



Integrated Agro-ecosystem Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Climate Resilience in Tuvalu

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10517

Countries

Tuvalu

Project Name

Integrated Agro-ecosystem Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Climate Resilience in Tuvalu

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

2/9/2022

Review completed by PM

4/19/2022

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/19/2022:

Cleared.

4/14/2022:

See follow up comment below:

-Under Project Information, as FAO will be co-executor of this project, please include FAO in the Executing partners list and correct the executing partner type from ?Government? to ?Other?.

-Please upload the Revised LOE and Major Amendment Request (that you shared with us by email on December 17th) to the portal.

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

19 April 2022

- Changes have been made in the portal and project document, as suggested
- The two documents have been uploaded in the portal

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/19/2022:

Cleared.

4/14/2022:

Please see follow up comments below.

Please include the expected outputs and outcome that will come out from the component M&E. In addition, since M&E is presented in its own separate component line, so please remove 'monitoring and evaluation' from the component 3 description or remove the separate M&E line and merge with the Component 3 all together.

4/5/2022:

Cleared.

3/18/2022:

Thank you for the details provided under the Core Indicator table. To ensure all of the information throughout the portal submission is aligned, as mentioned in the initial request, please disaggregate or ensure alignment of the core indicator numbers in Table B. At the moment Table B indicates 800 ha under SLM and 20 ha rehabilitated, while the Core Indicator Table indicates 150 ha of agricultural land restored and 650 ha of land under SLM.

2/18/2022:

-Yes, however please disaggregate the core indicator numbers as they are in the core indicator table with restoration and SLM indicators itemized separately.

Agency Response

19 April 2022

Adjustments have been made in the M&E component of Table B - Project Description Summary

3/31/2022

The indicator in Table B in the portal and prodoc have been revised and are now consistent with the core indicator table

3/15/2022:

The disaggregated core indicators are reflected in Table F and Core Indicator Worksheet (Annex G) as Indicator 3.1 - area of degraded agricultural lands restored; and Indicator 4.3 ? area of landscapes under SLM in production systems.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/25/2022:

Cleared.

4/22/2022:

Cofinancing Description: Please remove point b. from the Investment Mobilized description under the co-financing Table C. Please also add description for investment mobilized for LLEE of \$15,000:

4/19/2022:

Cleared.

4/14/2022:

Please make the following changes:

- FAO: the \$200,000 provided through the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) have been categorized as Grant ? Investment mobilized. By looking at a description of the TCP it would seem that it provides services, training and equipment, which would mean a change to In-Kind ? Recurrent expenditures. If this is indeed a cash contribution, please leave as is.

- MLGA: as per the co-financing letter please adjust the type of co-financing from in-kind to public investment.

- MPWIELMD: As per the co-financing letter it would seem that the this in-kind co-financing should be categorized as ?recurrent expenditures?

MFT: As per co-financing letter please request the agency to change the type of co-financing from in-kind to public investment.

LLEE ? Tuvalu: As per the co-financing table, please request the agency to correct, in the portal, from in-kind (recurrent expenditure) to Public Investment (Investment Mobilized) the \$15,000 and from in-kind (investment mobilized) to in-kind (recurrent expenditure) the remaining \$250,000

All co-financing categorized as Investment Mobilized should include a description on it was identified in the paragraph below Table C.

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

-The co-financing letter showing the contributions from the Ministry of Local Government and Agriculture (MLGA) and the Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructure, Environment, Labour, Meteorology and Disaster (MPWIELMD) show a mix of investment mobilized and recurrent expenditures. Please ensure this information aligns with what is in the portal.

-The co-financing letter from Live and Learn Environmental Education (LLEE-Tuvalu) indicates \$15,000 of recurring expenditure, however we don't see this reflected in the portal. Please clarify.

Agency Response

25 April 2022

Revisions have been made, as advised

19 April 2022

Thanks for the observation. Changes have been made, as suggested.

03/15/2022:

The information in the co-financing letters are now aligned with the information provided in the portal.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/19/2022:

Cleared.

4/14/2022:

Please see follow up comment below.

A ?National Project Coordinator? and a ?Coordinator-National? appear in the table. It seems to be the same expense charged twice in the budget, both the same amount (\$115,200). Please verify and remove one if indeed a duplicate.

4/8/2022:

Cleared.

4/6/2022:

Thank you for the additional information and revisions. However regarding the NPC we still note that a larger share of their tasks relate to project management functions. In addition as indicated in the GEF guidelines, the PMC charges are to be shared between GEF and co-financing. Noting that the project has investment mobilized financing available, please assign the NPC costs between the GEF portion and the co-financing portion of the PMC.

-Please also ensure all office equipment and other PMU expenses (non-expendable procurement) is also assigned to the PMU.

3/18/2022:

- We note a larger share of the NPC costs are associated with project components rather than PMC, however the functions listed in the TOR are mainly coordination and management tasks. Please clarify.

-Please see related comments on the Procurement Associate and Operations Support Officer in the coordination section.

-All other comments are cleared.

2/18/2022:

Not fully.

1. We understand that the level of capacity is a concern in the country and the project relies on technical assistance: however, half of the project (\$1.318 million / \$2.63 million) is devoted to consultants (\$0.4 million for international consultants and \$0.9 million for national or regional consultants). It might be acceptable if there is an effort to build on national and regional expertise, notably from regional and thematic organizations, but there is a question of value for money and sustainability. Please provide further details for clarification.

2. We note the inclusion of a Procurement Associate and Operations Officer in the budget, however we are unable to find the TORs for these positions and they do not seem to be mentioned in the Coordination section. Please provide TORs, clarify the need for these roles and to whom will they be reporting.

3. The costs for the National Project Coordinator and the Administration and Finance Officer should be assigned to the PMC and should be covered by a combination of GEF and co-financing.

4. In keeping with the GEF policies, project vehicles are not an eligible expense and should be covered by co-financing. In addition, no justification has been provided for the purchase of a motor vehicle. Please exclude this item from the budget.

5. Please clarify the line item Atomic Absorption.

Agency Response

19 April 2022

The full title of the 'Coordinator- National' pointed out in the review sheet is 'Coordinator- National Technical Support Programme' whose roles and responsibilities are different from the National Project Coordinator (see ToR)

7 April 2022

The Government's co-financing contribution to PMC is in-kind and will not be providing cash support to the PMU, including to the NPC in the form of provisions for entitlements afforded to public servants, such as housing.

To better reflect the share of NPC tasks on project management functions, the share of the NPC salary has been increased under PMC.

Office equipment for PMU is now assigned to DOA/MLGA as executing entity

03/31/2022:

The NPC's ToR has been amended to highlight more the tasks and technical support roles related to implementation of the components beyond coordination and management.

The Procurement Associate and Operations Support Officer will support the project for 6 and 2 months respectively, during the 4 years of project implementation. They will also support the government in strengthening the latter's procurement procedures and policies and harmonizing with FAO's policies, in line with the decision of the consultation held with the GEF OFP and the DOA/MLGA officials on 25 March 2022.

03/15/2022:

1. It is envisaged the regional technical agencies, in particular SPC, will provide technical advisory services through letters of agreement (LOAs) listed under Contracts in the project budget. The expertise of the international consultants envisaged to be hired for the project are crucial to meet the objectives of the project. None of these positions are full-time and the ToRs and deliverables of the consultants and the LoA will include capacity strengthening, including training of national partners and other stakeholders, to ensure sustainability of project interventions. As the 9 atolls (8 traditional Kaupule

jurisdictions) are scattered over a large ocean area, the cost of building capacity across all atolls is high, due to which a significant amount of the \$0.9 million for national Consultants is for the eight 8 Project Field Officers based on each of the atolls. To obtain the best value for money, the strategy is for regional organizations like SPC and international Consultants to build local technical capacity through training of trainers and of national institutions and agencies to then transfer the technical know-how to outer islands.

2. The Procurement Associate and Operations Support Officer will be engaged on a part-time basis for only 6 and 2 months respectively during the 4 year project period. They will be based in the FAO-SAP office in Samoa and report to the FAO Sub-Regional Coordinator. They will provide operational support services to support the PMU in its procurement processes, as requested by the GEF OFP and in accordance with the annual Work Plan & Budget and approved by the LTO. Their ToRs are now provided in the prodoc (Annex L)

3. A proportion, but not all, of the National Project Coordinator's costs is allocated to PMC, noting the NPC has important responsibilities in her/his ToR in coordinating implementation of project activities and in supervising the work of the Project Field Officers while undertaking a number of technical functions that contribute to different components of the project. The Administration and Finance Officer is now assigned to the PMC.

4. Project vehicle has been removed.

5. The line item Atomic Absorption Spectrometer is a Soil & Plant nutrient testing instrument, and the same is now mentioned in the budget. It is a much needed instrument for the National Technical Support Programme for LDN to expand capacity to collect data on soil and plants nutrient contents as datasets for local indicators of LDN and for monitoring health of agro-ecosystems. As explained in page 39 under Output 1.1.3, there is current capacity to carry out general soil tests using portable kits (Palintest kits) for in-field measuring of macro nutrients (soil pH, N/P/K), calcium, magnesium and conductivity. There is however no capacity in Tuvalu for testing nutrient content of plant materials and for wider range of soil nutrients.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/19/2022:

Cleared.

4/14/2022:

See follow up comment below.

Please ensure the GEF Core Indicators are explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework.

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

Not fully.

-Please provide details on how all of the indicators are being accounted. We note the information on CI 6, however CI 3, 4 and 11 are missing.

- Noting that Lifetime indirect GHG emissions mitigated are those attributable to the long-term outcomes of GEF activities that remove barriers, such as capacity building, innovation, and catalytic action for replication , it is not clear how this target will be delivered. Please indicate how the 122,008 emissions avoided (indirectly) are being accounted.

-We suggest double-checking the carbon indicators that include both avoided emissions from other sectors (6.2). It is unusual within the LDFA.

Agency Response

19 April 2022

The core indicators are mentioned in relevant parts of the Results Framework

3/15/2022

Details for CI 3, 4 and 11 have been added.

- The indirect GHG mitigation target for this project is estimated at 120,328 metric tons CO₂eq. Please refer to the separate EX-ACT file (indirect) uploaded in the Documents section of the Portal. This is based on the assumption that an additional 960 ha of agricultural land will benefit from the project's interventions that remove barriers, including capacity development and the national policies as well as Island Agro-ecosystem Action Plans. Total agricultural land in Tuvalu is 1,800 ha. 800 ha are included in the calculation of the direct targets, and an additional 120% (960 ha) in the indirect targets. In addition, 1,680 metric tons of CO₂eq of (indirect) avoided CH₄ over 16 yrs capitalization, not reflected in the EX-ACT calculation, has been included.
- The direct and indirect expected CO₂e emission avoided (6.2) have been revised to zero and instead added to 6.1 as these were estimates of avoided CH₄ emissions from improved management of livestock (piggeries) waste and was wrongly placed as a separate sector from Agriculture. The total emissions avoided (indirect) are now all from 6.1 and comprised of 1,680 metric tons of CO₂eq of avoided CH₄ over 16 yrs capitalization, and 120,328 from long-term outcomes of project activities that remove barriers, such as capacity development and the national policies as well as Island Agro-ecosystem Action Plans

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

Thank you including a comprehensive theory of change. The diagram is a bit difficult to understand without a key to indicate what the different colour boxes represent. It is also not clear if the barriers have been included in the ToC. It would be necessary to include these so that it is clear which barriers the project will be addressing, the specific outputs that will be addressing these barriers and the eventual expected outcomes. Please also include a list of assumptions.

Agency Response

3/15/2022

The TOC has been revised to respond more to the STAP reviews. In addition, the TOC diagram now has the Outputs specifically highlighted to show how they relate and are inter-linked in delivering the Outcomes, through the LDN Science-Policy interface. The assumptions and barriers have also been added for more clarity on the interlinkages in the causal pathway. The ToC text has also been edited to better describe the TOC.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

-There is mention of alignment with LD Objective 1-1, however this Objective has not been assigned any funding in Table A. Please clarify.

Agency Response

3/15/2022

LD -1.1 and LD -1.4 were combined as LD -1 and now disaggregated and assigned separate funding.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

-We expect the incremental reasoning to clearly show what is the current baseline and then the added value of the GEF investment. This can be presented as text or as a table. We note that some of the paragraphs indicate what will continue ?without the GEF investment?, but not all. Please include the others.

Agency Response

3/15/2022

More information has been added to elaborate on ?without the GEF investment?

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

-We note CCA 1 has been selected under the RIO Markers. Please expand on the expected adaptation benefits.

Agency Response

3/15/2022

The expected adaptation benefits have been elaborated in the relevant section in the portal and the prodoc (page 57)

It is envisaged that the range of interventions through integrated agro-ecosystems approach, such as agroforestry, sustainable land management and restoration, will address the drivers of land degradation, reduce pressure on natural resources leading to better flow of ecosystems services and sustainable livelihoods that enhance resilience to the increasing threats of climate change in Tuvalu.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

Not fully.

-We note and appreciate the stakeholder engagement plan and note that the customs and culture of the Tuvaluan communities are integrated in the project, acknowledging the traditional knowledge of the communities (notably the traditional land governance systems) associated to modern scientific knowledge.

-However we note that the private sector was not selected as a stakeholder that was consulted. Additionally, Tuvalu National Private Sector Organization (TNPSO) does not appear to have a role for project implementation. We see the value in their participation in particular as it relates Output 1.1.1 and Output 2.1.4 . Please clarify and consider this aspect.

Agency Response

3/15/2022

As noted in the prodoc (page 66), no individual Private Sector registered company was involved in the project consultations except the umbrella organization, TNPSO who

participated in all the three multi-stakeholder workshops, primarily because there are currently no export of agricultural products and therefore no formal agri-businesses active, except for informal local trades. The PPG consultations found very limited private sector activities in the food system, and there are currently no local fresh produce markets in any of the islands except for once a week outside the Friendship Garden demonstration farm in Funafuti. There are some limited 'gate sales' of some surplus vegetables. Some families make breadfruit chips, when in season, that they sell as snacks through the supermarkets.

As the national arm of the regional Pacific Island Private Sector Organization (PIPSO), mandated to provide technical support to private sector across the region, TNPSO provided useful interventions during the PPG consultations and will play a crucial role in training agri-businesses linked to the establishment of the Produce Market in Output 2.1.4 and in implementation of the 2021 National Food Systems Pathway.

The main focus of the National Food Systems Pathway is to facilitate support along the value chain to the small scale, including home-based enterprises. Consultations were carried out with the Business Unit of MoF responsible for coordinating implementation of the Pathway and will carry out secretarial roles to the FSS Pathway Steering Committee, to agree on synergistic implementation in the establishment of Fresh Produce Markets that will also sell processed food products, as envisaged in the FSS to stimulate private sector activities.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

See the comment above under the stakeholder section.

Agency Response

3/15/2022

The response is covered under stakeholder section

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/8/2022:

Cleared.

4/6/2022:

Thank you for the revisions to the IA/EA arrangements. This is accepted as an exception given the justification provided and the proposed plan for a phased approach to execution. We note that the government will have full control of the PSC and we recommend that governance at the national level is also retained in the PMU. Please make clear and revise the TORs for the National Project Coordinator and the Administrative and Finance Officer to state that these positions will report to National Project Director in close consultation with the FAO Sub-regional Coordinator for the Pacific Islands.

3/18/2022:

Thank you for the detailed response provided.

In our reading of the project budget, FAO will be managing approx. \$2M of the expenses with very little oversight left to the national government. This is a significant portion of the execution of the project, which was also not raised at PIF stage.

Rather than full execution of almost the entire project, please submit a solid plan for handing over many of the execution functions to the government agency over the course of the project. This should be reflected in the narrative under Item 6 (Institutional Coordination) of the CER and also in the budget.

2/18/2022:

Yes. However:

-We note the request for FAO to also play an executing role. Tuvalu being classified as an LDC and a SIDS is not sufficient justification for FAO playing a dual IA/EA role. We acknowledge and note the letter of endorsement from the OFP, however please provide a detailed justification for this request in particular as the GEF seeks to encourage national ownership and capacity building at the local level.

-Please also indicate whether or not a local NGO or regional based agency was explored as an alternative? If so, and if proven to be unsuitable, please provide details for this conclusion.

Agency Response

07 Apr 2022:

Thank you for the positive response on the implementation arrangements proposed.

The ToRs for the National Project Coordinator and the Administrative and Finance Officer have been revised to state that the positions will report to the National Project Director in close consultation with the FAO/SRC for the Pacific islands. This is provided in the Annex L of the project document.

03/31/2022:

After consultations with the GEF OFP and the DOA/MLGA officials on 25 March 2022, a phased approach is now proposed, with the intention of handing over most of the executing functions to the government counterpart, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Local Governance and Agriculture (DoA/MLGA), over the course of the project.

During the first 18 months of project implementation, FAO will be the main executing agency, with some executing functions by DOA/MLGA, under a standard Letter of Agreement. During this period, institutional capacity development activities will be carried out, keeping in mind the observations and findings of the Capacity Assessment, to enable DOA/MLGA to become the main executing agency for the rest of the project duration. The budget has been amended accordingly to reflect this arrangement. The respective amounts of the GEF grant in the budget to be managed by the DOA/MLGA and FAO are \$1,225,472 and \$1,414,254 respectively.

3/15/2022

FAO is in full agreement with GEF on the importance of encouraging national ownership and capacity building. At the same time, as the implementing agency of GEF, it is responsible for project oversight and due diligence.

During the project design phase, a micro capacity assessment (CA) was carried out by an external auditor to provide an overall assessment of MLGA's programme, financial and operations management policies, procedures, systems and internal controls. The CA included:

? A review of the operational partner's legal status, governance structures and financial viability; programme management, organisational structure and staffing,

accounting policies and procedures, fixed assets and inventory, financial reporting and monitoring, and procurement;

? A focus on compliance with policies, procedures, regulations and institutional arrangements that are issued both by the Government and the operational partner.

The CA Report however, was not finalised by the time of submission of the project document for CEO endorsement because of delays in responses to the findings from the Government of Tuvalu, primarily due to limited capacity to respond to the information requirements of the CA methodology. The GEF/OFP letter requesting FAO to provide operational support services was partly informed by the experience in responding and following the mini CA preliminary findings, which are:

1. Insufficient evidence that governing body is fully effective
2. Inadequate evidence of oversight and monitoring controls with respect to management of downstream partners
3. Weaknesses in financial statements presented for inspection
4. Insufficient risk management arrangements
5. Weaknesses in monitoring and evaluation process
6. Failure to demonstrate follow up on recommendations to independent evaluations
7. Job descriptions not evidenced
8. Lack of cost allocation methodology
9. Absence of codified procedure for maintenance of documents
10. Lack of evidence of reconciliations being performed of the general and subsidiary ledgers
11. Lack of evidence of appropriate segregation of duties
12. Weaknesses in budget management
13. Weaknesses in invoice processing procedures
14. Weaknesses surrounding cash and bank management
15. Weaknesses in management of fixed assets and inventory
16. Weaknesses in procurement procedures

There is no local NGO with capacity to be the executing partner. For example, the most effective local NGO in the country, Live&Learn Tuvalu, has only 3 full time staff. Its administration and project management services are provided by its parent organization Live&Learn international.

The Government has experience participating in regional GEF projects executed by regional organizations like SPREP and SPC, including the regional R2R project. Potential for engaging these regional agencies was discussed with the government. However, the latter was not in favour of SPREP or SPC being the executing partner for its national project as they charge 10% administration fees as executing partners, as this was not good value for money.

SPC will however execute some of the project activities and provide technical advisory services through LoA, including the NTSP for LDN, as indicated in page 87 of the

prodoc (6.b Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.)

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

Not fully.

-Please indicate any alignment with existing national climate change plans or the NDC.

Agency Response

3/15/2022

The project designers liaised with the NDC Hub Focal Point at the Ministry of Finance on linkages and potential contributions the project can provide to the NDC roadmap and investment plan. It was noted that the Tuvalu NDC roadmap and implementation plan have been developed and finalised and places focus on transport and energy efficiency sectors. The NDC Focal Point however recognise the need to incorporate agriculture, including avoided emissions from livestock through better management of waste and introducing appropriate technologies to utilise those waste as resources. It was decided to address this gap in the roadmap during the inception phase.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

Not fully.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/19/2022:

Cleared.

4/14/2022:

Please see follow up comment below.

Annex B, Responses to Project Reviews, is missing a comment from Colette O'Neill (UK). Please check the Stakeholder Comments tab for the UK Comment and provide a response.

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

19 April 2022

Thanks for the observation. Response to the comment from the UK has been provided.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/18/2022:

Cleared.

2/18/2022:

Please review the STAP assessment and respond to a few outstanding comments. https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/web-documents/10517_LD_STAP_screen.pdf

Agency Response

3/15/2022

The additional STAP comments have been added with response.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/18/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2022:

Additional comment on co-financing to be addressed.

4/19/2022:

All comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

4/14/2022:

Please address the follow up comments prior to CEO Endorsement.

4/8/2022:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

4/6/2022:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

3/18/2022:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

3/16/2022:

Not at this time. Please address the follow up comments in the review sheet.

2/18/2022:

Not at this time. Please address the comments in the review sheet.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/18/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/18/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/6/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/8/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations