

Securing Kiribati's Natural Heritage: Protected areas for community, atoll, and island climate resilience (Securing Kiribati)

Basic Information

GEF ID

10775

Countries

Kiribati

Project Title

Securing Kiribati's Natural Heritage: Protected areas for community, atoll, and island climate resilience (Securing Kiribati)

GEF Agency(ies)

IUCN

Agency ID

IUCN: P03760

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/26/2021

Yes.

4/22/2021

No, please include the co-financing amount for BD 2-6 in the Portal.

4/6/2021

No, please address the following:

- Please make sure each area is picked once in the Portal.
- Invasive species – The GEF has a particular approach to IAS that should include some effort at prevention. We set a high bar for supporting eradication as outlined in the GEF-7 strategy. The island has been identified as a high priority but had a failed attempt at eradication. Please provide information about how this project will be different, partners engaged, species that will be benefit, and cite the paper prioritizing it globally (Holmes et al 2019 or others).

CCA. 3/30/2021:

(a) In the 'Project information' section of the PIF, please change Rio Marker for Climate Change Adaptation to a value of "2".

(b) As laid out in the GEF's Adaptation Strategy for 2018-2022, objective CCA-3 can only be applied if the project is supporting the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process. If this is the case, kindly make this explicit in the PIF and excel metadata file. Otherwise, please select an appropriate CCA objective.

Agency Response

IUCN 22 April 2021

- Focal area elements have been fixed in portal
- Invasive species Output has been amended to include prevention (biosecurity) and further justification of the global importance of Enderbury and changes in methods.

(a) Complete

(b) Complete – CCA3 has been removed.

4/26/2021

Complete

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/26/2021

7/20/2021

Yes.

4/22/2021

No, Table B is still incorrectly entered in the Portal with each subcomponent getting a separate entry when they should be all together under each component. Please see other MTFs for a model on how to do this.

c. It would be good to include predicted changes from climate change as part of what the ocean plan will be addressing and include this in the text.

d. This has not been fixed in Table B.

e. This is not in Table B in the Portal. M&E and gender still are missing. As these are important and need to be budgeted for, we prefer to see them in Table B.

h. We don't see where the SMART indicators were added. These typically should be in Table B. We understand that they may be modified as the project is developed.

i. Please fix the issues in the Portal.

4/2/2021

No, please address the following:

CCA, 3/30/2021: Adjustments are requested.

(a) We expect at least 50 percent of the LDCF grant request to support on-the-ground adaptation Investments. At the moment it has all been allocated to Technical Assistance. Please revise.

(b) If any aspects of knowledge management and awareness-raising will also occur for the PA related components of the project, please assign some of the GEFTF grant to Component 4 (currently it is only mapped to LDCF).

(c) Please also consider mainstreaming climate change adaptation and EBA in relevant policies affecting the outer islands.

(d) 1.1.2 – This appears to be missing a word – developed? Drafted?

e. We typically see gender, KM and M&E included as a last component. They are missing from Table B and, therefore the budget. The costs can be split percentagewise between LDCF and GEFTF funds.

f. Logically, adaptation should be included in the work of component 1 as well such as in the National Ocean Policy and environmental

policy review (e.g. identifying and eliminating perverse incentives for activities that reduce adaptive capacity). The idea is not to have these be two separate lines of work.

g. Will the policy be revised or developed? It seems like this should have been decided.

h. Please include SMART indicators for the BD activities.

i. Please put each component only once with the various outputs and outcomes with it in the Portal.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

- (a) Component 2 and 3 have been classified as Investment
- (b) This has been addressed.
- (c) This has been addressed in the budget and narrative for Component 1.
- (d) Fixed.
- (e) Done
- (f) We have included adaptation in Output 1.1.1 and discussion in Output 1.1.2.
- (g) Clarification has been added.
- (h) Added, further indicators to be added during PPG phase and the full results framework.
- (i) Done

Table B has been amended.

C: Please see response below in Question 3.

D: It now reads: Output 1.1.2: Kiribati Integrated National Ocean Policy developed

E. We have added a KM and M&E output to Component 4. Gender will be incorporated throughout all 4 components and indicators have been set to account for this. It will also be a key part of the ESMS plan.

H. Indicators have been reflected in the Outcomes section. Apologies for overlooking them in the previous submission.

Components have been put once for BD and LDCF each.

4/26/2021

Table B has been amended.

C: Please see response below in Question 3.

D: It now reads: Output 1.1.2: Kiribati Integrated National Ocean Policy developed

E. We have added a KM and M&E output to Component 4. Gender will be incorporated throughout all 4 components and indicators have been set to account for this. It will also be a key part of the ESMS plan.

H. Indicators have been reflected in the Outcomes section. Apologies for overlooking them in the previous submission.

Components have been put once for BD and LDCF each.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at FII / WORK Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/2/2021

No, for cofinancing if it's a GEF Agency it should be IUCN if the money is coming through IUCN. It can note that it is coming from a particular source. EU funding should be classified as donor agency.

CCA, 3/30/2021:

- (a) Cofinance that has been labeled as "in-kind" cannot be categorized as "investment mobilized". Please correct this.
- (b) We expect at least some cofinance to be actual investment mobilized – and not only in-kind – for a project grant of this size.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

We have changed the source of co-financing to indicate the agency (IUCN) and the source.

- (a) This has been corrected.
- (b) Grants have been included as investment mobilized. We expect to have more co-financing by CEO Endorsement. IUCN cofinancing has been corrected to list as Grant and Investment mobilized.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/2/2021

No, please revise the entries in the Portal so there is one entry per programming direction line. Adjustment is needed.

The full STAR amount for Kiribati is \$6,135,653.23. The OFP LoE and PIF request is for \$6,100,000, i.e., there is a \$35,653.23 balance left for the country. Please submit a revised LoE to include this amount.

The total financing of the project is \$9,954,338 USD x 0.09 (IUCN) = \$ 895,890 USD. The fee appears to be calculated with a 9.5% ratio. Please calculate the fee at 9%. Same comment applies to the PPG.

CCA, 3/30/2021: LDCF total for Table D and Table E should add up to \$5 million, which they currently do not.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

Thank you. This has been addressed.

Thank you. This has been addressed.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes. Thank you for the adjustment to ensure that Kiribati uses all of its available STAR resources.

Yes. Thank you for the adjustment to ensure that Kiribati uses all of its available STAR resources.

4/6/2021

Yes. However, the full STAR amount for Kiribati is \$6,135,653.23. The OFP LoE and PIF request is for \$6,100,000, i.e., there is a \$35,653.23 balance left for the country.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes. Kiribati is fully flexible.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

No.

IND.

CCA, 3/30/2021: LDCF total for Table D and Table E should add up to \$5 million, which they currently do not.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Agency response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/6/2021

No.

CCA, 3/30/2021: LDCF total for Table D and Table E should add up to \$5 million, which they currently do not.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

Thank you. This has been addressed.

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines?

(GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes. Thank you for the revisions.

4/2/2021

No, please verify that the numbers have been entered correctly as the Portal does not match other documents provided. There may be a missing zero or two.

CCA, 3/30/2021: No. the excel file with (a) metadata and (b) core indicator information for the LDCF has not been submitted. Please ensure when submitting that the core indicators are distinct for the two funds (GEFTF and LDCF, for example, please avoid double-counting of direct beneficiaries unless justification is provided.)

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

This has been corrected. Thank you.

Thank you. The template has been completed and uploaded to the portal. I did not find a place in the portal to upload the LDCF figures.

The beneficiaries of the project will be the entire populations of the 5 islands. These represent 7% of the Kiribati population and 23% of the Outer Island population. We feel that the entire population of the island will benefit equally from the BD and LDCF funds and therefore have included them in both core indicator sheets.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes, thank you for the edits. At CEO Endorsement, it would be good to reflect how traditional knowledge is being included.

4/6/2021

No, while we appreciate that these has remained succinct the barriers section is not clear. It is good to mention some barriers that the project may not be able to or is not addressing, but it is unclear what are the barriers that the project interventions will be addressing. The Word document uses formatting to help clarify, but this is not in the Portal.

In some cases the language is confusing, such as the description of “linking sustainable land management...” It’s unclear whether this is in understanding or practice. Also “limited recognition of the role of ecosystem-based...” needs to be clarified. Will it only build awareness or actually demonstrate?

It is exciting and interesting to see discussion about the importance of traditional knowledge being used in the project; however, that seems

it is exciting and interesting to see discussion about the importance of traditional knowledge being used in the project, however, that seems to be missing from the actual project components.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

Thank you. The barriers section has been reformatted and edited to be clearer on the role of the project in addressing the barriers.

Apologies for the lack of clarity. We hope that the edits have made it easier to understand.

We have tried to make mention of traditional knowledge and practices in all components. This will be elaborated upon in the final ProDoc as it is a high priority for the project and the Kiribati government.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/2/2021

No, please address the following:

- Given the expense and resources needed to visit outer islands and the fact that the projects should be being implemented by the same ministries and people in government, it will be important for GEF6 and GEF7 projects to not just coordinate on lessons learned but really be a seamless project together that most beneficiaries couldn't tell apart. This will help be efficient and effective.

CCA, 3/30/2021: Further information is requested:

Impacts of climate change have been discussed in general terms in the PIF but there is little discussion on the constraints faced by the outer island communities and how, specifically, these will be added to or exacerbated by climate change. Please provide specifics on the vulnerability of the communities. How is climate change and increased variability likely to affect them? Who among them are the most vulnerable? Are women and men vulnerable in different ways? Which parts of the islands are more exposed to flooding and/or storms – do communities live there are of so, how can their resilience be enhanced?

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

Thank you and agreed. We have had several conversations since December 2020 with UNDP about this project and look forward to more coordination and cooperation with them during the PPG and implementation.

Thank you. More detail and precision has been added to the narrative.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/26/2021

Yes. During PPG, it will be important to make sure it is explicit that the plan will include information about predicted climate change impacts and responses.

4/22/2021

No, thank you for the helpful revisions, but there are still some issues that remain.

1.1.2 - Please discuss how the project will support providing information on anticipated changes resulting from climate change as well as planning the responses to them. As you do this, it would be good to note that this work will benefit the whole country in terms of adaptation even if they won't be counted in the beneficiaries numbers.

2.1.2 - Please review and edit the Monitoring... section as some words may be missing. It would likely be good to focus on a variety of equipment that there is potential need for including developing a plan for financing and maintaining them. Is the idea to design a monitoring and enforcement program for PIPA?

4/6/2021

No, please address the following:

- Connection to broader supply chains for fisheries – page 15 seems to imply that one of the goals of this project will be to connect the outer islands with larger commercial fisheries value chains. It's hard to see how this will be good for biodiversity. Is the project doing this? How will the project ensure that this does not lead to unsustainable fishing practices?
- In general, the description of the outputs and outcomes would benefit from a strong edit to remove content that fits better in other sections as well as clarify the types of activities anticipated under each thing. Bullets and other formatting can help to keep things concise while making sure that the point is being communicated.
- Given the size of 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 in terms of resources, more detail would be expected as to the types of activities that will be undertaken.

Components:

1.1.1 – It is good to incorporate traditional practices of environmental governance. However, are all these practices the same across the different islands? Is the project going to find ways to support different methods of governance?

2.1.1 – Will there be adaptation considerations in this work? How will the protected areas be designed? What will be the relationship with the activities in component 3? What types of activities will actually be done in this output?

- As it feels a bit muddled, it is worth noting that there is no one definition of protected area or sustainable use area that the GEF requires of projects. The objective is the protection of globally significant biodiversity and to support activities that will achieve that efficiently and effectively.

2.1.2 – It would also help to clarify what is envisioned for this work. As an example of editing: sentence 1 is intro; sentence 3 is actually describing 2.1.3; and the second half of sentence 4 is background. What activities are envisioned?

2.1.3 – Previous efforts to identify funding mechanism for the CTF have come up short. How will this project be different in its approach to raise funds?

- Given the significant distances to the outer islands, it seems likely that the only effective approach to PAs will be community-based which also will hopefully be low cost once established.

2.1.4 – The resources for this also appear rather high. It would likely be good to change the name of the output as it is doing more than just establishing the network. At CEO Endorsement, please include how this will be managed and supported at project end.

3.1 – It seems that this would be an opportunity to mainstream biodiversity and avoid siloed thinking.

CCA, 3/30/2021: Further information is requested:

(a) The primary focus of LDCF is to enhance the climate resilience of vulnerable communities. In some cases it seems various “adaptation” measures have been proposed without specifying which impacts of climate change people would be adapting to. We understand that incomes and sustenance will be diversified – though in part this seems to be proposed in response to negative effects of kopra production (rather than to climate change impacts).

(b) An LDCF grant of this size would normally be delivering a broader suite of climate change adaptation investments to an order of magnitude larger number of direct beneficiaries. Given that the populations on these islands are small, are there additional needed adaptation measures that the project can support, to generate greater impact from the LDCF grant?

By CEO Endorsement: please demonstrate that (i) the proposed NBS measures will reduce vulnerability of communities to climate change; and that (ii) the various adaptation measures that will be implemented are scientifically sound, given projected climate change impacts.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

The supply chain here will focus on sea cucumber and seaweed which are more robust and less perishable. These products can have a beneficial effect on ecosystems and biodiversity. This has been added to page 19.

Formatting has been added to aid. Thank you.

Thank you. We have added more details to both section and hope that they are clearer.

1.1.1. These will be applied primarily at community level in Components 2 and 3. However, there is a need to recognize them in the relevant legislation which is not currently the case in the environment act. Overall, the systems are similar throughout the Gilbert Islands chain with minimal differences between the islands.

2.1.1 We have added more details to this output narrative. The PAs will be part of the plans developed in 3.1.1. and the ecosystem and community resilience and adaptation components should be integrated.

2.1.2. Thank you. Revised.

2.1.3. This has been revised. Thank you.

2.1.4. Name changed and budget reduced slightly.

3.1. Agreed and this has been added.

CCA – We have attempted to make the arguments here clearer and more precise. Thank you.

26 April 2021

1.1.2. We have added some discussion on climate change information in the revised policies (1.1.1) and the National Ocean Policy section. This includes, “A National Ocean Policy will build on a marine spatial plan and help to coordinate ocean management, including for biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, and climate change adaptation, across multiple ministries and jurisdictions. The ocean is Kiribati’s greatest natural asset and the vehicle for most climate change impacts. A National Ocean Policy that harmonizes activities across Kiribati’s marine space, especially in the Gilbert Islands chain, will increase efficiencies for planning coastal and marine activities, monitoring of marine resources, and enforcement. The National Ocean Policy will break down silos between ministries. This will benefit all of the communities across Kiribati. The National Ocean Policy will help Kiribati to respond to climate change impacts of sea-level rise, coral bleaching, and ocean acidification by ensuring that all ministries are coordinated on their approach to ocean management, ecosystem-based adaptation, and biodiversity conservation. It will help to achieve Result 1.1 of the KJIP and the draft 2021-2036 KIEP’s Technical Area 6 (Ocean Health and Sustainable Blue Economy) Objective SBE1 (National Integrated Ocean Governance Policy).”

2.1.2 – We have edited the Monitoring section to be clearer. This includes: “One of the biggest challenges of managing PIPA is the distances between islands. Under the current (expired) management plan, the PIPA Management office has a Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) plan that is predicated on intercepting illegal activities with a patrol boat that is suitable for the high seas. Before such a purchase can be considered, there is a need to better understand the nature of illegal activity in PIPA and to have a plan for harbouring and maintaining such a resource. A vessel suitable for patrolling such a large area or responding to incursions will require significant funding for purchase and maintenance. Since the establishment of PIPA there have been significant advances in remote sensing and drone technology that may fill some of the roles of a patrol boat.

Securing Kiribati will support the PIPA Management Office to understand and document the nature of incursions and illegal activity in PIPA. Data will be collected with updated and innovative technology solutions, including remote sensing and drones. With this information, the PIPA MCS plan will be revised and if necessary, a business case for additional enforcement resources will be made.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment on PIP/Mark Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/6/2021

No, please see comments for review item 1 of Part I of the review sheet (on Table A).

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

Noted and addressed above.

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes. However, this section remains weak and should be strengthened during PPG.

4/22/2021

Yes, however this section remains weak.

4/6/2021

No, please address the following:

- This section does not address this issue. Please consult the guidelines and revise.
- More detail is need to for the two largest outputs in terms of dollar value.
- It is also not clear how this project will build on existing government programming, noting that because the GEF does not pay for staff time it will be important that these activities are built in to staff workplans.

CCA, 3/30/2021: This is not clear yet for CCA. As discussed in the comment for review item 3, above, it's not clear which climate change impacts – or potential impacts – the project would be building community resilience to.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

This section has been revised.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/6/2021

No, please note that the area indicators are in hectares not km² and double check the numbers. Also, please note that for all PAs we require METT scores and METT score improvements to be counted in those indicators. In some cases, especially with marine protected areas and fishing, they would be better classified as mainstreaming.

CCA, 3/30/2021: Please submit the excel file with CCA metadata and core indicators. Please see comment for item 6 in Part I of the review

sheet re: double-counting of beneficiaries for the GEFTF and the LDCF.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

Area indicators have been changed to Ha.

This has been uploaded to the portal.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes, thank you for the edits.

4/6/2021

No, this section would benefit from a focused edit as it is difficult to understand what proponents are highlighting in these three topics.

CCA:

By CEO Endorsement: Please provide further information on how the adaptation measures and learning can be scaled up or replicated.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

This has been edited

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes. At PPG, please include a more detailed map.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes, thank you for the additions.

4/6/2021

No, we understand that COVID has made travel particularly between the Line and Gilbert Islands challenging and limited consultation opportunities. The information on stakeholder engagement is insufficient. While it's understood that the consultations have been limited due to the pandemic and that the PPG will be used to conduct further consultations and formulate a Stakeholder Engagement Plan, please to provide a stakeholder analysis that includes a list of stakeholders in the project area, identifying their interests and potential role in the project as well as the means of engagement. We appreciated participating even if only virtually in the national dialogue.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

Noting the comment from PPO below, we have added a detailed stakeholder table.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes, it will be important during PPG to women's involvement in project design and implementation, such as including their different activities and use of natural resources.

4/6/2021

No, we welcome that the project will develop a gender plan. An edit to focus this section would be helpful with potentially a few targeted additions on different roles and relationship to nature as well as how the project will ensure women's perspective in design. Please address the following:

- Para. 4 implies that gender problems could arise from the development activities in this project, but it does not discuss what those might be or if/how the project will seek to avoid or mitigate them.

CCA, 3/30/2021: Is vulnerability to climate change the same for women and men? If not, are there measures the project will take to address

specific aspects of vulnerability for women and men?

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

The women and youth engagement section has been edited and updated to include specific examples as requested.

These points have been added to the Gender and Women's Empowerment section.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes, while we think there will likely be at least some private sector engagement we can understand how, at this point, it is difficult to identify what that will be.

4/6/2021

No, while the honesty is refreshing in this section, livelihood activities will likely develop some private sector. It would also be good to consider the private sector's role in funding for the PA system such as fisheries. There will still likely be some private sector engagement in this project even if limited.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

We have added more detail in the private sector engagement section and in Component 3.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

4/6/2021

No, it would be good to have greater consideration of the risks of climate change to this project including the BD activities. Scoring climate risks as low does not seem accurate given all the challenges facing Kiribati.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

This has been amended. We saw these risks as project implementation risks which are lower than in other parts of the Pacific where climate change induced cyclone risks are high and these result in project delivery delays. The Climate Risk Management and Screening tool lists climate risks to Kiribati as high or medium.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GFF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral**

is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/6/2021

No, it would be good state that there will be coordination with other GEF projects.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

Coordination with the GEF6 Whole of Islands approach project has been added to the coordination section. IUCN and UNDP met to discuss these projects in January 2021 and will continue to coordinate during the PPG phase.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/6/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes, however there is significant work to do on this section during PPG.

4/6/2021

No, the project needs to propose concrete knowledge outputs and communication strategies of lessons learned either in the Component 4 or knowledge management section. For example, the project identified “the lack of integration of traditional knowledge in approaches to disaster reduction, environmental management, and responses to climate variability by local communities” (page 22 & 31). They also recognized “the limited experience in community-based conservation of ecosystems and biodiversity (page 22)”, and “the limited recognition of the role of ecosystem-based adaptation and nature-based solutions as one of the barriers (page 23)”. It also said that “successful practices have been trialed (page 23)”. It is good to include good practices of integration of traditional knowledge, and development of lessons learned and knowledge sharing activities about community-based conservation of ecosystems and biodiversity, and recognition of the role of ecosystem-based adaptation and nature-based solutions as a part of knowledge management activities and outcomes in Component 4. Then, the project needs to secure clear budget for these activities in the CEO Endorsement.

1.

Agency Response

IUCN 21 April 2021

This is noted. Thank you.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/6/2021

No, it is well noted that IUCN attached their Preliminary ESMS Screening report and that targeted assessments are planned during the PPG Phase. There are some inconsistencies, however, in the reporting of the overall project ESS risk. While the attached Preliminary ESMS Screening states the overall ESS risk as moderate, the ESS section in the portal indicated that the overall ESS risk is low. Please review the rating. The possible livelihood impacts and consultation process including vulnerable communities, indigenous communities, women and youth indicate a moderate ESS risk.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/2021

Yes.

4/6/2021

No, please address the following:

- i. The Project amounts, signed by the OFP, are lower than those included in the Portal.
- ii. The amount in the table of the LoE (\$11,000,000) does not match the amount stipulated in the text of the letter (\$12,246,000).
- iii. The calculated agency fee does not correspond to the 9% structure for IUCN.
- iv. Please ensure that it included the full STAR amount for GEF-7.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/26/2021

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

4/22/2021

No, thank you for the revisions but there are some issues that remain.

4/6/2021

Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit. We would welcome a discussion with project proponents.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/6/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval