural at national, sub-national and local scales. For this to happen it must be incorporated into longer term and larger financial scale climate change adaptation strategies, and achievement of NDCs. While there are already pilot programs and site work across the Pacific Islands, M-CMERP through the M-BIF has the potential to scale EbA to a level that will also change the paradigm for our vulnerable coastal communities. The innovative implementation design will also see ongoing injection of funding for adaptation and resilience building initiatives at appropriate scales.

The M-CMERP will have a strong focus on learning and sharing. A series of regional exchanges centred around the outputs of Component 1 and supported by a cohort of regional post-graduate students will create a learning environment and network among Pacific Island Countries that will provide a sustainable mechanism for moving forward with EbA planning after the M-CMERP.

Sustainable Development Potential: Coastal and marine ecosystem-based approaches provide great social, economic, and cultural co-benefits and represent a no-regret option for resilience building in the Pacific Islands, and also address a number of the Sustainable Development Goals. For example, it is expected M-CMERP will support: Economic growth and development through safeguarding tourism and natural resource industries and livelihoods (agriculture, aquaculture, forestry, and fisheries); Social sustainability through environmental education and training, as well as through provision of healthy local environments and sustainable livelihoods; Environmental sustainability by safeguarding the ecosystems and their services for present and future generations; Food security through better managed natural resources with science to support adaptive management; Countries to be able to collect data and report against the SDGs, and capacity development at the national, sub-national, and community levels to raise awareness of sustainable development approaches in support of coastal and marine resource resilience. For these reasons, M-CMERP has a large sustainable development potential.

Through the focus on supporting strengthened, integrated and strategic policy, planning, decision making and governance more broadly, M-CMERP will exit with governments at national, sub-national and community levels having established, and operating at greater capacity and coordination, the ongoing delivery of ecosystem resilience decision making and a foundation for longer term ecologically sustainable development planning. By incorporating a culture and gender-sensitive approach from the outset, M-CMERP will also help to avoid exacerbating social inequalities, and will contribute to a more climate resilient future for men and women in the participating countries.

EbA delivers multiple benefits by providing many other ecosystem services including direct benefits such as improved fish production. For example, restoring upland wetlands can reduce downstream flooding but also improve water quality and food security, as well as potentially improving recreation and tourism. The construction of hard infrastructure on the other hand often leads to a degradation of many of those environmental services. The restoration of mangrove forest in the Nam Dinh Province of Vietnam was estimated to cost US $166 per hectare, but the benefits included coastal shoreline protection and also co-benefits of timber and honey production and the maintenance of fish populations worth almost US $630 per hectare. These co-benefits also improve the resilience of communities to deal with climate change.
M-CMERP will also generate significant new data and information through the knowledge management component. Inherent in this is an opportunity to collect the type of social and economic data that could support the development and spread of sustainable business and investment models that have ecosystem resilience and the payment for ecosystem services at their core.

Needs of the beneficiary countries: The participating PICs are all highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and have a high level of climate risk. The World Risk Index 2016 index has Vanuatu as the most and Tonga as the second most vulnerable countries, with both the Solomon Islands and PNG in the top 10. In the Notre Dame Global Adaptation Index all are listed as having high vulnerability, with Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands being the seventh and eighteenth most vulnerable nations respectively. A range of geographic, economic and social factors leave limited resources for Melanesian countries to mitigate the hazards associated with this exposure and sensitivity. The participating PICs considered, and have negotiated for, the GCF to deliver grant-based support to help build resilience to the impacts that come with a changing climate, a change for which they bear negligible responsibility.

The participating countries have also chosen to engage in M-CMERP because they recognise their economic, livelihood and cultural futures rely on the continued health and function of their ecosystems. Climate change threatens to weaken, if not destroy, these ecosystems and the services they provide. As noted previously in this proposal, subsistence-based livelihood and natural resource-based economic growth are defining features of Melanesian countries, and targeted interventions to protect ecosystems from climate impacts are critical. In most instances the services provided by ecosystems are public goods, from which a range of private goods and services can be derived. Protection and management of such public goods is typically the responsibility of government, and without coordinated actions and interventions, such public goods run the risk of being neglected or overexploited. Melanesian countries have limited resources and capacity to respond to accelerating climate change and the complex range of impacts that come with it. Additional support is needed if Melanesia is to successfully safeguard its ecosystems.

Country ownership: All participating countries were engaged in the genesis of the concept, and have confirmed their willingness to be part of M-CMERP through their Nationally Designated Authority (NDA). They have a strong desire to implement EbA adaptation responses, as is demonstrated by the alignment of M-CMERP with the EbA focus of national and regional policies, plans and frameworks that the participating countries developed and agreed to. Through the PPF process countries will be engaged closely, including the engagement of civil society and the private sector as appropriate. The success of M-CMERP relies on strong country buy-in and ownership; as such this will be a key focus of the PPF process and ongoing implementation.

M-CMERP will tailor the design and delivery for participating PICs, informed and driven by national level contexts and priorities. It is planned that these country specific, national investment profiles will be developed during the PPF process. Through Component 1, participating PICs will have the opportunity to assume full ownership of activities as Executing Entities (depending on their preferences and capacity), which will help ensure activities are designed, managed and delivered locally. Through the M-BIF granting component, local stakeholders will be supported to bring forward locally conceived and owned Programmes, which will also place a heavy emphasis on localised goods and services.

Effectiveness and efficiency: EbA solutions are often highly cost-effective in relation to other types of adaptation responses, as they are often of lower cost and use the “free goods” provided by biodiversity and ecosystem services. For example, a global study of natural versus engineered hazard reduction in coastal zones showed that reef restoration programmes are always significantly cheaper than hard solutions in tropical environments. Hard engineering responses on the other hand are expensive to build and maintain, static in nature and either need to be overdesigned to cope with future sea level rise or will need to be replaced or modified as climatic conditions change. EbA approaches have also proven to be highly effective. Studies have found that mangroves significantly attenuate waves and suggest wave height can be reduced by 13 to 66% over a 100-meter-wide mangrove belt, while wave height can be reduced by 50 to 100% over a 500-meter-wide mangrove belt; coral reefs naturally protect coasts from erosion and flooding by attenuating wave energy and supplying and trapping sediment found on adjacent beaches. Recent meta-analyses show that coral reefs reduce wave energy by up to 97%. Coral reefs, if they are maintained in a healthy state, also generate massive amounts of carbonate as they grow and are generally expected to be able to keep pace with sea level, although this needs to be qualified in the context of the impacts of ocean acidification. The latter highlights the importance of managing and sustaining coral reefs and associated ecosystems as part of broad scale EbA implementation strategies to limit all impacts on reefs.

M-CMERP represents an efficient way to promote and proliferate the use of EbA in mainstream resilient development strategies because a) it will require relatively low cost interventions to establish the enabling environment and capacity for ongoing EbA, b) it can deliver finance directly to communities who can to utilise resources in the most appropriate and efficient way to deliver lasting benefits against their priorities; and c) it will utilise existing engagement, coordination and delivery platforms and networks made possible through working with SPREP as a longstanding regional agency and the IUCN Oceania office, which can bring in international experience in grant delivery.
C. Indicative financing / Cost information (max. 3 pages)

C.1. Financing by components (max ½ page)

Please provide an estimate of the total cost per component and disaggregate by source of financing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indicative cost (USD)</th>
<th>GCF financing</th>
<th>Co-financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1 (National prioritization and Governance)</td>
<td>24 M</td>
<td>19 M</td>
<td>NR Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2 (Grant Facility)</td>
<td>26 M</td>
<td>21 M</td>
<td>NR Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative total cost (USD)</strong></td>
<td>50 million</td>
<td>40 million</td>
<td>10 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.2. Justification of GCF funding request (max 1 page)

Despite the strong policy foundations and growing evidence demonstrating the immense co-benefits and cost efficiencies of EbA (including Community and Ecosystem-based approaches to Fisheries Management - CEAFM), there is still a relatively limited uptake of on ground EbA implementation in PICs, and no real attempt yet made to take these approaches to scale. Well-designed interventions can ensure that PIC coastal and marine ecosystems can contribute significantly, along-side other adaptation investments, to increased climate resilience, and can continue to provide livelihood, cultural and economic services.

CMERP aligns with the core GCF result area Ecosystems and Ecosystem Services. Further, regarding investment opportunities GCF notes that “EbA may offer flexible and cost-effective options to address risks that can also deliver co-benefits for mitigation, livelihood protection, and poverty alleviation” and that while “understanding of how EbA works is still evolving” and that “holistic investment in ecosystem services is complex … the majority of [EbA] Programmes should be high-yielding investments” and finally that “focusing upon coastal ecosystems like coral reefs may be particularly relevant in SIDS, where they are threatened”xviii.

Similar to the international trends in climate finance (see figure adjacent), there is little climate finance being allocated specifically to EbA. Of the finance approved by the GCF for the Pacific Islands there are no programs primarily addressing the adaptation results area “Ecosystems and Ecosystem Services”xix

The M-CMERP proposal is responsive to this priority and the absence to-date of coordinated and large scale investment in the natural environment as a basis of resilient development. IUCN and SPREP in partnership represent the leading global and regional environmental organizations respectively, and are well placed to work in partnership to support a coordinated, country owned and managed programme to scale up EbA for resilient development in the Pacific Islands.

GCF investment will be the much-needed catalyst to deliver a paradigm shift to a more holistic EbA and resilient development regime in PICs.

C.3. Sustainability and replicability of the Programme (exit strategy) (max. 1 page)
The GCF provides PICs with a unique opportunity to obtain the funding to create the large-scale adaptation financing that is vital to addressing the region’s very high vulnerability to climate change, which includes the high dependency of PIC economies on coastal and marine areas where climate change impacts will be very great. The involvement of GCF will enable a long-term, predictable baseline investment for the region to support sustained efforts to strengthen the governance and institutional frameworks required.

The appropriate capacity (through training and capacity building in M-CMERP) and flexible, locally driven finance for EbA programmes and actions at a range of scales, will be offered to restore ecosystems in a sustainable manner so they provide long-term benefit. A key element of M-CMERP will be reinforcing the planning capacities of the region by providing countries and decision makers with a range of scenario assessment methodologies to determine the most appropriate responses to both short and long-term effects of climate change.

Through the focus on supporting strengthened, integrated and strategic policy, planning, decision making and governance more broadly, M-CMERP can exit with participating PICs having established (at national, sub-national and community levels), and operating at a greater capacity and coordination, the ongoing delivery of ecosystem resilience decision making and a foundation for longer term ecologically sustainable development planning.

The M-CMERP investment will establish a flagship EbA Programme in the Pacific Islands, one that, through the regional purview and coordinating role of SPREP (and other Programme partners) and the global role and status of IUCN, will serve as a platform for attracting additional and on-going investments that contribute to the overall EbA objectives of the GCF. This includes, for example, strategic coordination with GEF investments and with on-going bilateral investments, opportunities for private sector and philanthropic investment through the M-BIF mechanism, and also the investments made by the participating countries themselves.

The initial proposal will be for a 5 year initiative (Phase 1) that will likely see a sequential approach to M-BIF grant access based on a) existing priorities and no-regret investments; and b) implementation of M-CMERP Components 1 and 2. To achieve this M-CMERP will provide targeted support to country stakeholders to identify opportunities and plans to access the M-BIF. Other (unprompted) applications will also be considered. It is envisaged that, pending evaluation of investment impact, IUCN and SPREP will seek opportunities to extend M-CMERP for a second Phase of 5 years. This will include a focus on identifying and attaining on-going financing of the M-BIF grants mechanism, and also opening up access and providing support to additional PICs. This may also include seeking further support from the GCF.

C.4 Engagement among the NDA, AE, and/or other relevant stakeholders in the country (max ½ page)

At the Pacific GCF structured dialogue in Suva in June 2016, PICs identified coastal and marine ecosystem resilience as a key priority to be taken forward in a coordinated manner, and as a region. This was reinforced and expanded at the 2017 dialogue in Tonga to include the need for multi-country, flexible and scalable, responsive climate finance. In response, two GCF AEs (SPREP and IUCN) committed to work with PICs and other partners to develop an innovative and high impact GCF multi-country Programme focused on building the resilience of Pacific Island coastal and marine ecosystems as a key strategy for long term and effective climate-resilient development.

To date engagement between the AEs and the NDAs has been based on:

- dialogue at the GCF Regional Pacific Meetings, including via bilateral meetings
- circulation of a Programme idea note for comment and input in March 2017
- circulation of an early draft Programme concept and PPF in May 2017 with follow-up bilateral teleconferences through June/July 2017
- Presentation of the concept at the 2017 Oceans Conference preparatory meeting in Fiji in May
- Presentation of the concept at the 2017 Ecosystem Based Adaptation Forum
- Presentation of the concept at the 2017 Direct Access Entities Workshop in Songdo
- Circulation of a first draft of the concept and PPF in August 2017
- Circulation of revised draft concept to NDAs (informed by two rounds of GCF written feedback plus formal discussions at the 2018 Direct Access Entities Workshop in Songdo)
- Endorsement of the revised draft concept by countries at the 2018 Pacific GCF Regional Dialogue in FSM (where Nauru and Palau expressed interest in joining the regional consortium, with NoLs to be confirmed)
- Discussions with GCF in July 2019 with decision to break the Pacific concept into 3 sub-regional concepts for Melanesia (M-CMERP), Polynesia (P-CMERP), and Micronesia (Mi-CMERP)

NDAs have been supported to ensure the consideration of the PPF and Concept through their structured appraisal and approval (no objection) processes. SPREP and IUCN have also been engaging other interested parties with a view to ensure integration and identify
areas of potential collaboration and co-financing. Discussions are ongoing with US Climate Ready, SPC, OXFAM, Plan International, ADB and others.

### D. Supporting documents submitted (OPTIONAL)

- ☒ Map indicating the location of the Programme/Programme
- ☒ Diagram of the theory of change
- ☐ Financial Model (to be developed via PPF)
- ☐ Pre-feasibility Study (to be developed via PPF)
- ☐ Evaluation Report of previous Programme (to be developed via PPF)

### Self-awareness check boxes

Are you aware that the full Funding Proposal and Annexes will require these documents? Yes ☒ No ☐
- Feasibility Study
- Environmental and social impact assessment or environmental and social management framework
- Stakeholder consultations at national and Programme level implementation including with indigenous people if relevant
- Gender assessment and action plan
- Operations and maintenance plan if relevant
- Loan or grant operation manual as appropriate
- Co-financing commitment letters

Are you aware that a funding proposal from an accredited entity without a signed AMA will be reviewed but not sent to the Board for consideration? Yes ☒ No ☐