



Enhancing Whole of Islands Approach to Strengthen Community Resilience to Climate and Disaster Risks in Kiribati

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

9041

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

LDCF

Project Title

Enhancing Whole of Islands Approach to Strengthen Community Resilience to Climate and Disaster Risks in Kiribati

Countries

Kiribati

Agency(ies)

UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s):

Office of Te Berentitenti (OB) Kiribati

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Climate Change

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Climate Change, Climate Change Adaptation, Influencing models, Stakeholders, Type of Engagement, Communications, Civil Society, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Gender Mainstreaming, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Knowledge Generation, Community-based adaptation, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Community Based Organization, Non-Governmental Organization, Participation, Information Dissemination, Partnership, Consultation, Beneficiaries, Behavior change, Awareness Raising, Public Campaigns, Local Communities, Gender-sensitive indicators, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Women groups, Capacity Development, Training, Professional Development, Seminar, Workshop, Least Developed Countries, Mainstreaming adaptation, Private sector, Complementarity, Sea-level rise, National Adaptation Programme of Action, Livelihoods, National Adaptation Plan, Disaster risk management, Climate information, Innovation, Adaptation Tech Transfer, Small Island Developing States, Climate finance, Climate resilience, Ecosystem-based Adaptation

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 2

Duration

60In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

847,875

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
CCA-1	Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation	LDCF	5,775,000	46,061,000
CCA-2	Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact	LDCF	3,150,000	6,449,920
Total Project Cost(\$)			8,925,000	52,510,920

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To address urgent and immediate adaptation priorities, and kick-start the medium to long-term adaptation planning process to ensure that the development efforts are durable and sustainable

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. National and sectoral policies' strengthened through enhanced institutions and knowledge	Technical Assistance	1.1 Capacities of national government institutions and personnels strengthened on mainstreaming climate and disaster risks, supporting the operationalization of the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2014-2023 (KJIP)	1.1.1 National and sectoral level policy, planning and legal frameworks revised or developed, integrating climate change and disaster risks 1.1.2 National, sectoral and island level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes, related data gathering and communication systems enhanced and adjusted to support KJIP implementation 1.1.3 KJIP Coordination mechanism enhanced 1.1.4 Tools and mechanisms to develop, stock, and share data, knowledge, and information on climate change and disaster risks enhanced at the national level	LDC F	1,500,000	500,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Island level climate change resilient planning and institutional capacity development	Technical Assistance	2.1 Capacity of island administrations enhanced to plan for and monitor climate change adaptation processes in a Whole of Islands (WoI) approach	2.2.1 Island and community level vulnerability and adaptation (V&A) assessments revised and/or developed at 5 additional islands 2.1.2 Island Council Strategic Plans reviewed and complemented with Whole of Island adaptation action plans in 5 islands 2.1.3 Tools and mechanisms to develop, stock, and share data, knowledge, and information on CC and DR enhanced at the island level – with the option of exploring the software and hardware to strengthen information and communication mechanisms for early warning system (EWS) 2.1.4 I Kiribati population in 5 islands receives formal and informal training and awareness raising programmes on climate change and disaster risk management	LDC F	1,500,000	5,421,840
3. Whole of Island implementation of water, food security and infrastructure adaptation measures	Investment	3.1 Community capacities enhanced to adapt to climate induced risks to food and water security and community assets	3.1.1 Climate-resilient agriculture and livestock practices (including supply, production and processing/storage aspects) are introduced in at least 5 additional islands and communities 3.1.2 Water supply and storage facilities enhanced and/or installed at 5 additional islands and communities 3.1.3 Shoreline protection and climate proofing of infrastructure measures implemented at 5 additional islands and communities	LDC F	5,200,000	46,061,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)	
4. Whole-of-Island communication and knowledge management	Technical Assistance	4.1. Effective communication and coordination supports knowledge sharing and upscaling of the project approach	4.1.1 Whole-of-Island communication, engagement and coordination strengthened at national, island and community levels 4.1.2 Whole-of-Island lessons learned captured and shared with national and regional stakeholders to promote project replication and upscaling	LDC F	300,000	50,000	
Sub Total (\$)					8,500,000	52,032,840	
Project Management Cost (PMC)							
					LDCF	425,000	478,080
Sub Total(\$)					425,000	478,080	
Total Project Cost(\$)					8,925,000	52,510,920	

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP (TRAC)	Grant	50,000
Government	Govt. Kiribati	In-kind	52,270,920
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	190,000
Total Co-Financing(\$)			52,510,920

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	LDCF	Kiribati	Climate Change		No	8,925,000	847,875
Total Grant Resources(\$)						8,925,000	847,875

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

PPG Amount (\$)

200,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

19,000

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	
						Total Project Costs(\$)	0	0

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

1. The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed

Kiribati is vulnerable to Climate Change. Structural causes contributing to the vulnerability to climate and disaster risks include the extremely remote and low-lying geography of the country's atoll-islands; poverty; very limited human and natural resources; and gender and social inequalities. Water scarcity, poor water quality, limited options for food production, and exposure to inundations and storm surges make the population particularly vulnerable to climate variability and climate change.

Geographically, Kiribati's narrow land masses and low-lying geography results in almost the entire population being prone to flooding from storm surges and sea-level rise. The low-lying atoll islands are already experiencing inundation leading to a loss of land, buildings and infrastructure. Mean sea level is projected to continue to rise by approximately 5-15 cm by 2030 and 20-60 cm by 2090 under the higher emissions scenario. Sea-level rise combined with natural year-to-year changes will increase the impact of storm surges and coastal flooding. This will lead to increased risks of damage to coastal homes, community infrastructure (community halls, schools, churches) and critical infrastructure, such as health clinics. Further, increasing damage and interruption to roads, causeways and bridges, might lead to isolation of communities.

Sea-level rise also results in greater wave overtopping risk, and when marine flooding occurs, salt water infiltrates down into the freshwater aquifer causing contamination. This risk will increase with sea-level rise and increased flooding, and impact both water security and food security from agricultural production. With limited groundwater reservoirs, access to clean water and sanitation is already a serious problem in Kiribati, negatively impacting health and food security. Agricultural crop production is challenged by poor soil conditions and insufficient water supply and can be expected to be increasingly affected by salt water inundation, more extreme weather patterns, pests and diseases. This negative impact on food security is further exacerbated by the projected impact on coastal subsistence fisheries, affecting the main stable food source and livelihood of the country.

Despite an existing strong policy framework for CCA&DRM, several barriers exist that prevent Kiribati from achieving its CCA&DRM objectives. Therefore, the Project will address the following underlying institutional and technical constraints to the effective reduction of climate vulnerability and disaster risks in Kiribati:

- Limited integration of CCA&DRM in national and sub-national development plans and frameworks
- Insufficient institutional coordination at national, sectoral and sub-national levels
- Limited technical and institutional capacities at national and sub-national levels
- Weak data management, monitoring and knowledge management
- Limited community knowledge and adaptive solutions for CCA&DRM at outer island level

2. The baseline scenario or associated baseline projects

There has been no significant change in the baseline scenario described in the PIF. Further information on the baseline situation and baseline projects is given in the Project Document Results section IV (pp. 18-19; 22-24; 29-32; 39).

The baseline scenario for the proposed project is a weak enabling environment, insufficient coordination between national authorities, local authorities and communities. Although CCA&DRM are considered priorities in overarching national and sector policies, these ambitions are not sufficiently translated into plans and actions on-the-ground mostly due to a lack of technical capacities and resources. Gaps in the capacity of government technical staff can be attributed to insufficient training and understaffing at both national and island level. Technical capacity building programmes have been initiated under several projects, however there is a need to further strengthen technical capacities at all levels especially in relation to sector mainstreaming of CCA&DRM. Coordination of CCA&DRM is challenging due to the multitude of sectors involved at different government levels. There is a need for better coordination of national, sectoral, and sub-national plans to avoid maladaptation due to uncoordinated single-sector approaches. Further, enhanced coordination is expected to create synergies and thereby increase the effectiveness and efficiency of adaptation interventions that often require cross-sectoral approaches. Gathering and analysing data from dispersed and remote island communities without effective communication and information management systems is extremely challenging. As a result, it is rare that local level information is effectively integrated in national and sectoral policy and planning processes. As such, it is critical to improve data management from an island “bottom-up” perspective to ensure that CCA&DRM issues are addressed through responsive Island and community level plans and feedback loops. While communities have some understanding of the immediate impacts of climate change due to already apparent changes in weather patterns, local knowledge of CC resilience strategies is very low. There is also very little, if any, understanding of potential CC and disaster impacts over the long-term and what this means in terms of specific impacts for the sustainability of water and food supply on each island. While a number of studies and initiatives have been carried out, information is often not communicated in ways that are easily accessible or usable by island residents.

Existing and planned initiatives at the moment are limited in terms of the number at the selected project islands and lack in strategic and multi-sector island level approach. Therefore, through enhanced coordination, knowledge-sharing, and linkage with policy and institutional mainstreaming efforts, further integration and scaling of current and planned community level CC and DR resilience-building efforts is needed utilizing the Whole-of Island (WoI) approach. LDCF funding represents an opportunity to increase community resilience to climate and disaster risks through the WoI-approach in the outer islands of North Tarawa, Makin, Kuria, Onotoa and Kiritimati.

The project design integrates lessons learned and builds on the work of previous and current CCA&DRM projects in Kiribati including the recent NAP-review (also including recommendations for Strengthening Gender Considerations in Kiribati’s National Adaptation Plan Process), establishment of the KIVA database, piloting of the WoI-approach, UNICEF’s WASH and food security interventions, the Kiriwatsan Project I-II, the Building Safety and Resilience in the Pacific project (BSRP), the IFAD Outer Island Water and Food security project, and the Kiribati Adaptation Project (KAP I-III). Evaluations from several large adaptation projects ending in 2018 will be further reviewed at the project inception during the detailed project planning. As such, project interventions have been designed to build on methodologies and resources developed by previous and current projects.

The Project has several linkages to the GEF-LDCF Food Security project, in particular support to IVA-processes, improvement of Early Warning Systems (EWS), and improved food security through agriculture. The Project is building on existing lessons from IVA data collection and use, EWS implementation and operationalization, and training materials for extension officers and schools. During the parallel implementation of the projects, synergies and coordination will be further ensured through the KNEG. Linkages and synergies with the GEF-project Resilient Islands, Resilient communities (R2R)-project (approved 2018) will also be further explored during implementation, in particular in relation to agroforestry cooperation and engagement of agricultural extension officers, community outreach planning and materials, and monitoring.

During implementation, technical interventions under Outcome 3 will be further developed and aligned with parallel projects by various government sectors, working in close collaboration with technical specialists and relevant stakeholders. The Project will coordinate and build on synergies with a number of current and planned projects, in particular the UNDP-LDCF Food Security Project, UNICEF-implemented projects related to WASH and food security, the “Outer Islands Infrastructure Project” (GoK, ADB, WB), and the project “Supporting the implementation of the Line and Phoenix Integrated Development Strategy 2016-2036 with a specific focus on WASH and energy for a healthier population and a cleaner environment” (EU). More broadly, the Project will enhance coordination among partners through the existing WoI-partner network as described under outcome 4. A list of relevant recent and parallel projects is included as annex M to the project document.

3) Proposed alternative scenario

There has been no significant change in the proposed alternative scenario described in the PIF, however, some changes have been made in terms of the alignment of the project document with the original project design in the PIF. These changes were made based on stakeholder consultations and reflect changing national circumstances since the PIF was developed.

Changes to project design from PIF stage to Project document		
PIF	Change in Project document	Comment
Output 1.1.2 Budgetary processes and related institutional structures adjusted with considerations to climate change risk	Not addressed by project, taken out	During project design consultations with both government stakeholders and development partners, it was found that this output is currently being addressed under another project. A comprehensive Climate Finance Assessment is being conducted in mid-2018. Numbering of other outputs have been changed accordingly.
Output 1.1.3. National and sectoral monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes, related data gathering and communication systems enhanced and adjusted to support KJIP implementation	Changed to Output 1.1.2 National, sectoral and island-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes, related data gathering, and communication systems enhanced and adjusted to support KJIP implementation	Island-level monitoring included under this output.
Output 2.1.3. Island level M&E processes, related data gathering, and communications systems enhanced and adjusted linked with national systems.	Included in output 1.1.3, taken out of outcome 2	Island-level monitoring included under output 1.1.2. (above) to simplify design. Numbering of other outputs have been changed accordingly.

<p>Component /Outcome 4: <i>not included in PIF</i></p>	<p>Component 4: Whole-of-Island communication and knowledge management</p> <p>Outcome 4: Effective communication and coordination supports knowledge sharing and upscaling of the project approach</p>	<p>Outcome 4 added to address the need for enhanced communication and knowledge management.</p> <p>USD 300,000 allocated from outcome 3 to outcome 4.</p>
<p>Budget:</p> <p>Component 1: USD 1,500,000</p> <p>Component 2: USD 1,500,000</p> <p>Component 3: USD 5,500,000</p>	<p>Budget revisions:</p> <p>Component 1: USD 1,500,000</p> <p>Component 2: USD 1,500,000</p> <p>Component 3: USD 5,200,000</p> <p>Component 4: USD 300,000</p>	<p>Budget reallocations in line with the above described programming priorities were undertaken. The most significant change is the addition of Component 4, with funds being drawn for knowledge management from component 3.</p>

The Project will address key challenges and vulnerabilities to climate change through four inter-related work components: effective operationalization of the KJIP (NAP); use of a strengthened “Whole of Island” (WoI) approach to development; implementation of priority adaptive measures in five of Kiribati’s most vulnerable outer islands; and improved CCA&DRM knowledge management and communication systems.

Component 1: National and sectoral policies strengthened through enhanced institutions and knowledge

At national level, the Project will support integration of CCA&DRM in legal frameworks and ministerial strategic and operational plans, as well as strengthening cross-sectoral coordination and monitoring mechanisms and tools to improve implementation of these measures. This approach will lead to increased institutional capabilities, improved CCA&DRM mainstreaming and enhanced inter-agency collaboration. GoK ministries through the Kiribati National Expert Group on CCA&DRM (KNEG) will collectively and individually benefit through increased effective CCA&DRM capacity and mainstreaming which will in turn strengthen the integration of climate change into development planning. By incorporating CCA&DRM into sectoral plans and the associated increase in capacities of the Government staff, the interventions will have a longer-lasting impact, beyond the lifetime of the project. Furthermore, the close involvement of government ministries in project planning and implementation will ensure that the project is aligned with national initiatives to maximise benefits at all levels of governance. The technical and institutional capacity of KNEG members will be enhanced through specialized training, active involvement in carrying out Integrated Vulnerability Assessments (IVA) and WoI-planning processes, improved data systems and better monitoring processes that can quickly identify implementation challenges.

Component 2: Island level climate change resilient planning and institutional capacity development

At sub-national level, a phased WoI-approach will be supported to ensure that findings from Integrated Vulnerability Assessments (IVAs) are translated into strategic island development planning and actionable, responsive WoI-implementation and investment plans. These plans will provide the framework for Island Councils to prioritize interventions and identify funding needs and gaps. This approach builds on the IVA-methodology and WoI-approach piloted in 2014 and evaluated in 2018 by strengthening the methodology, by increasing integration with Island Council Strategic Plans (ICSP), and by supplementing the approach with formulation of WoI-implementation and investment plans. This approach will build capacities for CCA&DRM and enable Island Councils to take ownership, approach government or donors for funding, and ensure coordination in the implementation of development activities. Communities will be actively involved in all planning processes and will benefit from customized and responsive outreach programmes and awareness activities, strengthening of island-level CC&DRM committees and strengthening of Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Management (CBDRM) Plans with climate risk information and early warnings mechanisms (focus on drought planning and flood and erosion mapping). The Project will strive to ensure that men and women participate equally in Island level planning processes and that consideration is given to the needs of the most vulnerable community members. For this purpose, the project will conduct an analysis/research of the different impacts of CC and needs of different target groups.

Component 3: WoI-implementation of water, food security and coastal adaptation measures

Building on WoI-implementation and investment plans (outcome 2) and a number of sector-specific technical assessments conducted in the first years of the project (water resources assessments, technology assessments), the project will implement adaptation measures to address vulnerabilities in the areas of food security (agriculture), water security, coastal management and protection of coastal infrastructure in the five project islands. Technical assessments will be carried out to ensure well informed decisions, application of standards, impact assessments and cross-cutting issues such as environmental protection. Technical assessments will also consider technology choices and look into adopting more innovative approaches, locally appropriate solutions, and bring in good practices from other SIDS/LDCs, especially in the Pacific. Capacities of involved sectors, extension officers and communities will be built as part of this process to ensure sustainability and promote up-scaling in other islands. Communities will benefit from implementation of adaptation measures based on site-specific vulnerabilities and risks, as well as technical capacity building enabling farmers, community groups and schools to implement adaptive measures. The design of all water, food and infrastructure investments will carefully consider the needs of women, men, boys and girls as well as people with disabilities through adherence to Universal Standards and Build Back Better principles.

Component 4: Enhanced knowledge management and communication strategies

The above components will be supported by enhanced knowledge management and communication aimed at improving CCA&DRM awareness and increasing adaption action at national, island and community level. The objective is to institutionalize the WoI-approach, increase knowledge of CCA&DRM, and ensure ownership for KJIP outcomes. The Project will enhance knowledge management and information at all levels by enhancing information feedback loops and regular sharing of lessons learned and best practice strategies using a range of information sources including existing regional, national, island level mechanisms. In developing the project communication and outreach strategy, attention will be given to ensuring that information is provided in accessible formats (formal and informal channels) to targeted stakeholders, including women, youth and children.

All of the above outcomes integrate ambitious Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) strategies through close involvement of the Ministry of Women, Youth and Social Affairs (MWYSA) to mainstream GESI-sensitive perspectives in project activities.

4) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing;

There were no significant changes in the incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected baseline contributions from the PIF and no change in total amounts of GEF TF and LDCF funds. There was a minor increase in the total amount of parallel co-financing, from USD 45,000,000 identified at PIF-stage to USD45,851,156. This was also reflected in changes in the distribution of co-financing sources in the PIF, with USD45,661,156 sourced from various national government units through OB NSPD, and USD 240,000 from UNDP.

The project builds on a range of on-going baseline initiatives and leverages 5 times the grant contribution of USD 8,925,000 in the form of co-financing totalling USD 45,851,156. Co-financing contributions are based on government contributions and contributions sources from various national government units (through support of development partners) to adaptation efforts in the country – in the areas of national institutional and capacity building, and related to food security, water security, and shoreline protection – which is reflected in the design of the project. Refer project document section VI. Financial planning and management, and Annex J Co-financing letter for further details.

5. Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

The Project will address the exacerbation of climate change on coastal zones and infrastructure, water security, and food security, by increasing community resilience to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters and building capacities at island and national levels. In doing so, the Project will contribute to GEF focal areas CCA-1 Reduce vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems; CCA-2 Strengthen institutional and technical capacities for effective CCA, and CCA-3 Integrate CCA into relevant policies, plans and associated processes.

The project will also contribute to achieving several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including: SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; SDG 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all; SDG 12: Achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture, and SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower women, by ensuring women's equitable participation in Project planning and implementation and by actively monitoring gender equity and social inclusion (GESI) outcomes.

The project targets to deliver adaptation benefits to the entire population of the five Project Islands estimated at approximately 17,500 people of which 49% women (direct beneficiaries). For awareness activities, the project target is the entire population above 5 years of age (school children and adults) in the 5 project islands, estimated at approximately 14,500 people.

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and upscaling

While the Whole-of-Island approach is an existing approach, it is still relatively new to the region and Kiribati, where it is yet to be adopted in a structured manner. The project is building on existing mechanisms and methodologies for WoI-planning (piloted in 1 island, Abaiang); however, addressing identified gaps by including new aspects and perspectives. Compared to other community- and governance levels adaptation interventions addressing specific sector needs, the WoI-approach offers an integrated multisector approach based on data-informed multi-sector vulnerabilities and priorities. In this way, the WoI approach encompasses sector needs and enables subnational and national government to identify, prioritize and allocate funding for adaptation gaps and needs in a holistic manner, taking into consideration existing investments. A WoI evaluation of the interventions in Abaiang is being undertaken in 2018 by SPC with initial positive feedback from communities to the coordinated and collaborative approach. However, the approach has struggled to gain traction and expand to other islands due to insufficient capacity and coordination mechanisms and lack of human and financial resources. Draft findings and recommendations arising from the WoI-evaluation have been incorporated in the Project design, and the final evaluation will be reviewed during the Project inception phase.

At present, the IVA-process (IVA carried out in 8 islands by the end of 2018), while identifying numerous crosscutting vulnerabilities, and the WoI-approach (piloted in 1 island), lack translation into integrated, planned action. The project will therefore enhance innovative data analysis and use for the formulation of island-level strategic plans as well as WoI-implementation and investment plans, enabling Island Councils and the government to plan, prioritize and identify funding needs and sources. Under Outcome 3, the use of innovative measures and technologies will be explored through sector-specific technology-assessments to identify the most appropriate and site-specific solutions in the areas of climate-resilient agro-forestry, water adaptation, and coastal protection.

The project is expected to have a lasting and enabling impact by building capacities and establishing methodologies, tools and mechanisms for sustaining and upscaling project interventions in the project islands and upscaling in other outer islands.

The Project will be implemented by existing national and island level structures and strengthen institutions, mechanisms and tools in place such as the KNEG, Islands Councils, the IVA-methodology and WoI-approach, and the KIVA database to ensure ownership and sustainability. The WoI-implementation and investment plans will identify prioritized adaptation needs and funding gaps and enable the GoK to allocate resources and/or attract donor funding to the project islands beyond the project. The phased WoI-approach is thus expected to establish a foundation for development planning in outer islands and lead to effective prioritization of project interventions beyond the project.

To solicit the interest and foundation for the upscaling of the WoI-approach, information and knowledge sharing with stakeholders not directly involved in the project will be ensured through engagement of the cross-sectoral advisory committee, KNEG, and sensitization of national decision-makers such as the Mayor's Forum and the Parliament Select Committee for Climate Change throughout project implementation. At the end of the project, a regional WoI-conference (Outcome 4) will be held to present results and discuss opportunities and strategies for replicating the WoI-approach in other outer islands in Kiribati and in other Pacific countries.

A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

Do they include civil society organizations (yes /no)? and indigenous peoples (yes /no)? [1]¹

The Project design phase and implementation involve participation of multiple stakeholders at national, island and community-levels.

During the preparation of the project, extensive engagement of stakeholders was ensured through national level consultations with the KNEG (inception workshop, KNEG-retreat and validation workshop), one-to-one discussions with all relevant government stakeholders, NGOs, project offices, development partner organizations, and islands consultations with Islands Councils, extension officers, and community representatives in 4 of the 5 project islands (consultations in one island were cancelled due to flight cancellations). The project is designed based on the inputs and feedback received from these consultations.

During the implementation of the project, participation and representation of stakeholders will be ensured through the governance structures to be put in place by the Project (Project Board, Technical Advisory Committee / KNEG, PMU), and through existing structures at regional, national and islands/community levels (e.g. KNEG, GIS-user group, Island Councils, Islands Development Committees, Community-Based Groups, and WoI-partner network,). Through these structures, stakeholders will be consulted and involved in the implementation of project outputs and activities.

During the project inception and as part of the project communications and outreach- and Knowledge Management strategies, a detailed GESI-sensitive stakeholder engagement plan will be developed.

While project design consultations involved relevant civil society organizations, the role of those during project implementation has not been defined, besides the involvement of the Kiribati Local Governance Association (KiLGA) for the formulation of Island Council Strategic Plans. The number of NGO's in Kiribati is very limited, and none of the NGO's are present in the 5 project islands. However, community-based groups such as women's and youth groups present in the 5 project islands have been identified as possible channels for community engagement and awareness. For this purpose, island-specific engagement and outreach plans will be developed based on the communication and outreach strategy.

The table below present the key responsibilities of stakeholders related to each project output.

Outcome	Output	Stakeholders	Key responsibilities
Outcome 1: Capacities of national government institutions and personnel is strengthened on mainstreaming climate and disaster risks, supporting the operationalization of the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2014-2023 (KJIP).	Output 1.1: National and sectoral level policy, planning and legal frameworks revised or developed, integrating climate change and disaster risks	OB NSPD KNEG MWYSA, MJ, Selected sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Facilitate legal review and update from a CCA&DRM-perspective · Support and strengthen capacities for CCA&DRM mainstreaming in MSPs and MOPs
	Output 1.2: National and sectoral monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes, related data gathering and communication systems enhanced and adjusted to support KJIP implementation	OB NSPD KNEG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Develop KJIP monitoring framework · Enhance monitoring tools (KIVA database) and capacities at national, sector and island levels

	Output 1.3: KJIP coordination mechanism enhanced	OB-NSPD KNEG Relevant sectors	· Enhance and facilitate coordination within KNEG, between sectors and between national and island-levels.
	Output 1.4: Tools and mechanisms to develop, stock, and share data, knowledge, and information on climate change and disaster risks enhanced at the national level	OB NSPD MFED-NSO MFMRD-GCM	· Strengthen IVA and CCA&DRM data collection, processing, analysis and dissemination tools and capacities · Enhance tools and capacities for data management and analysis (KIVA database and GIS-data platform)
Outcome 2: Capacity of island administrations enhanced to plan for and monitor climate change adaptation processes in a Whole of Islands (WoI) approach	Output 2.1: Island and community level vulnerability and adaptation (V&A) assessments revised and/or conducted at 5 islands	OB NSPD KNEG MIA, Island Councils	· Strengthen IVA methodology and capacities at national and island levels, including IVA processes in 5 islands
	Output 2.2: Island Council Strategic Plans reviewed and complemented with WoI- plans in 5 islands	OB NSPD KNEG MIA, KiLGA Island Councils, Islands Development Committees	· Strengthen ICSP-methodology with link to CCA&DRM, and review ICSP for 5 islands · Develop methodology and capacities for WoI-planning, including formulation of WoI implementation and investment plans for 5 islands

	<p>Output 2.3: Tools and mechanisms to develop, stock, and share data, knowledge, and information on CC and DR enhanced at the island level with the option of exploring the software and hardware to strengthen information and communication mechanisms for early warning system (EWS)</p>	<p>OB NSPD Islands Disaster Management Committees OB KMS MISE-WSEU MELAD-ECD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Strengthen island-level communication and information on CCA and DRM · Enhance community preparedness through enhanced CBDRM, including early warning measures
	<p>Output 2.4: I-Kiribati population in 5 islands receives formal and informal training and awareness raising programmes on climate change and disaster risk management</p>	<p>OB NSPD KNEG Relevant sectors Community-Based groups Communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Enhance CCA&DRM awareness through community consultations, trainings and awareness activities
<p>Outcome 3:Community capacities enhanced to adapt to climate induced risks to food and water security and community assets</p>	<p>Output 3.1: Climate-resilient agriculture and livestock practices (including supply, production and processing/storage aspects) are introduced in at least 5 additional islands and communities</p>	<p>MELAD – ALD (MCIC) (MoE) Communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Oversee technical assessment and development of trainings materials · Promote and implement a range of climate-resilient agro-forestry techniques and measures through demonstration and trainings for agricultural nurseries, schools, community-groups and farmers · Enhance marketing (including supply, production, processing and storage) of agricultural products

	Output 3.2: Water supply and storage facilities enhanced and/or installed at 5 additional islands and communities	MISE-WSEU Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Oversee and carry out water resources and technology assessments · Establish drought contingency measures · Liaise with communities and implement improved water technologies · Facilitate trainings for water technicians · Facilitate community WASH awareness
	Output 3.3: Shoreline protection and climate proofing of infrastructure measures implemented at 5 additional islands and communities	MISE-CEU MFMRD-GCM (MELAD-ECD, MELAD-LMD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Oversee and carry out technical assessments and cost-benefit analysis for selected areas/infrastructure · Implement coastal management measures (shoreline assessment and infrastructure protection measures)
Outcome 4:	Output 4.1: WoI-communication, engagement and coordination strengthened at national, island and community level	OB NSPD KNEG WoI-partner-network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Develop communications and knowledge management strategies and awareness materials · Ensure effective communication and information sharing between national, sector and island levels · Enhance partner-coordination
	Output 4.2: WoI-lessons learned captured and shared with national and regional stakeholders	OB CC&DM KNEG WoI partner network	Capture and disseminate lessons learned at regional, national, and island levels

List of key stakeholders:

Government (central level)

<p>Office of Te Beretitenti (OB – Office of the President)</p> <p>CC&DM division</p>	<p>The Office of Te Beretitenti (OB) plays a key coordinating role for CC & DRM. The National Strategic Policy Division functions as KJIP and KNEG Secretariat and chair of KNEG with a mandate to coordinate and monitor CC&DRM initiatives and Kiribati’s role in global CC negotiations.</p> <p>The OB also hosts the Kiribati Meteorological Services (OB-KMS) responsible for weather forecasting and issuing of advisories and climate and weather-related data collection.</p>
<p>Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KNEG)</p>	<p>The development of the KJIP led to the establishment of a Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KNEG), encompassing experts from core and line ministries, NGOs, the Kiribati Chamber of Commerce and Industries and other non-state actors (total around 30 members). The KNEG acts as a coordination mechanism for climate change and disaster risk management initiatives. It plays an overall steering function for the design, implementation and monitoring of climate change and disaster risk management initiatives and also form sub-steering groups for sector-specific measures or integrated approaches targeting outer islands and community level (such as the Whole of Island Approach - WOI).</p>
<p>Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA)</p>	<p>The MIA is responsible for Local Government and outer island development. The Local Government Act governs the Island Councils functions and operations. The Local Government Division is the link between Island Councils, the government and other organizations (NGO’s and partners). MIA staff stationed in each outer island includes the Island Council Clerk, Island Project Officer and the Treasurer serving the Island Councils.</p>
<p>Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MFED)</p>	<p>The Ministry of Finance and Economic Development is responsible for national planning and budgeting. Funds for the project will be disbursed to the PMU through the Kiribati Fiduciary Steering Unit established within the Ministry to handle large project funds and following Government Financial Regulations and Procedures. The National Statistics Office (NSO) under MFED plays a key role in managing national data. In 2017, the Kiribati Climate Finance Division (KCFD) was established under MFED to attract and manage climate financing.</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD)</p>	<p>MELAD is responsible for National Environment, Lands and Agriculture. The Environment and Conservation Division (ECD) is the GEF Operational Focal Point of the GEF. This agency is responsible for environment, lands and agricultural policy development, implementation and monitoring/evaluation. Through the Lands, Agriculture and the Environment Conservation Divisions, the Ministry has direct interests in food security, environment conservation for both marine and land management and agriculture resources and to ensure that development activities are pursued sustainably for the environment and for traditional food production systems. The Agriculture and Livestock Division (ALD) plays a critical role in the up-scaling of crop and livestock production through implementation of ALD field programs.</p>

Ministry for Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy (MISE)	The Ministry of Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy (MISE) is responsible for infrastructure development and maintenance to support transport, coastal protection and water access and conservation. The Water and Sanitation Engineering Unit (WSEU) is responsible for ensuring that the people of Kiribati have sufficient access to reliable, safe water supplies and safe sanitation facilities and practices, as well as monitoring of water quality in the outer islands through the supervision of Island water technicians (extension officers) based in the Island Councils. The Civil Engineering Unit's (CEU) main role is to provide technical advice, infrastructure designs, construction and maintenance, as well as, in collaboration with the Quality Control Unit and Cost Planning Unit, to do costing and provide quality assurance for all coastal and transport infrastructure works.
Ministry for Women, Youth and Social Affairs (MWYSA)	The Ministry is responsible for the protection of the interest of women, youth and children through advocating national policies, international agreements, conventions and treaties. MWYSA is providing support and active services through its main service delivery bodies which include: 1. Civil registration, 2. Disability and Inclusion, 3. Human Rights, 4. Social welfare, 5. Non-governmental organisations, 6. Sport, 7. Women's development, and 8. Youth.
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD)	MFMRD is responsible for national marine and fisheries policies development, implementation and monitoring, as well as geology and coastal management. Key mandates include sustainable management of fisheries and mining resources and protection of fish stocks and marine environment of Kiribati.
Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Cooperatives (MCIC)	The Ministry is responsible for maintaining cash earning opportunities and trade related activities and ensures sufficient food supply to meet the national food demand. Copra is one area of focus which sustains rural communities' economic well-being.
Ministry of Line and Phoenix Islands Development (MLPID)	The Ministry of the Line and Phoenix Islands' mandate is the overall administration of Line and Phoenix Islands administration. The Minister is based in Kiritimati and oversees all government activities, employees and companies in the Line and Phoenix Islands Group, in consultation with respective sectors. and assist and facilitate the implementation of approved Developmental Programs.
Ministry of Justice (MJ)	The Ministry of Justice (MJ) was established in 2018 to enforce the law; to ensure public safety against foreign and domestic threats; to provide federal leadership in preventing and controlling crime; to seek just punishment for those guilty of unlawful behaviour; and to ensure fair and impartial administration of justice for all Kiribati citizens.

Ministry of Information, Transport, Tourism and Communication Development (MITTCD)	The Ministry's mandate related to the different divisions under its portfolio relate to policy development, regulation and oversight of state owned enterprises registered under each of the divisions, registration and license, management of on-land, air and marine transportation, rescues, space management and policies, government print and postal services, airport terminal and security, and tourism policies and development.
Parliament Select Committee on Climate Change	The role of the Parliament Select Committee on Climate Change is to inform the Parliament, assess islands/community needs and put forward/match request from communities with government projects. There are 5 members in the committee.
Government (subnational level)	
Island Councils	Island Councils are responsible for the development, administration and management of island affairs assisted by the central Government through the MIA. The Local Government Act governs Island Council functions and operations. Island Councils have individual by-laws that largely guide their business and operation. They oversee, lay out rules and procedures for how domestic island affairs, business operators and licensing, and development are managed. Island councils have discretionary power through issuing licenses for business development and setting prices and charges such as bus fares and fish sales prices in the local market. Besides MIA staff, the Island Council consist of elected positions (Mayor, deputy Mayor) and extension officers. Islands Development Committees consist of representatives from each outer islands wards, and work closely with the Island Project Officer to identify needs and develop interventions.
Extension officers	<p>Island Extension Officers are government sector staff deployed on the outer islands for a period of time to provide technical support to the island council in areas related to their Ministry's mandate.</p> <p>Island Water Technicians are responsible for maintenance of water systems running on the islands. They also responsible for collecting data related to water as well as providing assistance to people in the communities in building safe wells. Agricultural Extension Officers are responsible for supporting agricultural effort in the rural communities. They provide training to improve the capacity of people to maintain and to grow their own foods, planting materials to sustain peoples' effort in diversifying food production and provide advice on the most productive and high yielding crop species.</p> <p>Assistant Social Welfare Officers (ASWOs) are employed by MWYSA in outer islands to handle social issues. Other extensions officers include teachers (ME), medical staff (MHMS) and Fisheries Extension Officers (MFMRD).</p>
Local Communities	

Village Elders and Leaders (Old men's association)	At community level for each Island, there is a communal leadership system that strongly recognizes the powerful authority of 'unimane' (village male elders) who are the supreme authority for village level matters for the wellbeing of the members of the village. Most villages located on islands are led either by a group of village elders from amongst whom a Chairman is selected. The elders committee is a respected body on the Island whose decision is often respected. Their involvement through consultation throughout implementation is important to reinforce the support that village Councillor reps and the Mayor for the project.
Women and Youth	Women are mostly involved in providing domestic support to the family and are also doing the marketing of the men's catch. Women and Youth sometimes help with shellfish collection in the reef. They are also engaged with agricultural activities for family as well as for income by selling agriculture products to schools and Tarawa.
Community-based groups	In each outer island, there is number of community-based groups and organizations formed to serve particular community interests, such as church-based women's groups, youth groups as well as active working committees.
Civil Society	
KiLGA (Kiribati Local Government Association)	Kiribati Local Government Association (KiLGA) is an NGO that provide technical assistance and support to local government and Island Councils, particularly for capacity building and related to developing strategic plans and developing project documents to support their strategic plans. All island Councils are registered members of KiLGA and therefore entitled to all services KiLGA provide. KiLGA also provide networking with Local Government bodies abroad to share information.
NGO's	There are a number of NGO's present in Kiribati, however presence in the outer islands is limited. The main NGO's include: - Kirican (climate change awareness) - Live and Learn (environmental education and awareness) - Foundation of the People of the South Pacific - FSPK (agriculture) - Red Cross (disaster risk reduction)

[1] *As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.*

Documents

Title	Submitted
GEF ID 9041_LDCF_Kiribati_Stakeholder Engagement Plan	

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

During the project design phase, a Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) specialist was engaged to carry out GESI-consultations and analysis and formulate a GESI-action-plan. The GESI-action plan identifies specific project strategies and actions to mainstream GESI-perspectives, that has been built into relevant activities under all project outcomes.

Direct project beneficiaries are constituted by 49% women and 51% men, constituted by the total population of the 5 project islands, based on available census information.

A comprehensive Gender Analysis was carried out during the project design phase which included a literature review and extensive stakeholder consultations with national level state and non-state agencies and a wide range of island and community representatives in target project islands. These consultations included one-to-one interviews as well as a series of focus group sessions aimed at assessing the impacts of climate change on all members of society, with special emphasis on the most vulnerable. Consultations in all locations revealed a significant and growing concern with water and food security, with negative impacts on people's health, children's education and the overall level of social capital already apparent.

With regard to Outcome 1 work at national level, the gender assessment indicates a strong need to increase the capacity of the KNEG and the Ministry of Women, Youth and Social Affairs (MWYSA) to better understand the gendered impacts of climate change and disasters on women, children and other vulnerable groups including people with disabilities. It will be important that the Project works closely with the women, youth and disability divisions of the MWYSA to increase staff knowledge and capacity and to support awareness work that is already underway.

With respect to island-level implementation under Outcome 2 and Outcome 3, the Project will address priority water and food security issues by ensuring wide representation of both male and female beneficiaries from target islands and communities in water and agriculture assessments and the implementation planning processes. Women are under-represented on Island Councils and national government extension officers are predominately male; there are currently no female water technicians and very few agricultural assistant officers. As such, it is critical that women are actively involved in all project investment decision-making processes as well as in monitoring the impacts of new and refurbished infrastructure. Similarly, the Project stakeholder engagement plan will ensure that participatory processes are in place to capture the perspectives of youth and people with disabilities. All islands have established youth networks that can be tapped for this purpose. Working through existing women and youth groups provides an opportunity to increase knowledge about climate change, build adaptation capacity and communicate critical information within peer networks. At island-level, the Project will also forge a strong relationship with Ministry of Women, Youth and Social Affairs (MWSYA) island extension officers, known as Assistant Social Welfare Officers, to promote and ensure women's equitable participation in planning and decision-making forums.

To better understand the way climate and disaster risk affect different population groups, the Project will carry out CCA&DRM GESI-research/analysis during project year 1. This will allow the Project to establish a better understanding of the different needs of project beneficiaries, and to plan implementation strategies accordingly. Under Outcome 4, GESI-sensitive WoI knowledge management and communications and outreach strategies will be formulated, as well as GESI-sensitive IEC materials.

The Project will engage a consultant with considerable expertise in GESI and CCA&DRM on a periodic input basis to ensure that the PMU and key project stakeholders have sufficient knowledge and skills to effectively implement the Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) Action Plan, while also building national capacity for climate related gender and inclusion work. In this role, the GESI Consultant will give priority to building the capacity of the Project Management Unit, the implementing agency (OB) and the KNEG to improve their understanding of critical equity and inclusion dimensions of CCA, and to ensure project activities and processes are highly sensitive to the different perspectives of women, men, girls and boys and that all possible efforts are being taken to consider the needs of people with disabilities and other marginalized groups. The Gender Consultant will work in close collaboration with the MWYSA to build staff knowledge of GESI responsive adaptation strategies. The specific gender targets set out in the Project M&E Framework will be reviewed with key stakeholders during project inception and strategies developed to achieve these targets.

Documents

Title

Submitted

GEF ID 9041_LDCF_Kiribati_Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) Analysis and Action Plan

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

Please refer to the attachment "Annex G - Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) Analysis and Action Plan"

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being, achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

Project risks include environmental, social, operational, organizational and political risks. No critical risks have been identified, and countermeasures/management response to all risks have been developed through project design consultations. The Social and Environmental Screening (SESP, annex E) categorize the project risk as moderate, defined as:

“Projects that include activities with potential adverse social and environmental risks and impacts, that are limited in scale, can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty, and can be addressed through application of standard best practice, mitigation measures and stakeholder engagement during Project implementation”.

Social and Environmental project risks identified in the SESP include risks related to human rights, gender, biodiversity/environment, climate change, health/safety, traditional knowledge, land ownership and pollution prevention and resources. A full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) will be carried out at the first phase of the project, and an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) developed to define appropriate management measures to fully address potential risks, as well as establishment of a project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism.

As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. when impact is rated as 5, and when impact is rated as 4 and probability is rated at 3 or higher). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

The table below summarizes the identified risks and countermeasures.

#	Description	Type	Impact and probability	Countermeasures / management response
<i>Risks identified in SESP</i>				

1	Current conflicts related to access to resources (water) could escalate in project sites	Human rights (other)	Water-related conflicts are increasing due to lack of sufficient and safe drinking water. The implementation of the project in stages could potentially lead to escalating conflicts. P = 5 I = 3	The project targets to ensure sufficient quantity of safe drinking water to 100% of the population in the 5 project islands through household and community institutions (schools, clinics, island council, community halls). This is expected to reduce conflicts. Community consultations and engagement strategies related to the project's IVA-process, WoI-planning and implementation of the GESI-action plan are put in place to ensure that all community groups are consulted throughout the project and interventions planned in a participatory manner.
2	Retrofitting of buildings may cause temporary disruption to the provision of services (schools)	Human rights (other)	Retrofitting of schools and community buildings may cause disruption of public services. P = 4 I = 3	When the project has identified buildings/infrastructures for retrofitting, plans will be put in place considering the best way to ensure that services can continue during retrofitting in alternative locations.
3	The Project can potentially reproduce gender discriminations, especially regarding participation in design and implementation	Gender (other)	Traditionally, women are not involved in public decision-making in Kiribati societies. P = 4 I = 2	The project's Gender, Equity and Social Inclusion action plan addresses the need and strategies to ensure participation of women in design processes and implementation.
4	Introduction of climate change- resilient species (flora) could cause invasive spread and negative impacts on ecosystems and biodiversity	Environmental	The introduction of new climate change-resilient species (open pollinated seeds) could cause invasive spread and negative impacts on ecosystems and biodiversity. P = 2 I = 4	The project will ensure that UNDP's biodiversity guidance note is followed, including the following requirements: "No introduction of known invasive species. No introduction of any alien species without risk assessment. Possibility of accidental introduction of invasive alien species to be considered and managed". The Project will also build on existing research and experience of introducing climate-resilient species in Kiribati and the region.

5	Use of raw materials (sand) can potentially cause negative impacts to natural habitat	Environmental	<p>For retrofitting of existing infrastructure, the project requires consumption of raw materials (sand, gravel, reef mud), that can potentially impact natural habitats.</p> <p>P = 3 I = 3</p>	<p>The required quantity of raw materials is limited in scale as no new infrastructures will be developed. Required safeguards will be addressed in the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and EIAs will be conducted. Further, the project is establishing guidelines and mechanisms for the mining of raw material for construction at the island level to ensure sustainable use of resources. This will be established before the actual infrastructure related work begins and will therefore follow these guidelines.</p>
6	The Project may potentially result in negative impacts on the environment due to installation and use of adaptation technologies and retrofitting of infrastructure	Environmental	<p>During retrofitting of buildings and infrastructure and related to installation of water and food security technologies, there is a possibility that some level of hazardous and non-hazardous waste will be generated. Working in remote outer islands, it is unlikely that proper waste management can be done sufficiently on site.</p> <p>For retrofitting of existing infrastructure, the project requires consumption of raw materials (sand, gravel, reef mud), that can potentially cause release of pollutants, however the required quantity of raw materials is limited in scale.</p> <p>Water adaptation technologies and extraction can potentially impact endangered species and groundwater reservoirs.</p> <p>P = 5 I = 3</p>	<p>During project implementation, contractors will be required to develop waste management plans for any interventions with the possibility of generating hazardous and non-hazardous waste generation.</p> <p>Required Environmental Impact Assessments (in line with national law) will be conducted and will be addressed in the EMSF, to ensure that SES requirements are met. Further, the project is establishing guidelines and mechanisms for the mining of raw material for construction at the island level to ensure sustainable use of resources. This will be established before the actual infrastructure related work begins and will therefore follow these guidelines.</p> <p>Increasing availability of drinking water will require using a mix of water technologies to be determined by site-specific water resources assessments and technology assessments. These assessments will also determine the sustainable yield available for each project site, and the optimal technology choices. Technologies will be small scale technologies implemented at household or community-level. Implementation will follow government requirement and procedures for Environmental Impact Assessment.</p>

7	Climate-induced disasters such as drought and flooding can potentially disrupt or delay project implementation	Environmental	Climate-induced disasters can potentially affect project interventions and the ability of communities, Islands Councils and sectors to participate, causing project implementation delays P = 2 I = 4	The project target is to address the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience of communities and building capacities at all levels. The probability of severe climatic events impacting project progress is not likely. Most climate related impacts in Kiribati are expected to take place gradually (slow onset). If required, the project will engage closely with project partners before, during and after disaster/hazard to revise implementation schedules/ timelines to accommodate for disaster situation (i.e. prioritise activities that can be implemented regardless of disaster).
8	Project activities related to installation of technologies and retrofitting of infrastructure can potentially pose risks to the safety and health of communities and/or workers	Health/safety (other)	Installation, retrofitting, maintenance, or collapse related to agriculture and water adaptation technologies and retrofitting of buildings and infrastructure can potentially pose risks to the safety and occupational health of communities and/or workers. P = 4 I = 3	The project will ensure that installation and maintenance of adaptation technologies as well as retrofitting of infrastructure and buildings are carried out in respect of SES and national standards. The project will support a technology review/assessment and capacity building of MISE-CEU to ensure that optimal retrofitting design and standards are applied. Furthermore, retrofitting activities will be carried out by MISE-CEU and national service providers who have experience in installing technologies and building public infrastructure. The project will make sure that environmental and social impacts assessment are made prior to installation of technologies and retrofitting of infrastructure.
9	Collection and use of traditional knowledge is sensitive	Cultural heritage (other)	Traditional knowledge to support forecasting and Early warning mechanisms will be documented and compiled. Traditional knowledge is considered sensitive and well-guarded, and its use therefore has to be considered carefully. P = 4 I = 2	The knowledge will be collected by government officials and used and shared only if and where appropriate, and not for commercial purposes.

10	Installation of Automated Weather Station may involve land tenure arrangements	Operational	Installation of one Automated Weather Station (AWS) in Onotoa requires identification of location, that may involve land tenure arrangements P = 3 I = 3	As per government procedure in preceding projects, the AWS will be installed in a location under current government lease, however this may require access to customary held land. Consultations with local communities and land owners will be carried out as part of this process.
<i>Risks not included in SESP</i>				
11	Changing leadership at national and local level resulting in project delays or refocus	Political	The probability of a leadership change (elections 2020) resulting in refocus of the project is unlikely given that CCA&DRM are national priorities. However, delays in government decision making is a likely consequence I = 3 P = 3	The project will work closely with the OB, KNEG and Island Councils to ensure that key stakeholders are updated with progress and able to advice and keep new national and local leaders informed
12	Limited capacities and human resources within government cause insufficient progress in project implementation	Organizational	Government stakeholders are managing multiple projects and a lack of focus could cause delays or insufficient delivery of the project interventions. Changing committee membership is a challenge for knowledge retainment. I = 3 P = 4	The project will strengthen institutional and technical capacities for planning, designing and implementing adaptation actions throughout the project duration. Technical and capacity building expertise will be contracted to work with and train local technical staff and establish mechanisms and procedures. A dedicated Project Manager will be supported by a CTA to ensure smooth and timely delivery of project outputs.

13	Dependency on domestic flights/boat transfers for transport of personnel, equipment materials to remote outer islands	Operational	Limited ticket availability, cancellations and/or delays of domestic flights and boat transfers to the project sites may delay project implementation. International shipments of materials and goods to suppliers are often delayed. I = 3 P = 5	Transport of project personnel for carrying out activities in outer islands, will be planned outside peak seasons, and for larger teams chartered flight/ boats will be considered as the most cost-effective solution. For transportation of equipment, construction materials and machinery to outer islands, one of the selection criteria for the vendor/ construction company is the transportation capability so that the project will not rely on the existing boats in the country. Project planning will take into account the time required for procurement and delivery of international materials and goods by proactive and realistic planning.
14	Limited manpower and limited connectivity to outer islands reduces information sharing and feedback loops	Operational	Limited manpower as well as limited phone and internet connectivity to outer islands make information sharing and feedback challenging I = 2 P = 5	The project will be supported by dedicated project island technical support officers in the projects islands. These officers will be based with Island Councils to enhance information sharing and feedback, through regular communication with the OB NSPD and the PMU. Unreliability and break-down of telecom connectivity can cause delays in information-sharing, however joint monitoring by sectors involved in the project and frequent monitoring visits will help to ensure information sharing and feedback.
15	Community engagement and participation can potentially be impacted by cultural norms and traditions and affected by addiction problems (gambling and alcohol)	Operational	Different cultural norms and traditions in the project islands can impact project implementation schedules. Addiction-related problems may lead to difficulties in engaging communities in awareness activities and trainings I = 3 P = 4	Project design islands consultations highlighted the need and interest of communities for CCA&DRM-awareness and close engagement in the project. In line with the consultation findings, the project will engage community-members in smaller groups, apply a GESI-sensitive approach, make use of existing community-based groups, and plan community engagement activities in conjunction with cultural/social activities to attract engagement and interest. Different cultural norms and traditions in the 5 project islands will be taken into consideration by close involvement of Island Councils and community representative in the planning pf activities.

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The project will be guided by a Project Board composed by the OB National Strategic Policy Division (NSPD, chair, executive), UNDP (senior supplier) and the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA, beneficiary), representing islands communities. The Project Board is the decision-making authority. A Technical Advisory Committee constituted by the KNEG (and sub-groups of the KNEG as required) will provide technical advice to the Project Board and the PMU and ensure close cooperation during the implementation of project activities.

A Project Management Unit will be based in the office of the OB National Strategic Policy Division to ensure close cooperation and alignment with CCA&DRM-priorities. Based on experience from other LDCF-projects in Kiribati, the PMU will consist of a Project Manager and a Finance/Procurement Officer. The PMU will be supported by a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA, part-time), a Communications Officer, as well as output-specific Technical Assistance. Further, the Project will contribute to the cost-sharing of a Finance Officer based in the MFED to support implementation of all UNDP-supported projects.

At outer island level, improving WoI-planning and monitoring will require additional support for Island Councils. As such, Project Islands Technical Support Officers will be established within the five Islands Councils with the aim of supporting project implementation by strengthening information and communication mechanisms for GESI responsive IVA, ICSP, WoI-implementation and investments planning processes, coordination of community awareness and outreach activities, and implementation of the adaptive solutions identified under Outcome 3. Their role will also include KJIP monitoring and KIVA database updates. As such, the Project Island Technical Support Officers will support the project implementation activities during the project period, while also contributing to improved data gathering, information sharing and serve as communication link between outer island and national level agencies and processes. During the project implementation and terminal evaluation, the role of project islands technical support officers will be reviewed, and sustainability of their positions will be discussed with government.

The Project will ensure coordination with other projects through the OB NSPD and KNEG. Specifically, the Project will align with a number of on-going projects with similar objectives to maximise benefits and synergies. These projects include other GEF-supported projects such as the GEF-LDCF Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change-project and the GEF-project Resilient Islands, Resilient communities (R2R)-project. The Project has several linkages to both projects, that will be coordinated through the involvement of the KNEG as technical advisory committee for all CCA/DRM projects, coordination with the GEF-OFP and cooperation related to the implementation of specific project activities, in particular IVA-processes, improvement of Early Warning Systems (EWS), improved food security through cooperation and engagement of agricultural extension officers, as well as community outreach planning and monitoring.

Coordination and cooperation with other projects and partners will also be facilitated through the existing WoI-partner network. Under outcome 4, the Project will revive and strengthen this network by including more partners and ensuring regular information sharing and participation of the OB NSPD. Currently members of the network are: EU, GIZ, SPC, SPREP, UNDP, UNICEF, USAID, USP, however during the project inception it will be considered to broaden the network with new partners, including resident partners in Kiribati.

UNDP and UNICEF will further strengthen cooperation in a number of areas through the Project, namely in relation to strengthening and adopting the WoI-approach and in the implementation of interventions related to improving food security in schools, improving water security in community-facilities such as schools, health clinics and island councils,

and retrofitting of school buildings. In these areas, the Project will build on UNICEF's experience and existing materials and add value to the work of UNICEF by addressing medium and long-term adaptation needs through institutional strengthening at national, island and community levels, review and development of joint resources and joint monitoring mechanisms.

The Project will also build a strong partnership with the Ministry of Women, Youth and Social Affairs with the intention of: i) ensuring that the perspectives of women, youth and people with disabilities are incorporated in project planning and implementation and ii) building the capacity of the MWYSA staff (including Assistant Social Welfare Officers based in the outer islands) to better understand and respond to the impacts of CCA&DRM on vulnerable groups. Strategies to achieve this are described in the GESI action plan (Annex G to the project document).

Linkages to recent and parallel CCA&DRM projects

The project design integrates lessons learned and builds on the work of previous and current CCA&DRM projects in Kiribati including the recent KJIP-review (also including recommendations for Strengthening Gender Considerations in Kiribati's National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Process), establishment of the KIVA database, piloting of the WoI-approach, UNICEF's WASH and food security interventions, the Kiriwatsan Project I-II, the Building Safety and Resilience in the Pacific project (BSRP), the IFAD Outer Island Water and Food security project, and the Kiribati Adaptation Project (KAP I-III). Evaluations from several large adaptation projects ending in 2018 (e.g. W-o-I evaluation, KAP III evaluation) will be further reviewed at the project inception during the detailed project planning. As such, project interventions have been designed to avoid overlaps and build on methodologies and resources developed by previous and current projects.

The Project has several linkages to the on-going GEF-LDCF Food Security project, in particular support to IVA-processes, improvement of Early Warning Systems (EWS), and improved food security through agriculture. The Project is building on existing lessons from IVA data collection and use, EWS implementation and operationalization, and training materials for extension officers and schools, and during the parallel implementation of the projects, synergies and coordination will be further ensured. Linkages and synergies with the GEF-project Resilient Islands, Resilient communities (R2R)-project (approved 2018), in particular in relation to agroforestry cooperation and engagement of agricultural extension officers, community outreach planning and materials, and monitoring, will be coordinated during implementation through the KNEG.

During implementation, technical interventions under Outcome 3 will be further developed and aligned with parallel projects by various government sectors, working in close collaboration with technical specialists and relevant stakeholders. The Project will coordinate and build on synergies with a number of current and planned projects and programmes described under partnerships, in particular the UNDP-LDCF Food Security Project, UNICEF-implemented projects related to WASH and food security, the "Outer Islands Infrastructure Project" (GoK, ADB, WB), and the project "Supporting the implementation of the Line and Phoenix Integrated Development Strategy 2016-2036 with a specific focus on WASH and energy for a healthier population and a cleaner environment" (EU). More broadly, the Project will enhance coordination among partners through the existing WoI-partner network as described under outcome 4. A list of relevant recent and parallel projects is included as annex M.

Partnerships

The Project will align with a number of on-going projects with similar objectives to maximise benefits and synergies as described under section II (Strategy). These projects include other UNDP-supported projects (UNDP-LDCF Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change and UNDP Governance project (pipeline)), UNICEF-supported projects (WASH in Schools; WASH and Nutrition; WASH in schools and health care facilities in Line islands), SPC (ISACC – Institutional Strengthening for PICs to Adapt to Climate Change), GoK/ADB/WB (Outer Island Infrastructure Project), and the EU (water security projects in Kiritimati island). Project details are presented in annex M: Current CCA&DRM-related projects in Kiribati.

Coordination and cooperation with the above-mentioned projects and partners will be facilitated through the KNEG and the existing WoI-partner network. Under outcome 4, the Project will revive and strengthen this network by including more partners and ensuring regular information sharing and participation of the OB NSPD. Currently members of the network are: EU, GIZ, SPC, SPREP, UNDP, UNICEF, USAID, USP, however during the project inception it will be considered to broaden the network with new partners, including resident partners in Kiribati.

UNDP and UNICEF will further strengthen cooperation in a number of areas through the Project, namely in relation to strengthening and adopting the WoI-approach and in the implementation of interventions related to improving food security in schools, improving water security in community-facilities such as schools, health clinics and island councils, and retrofitting of school buildings. In these areas, the Project will build on UNICEF's experience and existing materials and add value to the work of UNICEF by addressing medium and long-term adaptation needs through institutional strengthening at national, island and community levels, review and development of joint resources and joint monitoring mechanisms.

The Project will also build a strong partnership with the Ministry of Women, Youth and Social Affairs with the intention of: i) ensuring that the perspectives of women, youth and people with disabilities are incorporated in project planning and implementation and ii) building the capacity of the MWYSA staff (including Assistant Social Welfare Officers based in the outer islands) to better understand and respond to the impacts of CCA on vulnerable groups. Strategies to achieve this are described in the GESI action plan (Annex G).

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

At national level and sub national-level, the project will build institutional capacities and institutionalize methodologies and tools to support effective integration of CCA&DRM in planning, monitoring and outreach.

The Project's adaptation benefits will be delivered at community-levels at five of the most vulnerable outer islands. The islands were selected based on criteria covering human/socio-economic and environmental vulnerabilities (health, literacy, food security, water security, erosion, biodiversity). The Project Islands are also representing geographical coverage of Kiribati's different islands groups, to ensure a nation-wide coverage, with the total population of the five islands representing approximately 16% of the total population of Kiribati. The island selection was done by OB NSPD and the KNEG, and endorsed by Cabinet, based on a detailed selection methodology with transparent criteria and related data sources developed as part of the piloting of the WoI-approach in Abaiang. During the project design phase, the criteria and data sources were reviewed and updated.

The project targets to deliver adaptation benefits to the entire population of the five Project Islands estimated at approximately 17,500 people of which 49% women (direct beneficiaries). For awareness activities, the project target is the entire population above 5 years of age (school children and adults) in the 5 project islands, estimated at approximately 14,500 people.

As a direct impact of improved adaptation practices and technologies for food security, water security, and coastal protection, the project is expected to derive significant socio-economic benefits. Implementation of improved adaptation practices and technologies will be supported both at household level and in community institutions/facilities such as schools, health clinics, community halls, agricultural nurseries, and Islands Councils. In total, the project will target improved food security, water security and coastal protection of 60 community institutions. At individual level, the project will support 300 farmers across the 5 islands and ensure that water adaptation technologies are in place to provide sufficient quantity of safe drinking water for the entire population of the 5 islands.

The main socio-economic benefits expected to be derived by the project are:

- Health: Availability of sufficient and safe water will contribute to improved health status. Availability of local produced vegetables and livestock will improve nutritional status.
- Poverty alleviation: Agricultural production will reduce the dependency on buying imported foods and provide income-generating opportunities. Availability of sufficient and safe water will reduce the time spent on carting and boiling water (of women and children in particular) that can be used for other purposes, for example income-generating activities and education.
- Education: Availability of water and food in schools will enhance the capacities of students for learning. Community outreach and engagement activities will enhance community awareness and enable communities to understand CCA&DRM impacts and how to build resilience.
- Safety: Protection from coastal inundation, and improved climate risk information and planning, will contribute to community safety and stability.

Improved socioeconomic status is, in turn, expected to contribute to the sustained and improved resilience of communities to withstand the impacts of climate and disaster risks.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the Knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

Through Outcome 4 of the Project, South-South cooperation, knowledge-sharing and learning will be promoted, both within Kiribati between project islands and other outer islands, and with communities and governments of other Pacific countries. National and regional knowledge sharing will be supported through existing national fora, such as the KNEG, the annual Mayor's Forum and the Parliament Select Committee for Climate Change, as well as regionally through the existing WoI-partner network and participation in regional events,

such as the GEF Expanded Constituency Workshop. Cooperation and sharing of lessons learned with government and communities implementing LDCF projects will be explored during implementation, for example Vanuatu. Additionally, the Pacific Risk Reduction Programme (PRRP), if extended, will offer a platform for Kiribati to share WoI-lessons and benefit from risk-informed governance and development approaches undertaken in neighbouring countries. Agencies, government staff and businesses from within Kiribati will also have the opportunity to engage with existing informal risk informed development networks who share lessons and programme in areas such as gender, local government, agriculture and the private sector.

The Project will enhance CCA&DRM knowledge management and awareness (outcome 4) by developing knowledge management and communication and outreach strategies and supporting development of IEC materials targeting both national, island and community level. The Knowledge Management Strategy will define mechanisms and templates for capturing lessons and best practices throughout the project cycle, as well as ways to integrate these lessons into the work of the project and beyond. During the last year of the Project, lessons learned and best practices from the WoI-implementation in 5 outer islands will be compiled and published for dissemination both nationally and regionally. Findings will be presented at a WoI-conference for stakeholders from outer islands, national level and regional partners with the objective of sharing results and discussing up-scaling/replication of the WoI-approach in other outer islands. Participation of government counterparts from neighboring countries will also be explored.

The Communications and Outreach strategy will be developed through involvement of all sectors (through the KNEG) to ensure a cross-sectoral approach, addressing CCA&DRM awareness perspectives from multiple sectors (environment, water, agriculture, land-use, fisheries). The Communication outreach strategy will define and support both formal and informal pathways of engaging different target groups. Communication strategies and materials will enhance awareness both within the government and the public about the WoI-approach and CCA&DRM. At national level, this will support the work of the OB NSPD and KNEG. For the targeted outer islands, the Communication Strategy and IEC materials will be translated in local language and used to support community outreach and awareness activities (output 2.1.4). This will include both information on the WoI-approach, CCA&DRM awareness and adaptive local solutions, through a mix of communication channels such as trainings/consultations through Islands Councils and community-based groups, posters, radio, and more innovative communication channels such as social media, popular theatre, music, games, story-telling, audio-visual productions, info-graphics etc. It is also essential that all IEC materials are sensitive to the needs and rights of women, children and people with disabilities and are widely disseminated in user-friendly formats.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

The LDCF project is consistent with the priority areas identified in the NAPA: water resource management (1), coastal zone management (2), agricultural and food crops development (6), and upgrading coastal defense and causeways (8). Furthermore, the project will support the NAP process by: building on existing capacities and ongoing initiatives - supporting KDP & KJIP implementation process; aligning with longer term NAP-relevant objectives and institutional processes, and NAPA priority areas for immediate adaptation actions, replicating “Whole of Island” processes and good practices in island groups and remote communities, and strengthen institutions and policies at national and island levels with tangible on-the-ground adaptation measures.

Climate change adaptation and disaster risk management are recognized as national priorities within Priority Areas 4 (Environment) and 6 (Infrastructure) of the Kiribati Development Plan (KDP 2016-2019) and Kiribati's 20-year Vision (KV20). Kiribati's national policy framework relating to climate change and disaster risk reduction (CCA&DRM) is robust, and includes several policy documents at national level, most recently with the Kiribati Climate Change Policy (KCCP, draft 2017) and the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2014-2023 (KJIP, reviewed 2018), which is the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) document. The KCCP highlights priority areas for the national government and the KJIP sets out the national framework for integrating CCA and DRM considerations into existing national and sector strategies. These documents supersede and complement previous policy documents, such as the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA 2007) and the National Disaster Risk Management Action Plan (2012).

The Project will provide support to national and sub-national government to integrate climate risks and opportunities into policy- and decision-making, as well as design and implement climate change adaptation (CCA) interventions aimed at reducing vulnerability and building the adaptive capacity of local communities. In this context, the project will contribute to implementation of the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster risk Reduction (KJIP 2014-2023, NAP-document), and specifically to the following eight of twelve National Adaptation Priorities:

- 1 – Strengthening good governance, policies, strategies and legislation
- 2 – Improving knowledge and information generation, management and sharing
- 3 - Strengthening and greening the private sector, including small-scale business
- 4 – Increasing water and food security with integrated and sector-specific approaches and promoting healthy and resilient ecosystems
- 6 – Promoting sound and reliable infrastructure development and land management
- 7 – Delivering appropriate education, training and awareness programmes
- 8 – Increasing effectiveness and efficiency of early warnings and disaster and emergency management
- 12 – Enhancing the participation and resilience of vulnerable groups.

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with UNDP requirements as outlined in the UNDP Program and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) and UNDP Evaluation Policy. While these UNDP requirements are not outlined in this project document, the UNDP Country Office will work with the relevant project stakeholders to ensure UNDP M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion and to high quality standards. Additional mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements (as outlined below) will be undertaken in accordance with the GEF M&E policy and other relevant GEF policies .

In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management will be agreed during the Project Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report. This will include the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities including the GEF Operational Focal Point and national/regional institutes assigned to undertake project monitoring. The GEF Operational Focal Point will strive to ensure consistency in the approach taken to the GEF-specific M&E requirements (notably the GEF Tracking Tools) across all GEF-financed projects in the country. This could be achieved for example by using one national institute to complete the GEF Tracking Tools for all GEF-financed projects in the country, including projects supported by other GEF Agencies.

M&E Oversight and monitoring responsibilities:

Project Manager: The Project Manager is responsible for day-to-day project management and regular monitoring of project results and risks, including socio-cultural and environmental risks. The Project Manager will ensure that all Project staff maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in M&E and reporting of project results. The Project Manager will inform the Project Board, the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF RTA of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation so that appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted.

The Project Manager will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in Annex A, including annual output targets to support the efficient implementation of the project. The Project Manager will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the Results Framework indicators are monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF PIR, and that the monitoring of risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g. ESMP, Gender Action Plan, Stakeholder Engagement Plan etc.) occur on a regular basis.

Project Board: The Project Board will take corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. The Project Board will hold project reviews to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan for the following year. In the project's final year, the Project Board will hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to highlight project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. This final review meeting will also discuss the findings outlined in the project terminal evaluation report and the management response.

Project Implementing Partner: The Implementing Partner is responsible for providing all required information and data necessary for timely, comprehensive and evidence-based project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary. The Implementing Partner will strive to ensure project-level M&E is undertaken by national institutes and is aligned with national systems so that the data used and generated by the project supports national systems.

UNDP Country Office: The UNDP Country Office will support the Project Manager as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The annual supervision missions will take place according to the schedule outlined in the annual work plan. Supervision mission reports will be circulated to the project team and Project Board within one month of the mission. The UNDP Country Office will initiate and organize key GEF M&E activities including the annual GEF PIR, the independent mid-term review and the independent terminal evaluation. The UNDP Country Office will also ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality.

The UNDP Country Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](#). This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed and monitored and reported using UNDP corporate systems; the regular updating of the ATLAS risk log; and, the updating of the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on gender mainstreaming progress reported in the GEF PIR and the UNDP ROAR. Any quality concerns flagged during these M&E activities (e.g. annual GEF PIR quality assessment ratings) must be addressed by the UNDP Country Office and the Project Manager. The UNDP Country Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure to support ex-post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).

UNDP-GEF Unit: Additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support will be provided by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP-GEF Directorate as needed.

Audit: The project will be audited as per UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on NIM implemented projects.[1]

Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:

Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held within two months after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to, amongst others:

- a) Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project strategy and implementation;
- b) Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;
- c) Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;
- d) Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF OFP in M&E;
- e) Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; SESP, Environmental and Social Management Plan and other safeguard requirements; project grievance mechanisms; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;
- f) Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and
- g) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first-year annual work plan.

The Project Manager will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser and will be approved by the Project Board.

GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Manager will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the PIR. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR.

The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR as appropriate. The quality rating of the previous year's PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.

Lessons learned and knowledge generation: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to the project. The project will identify, analyse and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely. There will be continuous information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The following GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be used to monitor global environmental benefits: LDCF/SCCF Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT). The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool(s) – submitted as Annex B to the project document – will be updated by the Project Manager/Team (not the evaluation consultants hired to undertake the MTR or the TE) (indicate other project partner, if agreed) and shared with the mid-term review consultants and terminal

evaluation consultants before the required review/evaluation missions take place. The updated GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be submitted to the GEF along with the completed Mid-term Review report and Terminal Evaluation report.

Independent Mid-term Review (MTR): An independent mid-term review process will begin after the second PIR has been submitted to the GEF, and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in the same year as the 3rd PIR. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be 'independent, impartial and rigorous'. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final MTR report will be available in English and will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser and approved by the Project Board.

Terminal Evaluation (TE): An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The terminal evaluation process will begin three months before operational closure of the project allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Manager will remain on contract until the TE report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](#). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be 'independent, impartial and rigorous'. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final TE report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser and will be approved by the Project Board. The TE report will be publicly available in English on the UNDP ERC.

The UNDP Country Office will include the planned project terminal evaluation in the UNDP Country Office evaluation plan and will upload the final terminal evaluation report in English and the corresponding management response to the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). Once uploaded to the ERC, the UNDP IEO will undertake a quality assessment and validate the findings and ratings in the TE report and rate the quality of the TE report. The UNDP IEO assessment report will be sent to the GEF CEO along with the project terminal evaluation report.

Final Report: The project's terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

The Mandatory GEF M&E requirements and M&E budget is presented in the table below. The total budget allocated for M&E is 145,000 USD and includes project inception workshop, yearly project monitoring (project manager) and audits (UNDP), project board meetings, MTR and TE, including updates of the GEF tracking tool (AMAT). The implementation and monitoring of the project's knowledge management generation, stakeholder engagement plan, GESI-action plan, SESP (including ESIA and EDMP), and risk management have been built into and budgeted for under the relevant project outcomes, and do not require separate budget. The project manager, with support of the communications officer and the CTA, will ensure other M&E requirements, such as projects reports and PIRs, and do not require separate budget.

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ^[2] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Inception Workshop	UNDP Country Office	USD 15,000	None	Within two months of project document signature
Inception Report	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Risk management	Project Manager Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	Project Manager	Per year: USD 4,000	None	Annually before PIR
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies	UNDP Country Office	Per year: USD 5,000	None	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Manager	None	None	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Manager UNDP Country Office	None	None	On-going
Stakeholder Engagement Plan	Project Manager UNDP Country Office	None	None	On-going

Gender Action Plan	Project Manager UNDP Country Office UNDP GEF team	None	None	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Manager UNDP Country Office	None	None	On-going
Project Board meetings	Project Board UNDP Country Office Project Manager	USD 10,000	None	Annually
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office	None ^[3]	None	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Troubleshooting as needed
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	To be determined.
Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool to be updated	Project Manager	USD 5,000	None	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 35,000	None	Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR.
Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be updated	Project Manager	USD 5,000	None	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 30,000	None	At least three months before operational closure
TOTAL indicative COST				
Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD 145,000	None	

[1] See guidance here: <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPChapter.aspx?TermID=f3136f23-5ced-45d8-89a0-c7b6b56b5229>

[2] Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

[3] The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Adriana Dinu	5/25/2018	Aishath Azza		aishath.azza@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

<p>This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):</p> <p>SDG 13 –Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts;</p> <p>SDG 6 - Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all;</p> <p>SDG 12 – Achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture;</p> <p>SDG 5 - Achieve gender equality and empower women.</p>					
<p>This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:</p> <p>SRPD Outcome 1: By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters; and environmental protection is strengthened.</p>					
<p>This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:</p> <p>Output 1.4: Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation cross sectors which is funded and implemented</p>					
	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline[1]	Mid-term Target[2]	End of Project Target	Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions[3]
<p>Project Objective:</p> <p>To address urgent and immediate adaptation priorities, and kick-start the medium to long-term adaptation planning process to ensure that the development efforts are</p>	<p>Indicator 1: Extent to which implementation of comprehensive measures - plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets – to achieve low-emission and climate-resilient development objectives has improved <i>(UNDP Strategic Plan IRRF outcome indicator 1.4.2)</i></p>	<p>Baseline and impact measurement through scorecard (IRRF indicator 1.4.2) assessment: Baseline: 2</p>	3	4	<p>Data source: Project reports (PIR, MTR, TE)</p> <p>Risks: Changing government leadership at national level resulting in project delays or refocus; Limited capacities and human resources cause insufficient commitment and attention to project activities and implementation.</p> <p>Assumptions: With the support of the project, government sectors are willing and able to integrate CCA&DRM in plans, programmes and budgets.</p>

 durable and sustainable	Indicator 2: Number of direct project beneficiaries – disaggregated by gender <i>(AMAT indicator 1: Number of direct beneficiaries)</i>	0	2,000 people	17,500 people	Data source: Project reports (PIRs, MTR, TE) Risks: Climate-induced disasters such as drought and flooding will disrupt or delay the project. Assumptions: Ownership and involvement of communities and local government in the target areas are committed to participating in the project and adopting climate-resilient technologies and practices.
Component 1: National and sectoral policies strengthened through enhanced institutions and knowledge	<i>Outcome 1.1 Capacities of national government institutions and personnel strengthened on mainstreaming climate and disaster risks, supporting the operationalization of the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2014-2023 (KJIP)</i> 1.1.1 National and sectoral level policy, planning and legal frameworks revised or developed, integrating climate change and disaster risks 1.1.2 National, sectoral and island-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes, related data gathering, and communication systems enhanced and adjusted to support KJIP implementation 1.1.3 KJIP Coordination mechanism enhanced 1.1.4 Tools and mechanisms to develop, stock, and share data, knowledge, and information on climate change and disaster risks enhanced at the national level				
	Indicator 3: Number of legal frameworks and plans mainstreaming CCA&DRM, including gender from a CCA/DRM-perspective	0	Total at mid-term: 8 4 Ministerial Strategic Plans (MSPs) 4 Ministerial Operational Plans (MOPs)	Total at project-end: 9 At least 4 MSPs At least 4 MOPs At least 1 legal framework	Data source: Legal review, MSPs, MOPs, project reports Risks: Changing government leadership at national and local level resulting in project delays or refocus; Limited capacities and human resources cause insufficient commitment and attention to project activities and implementation. Assumptions: Government sectors are willing to integrate CCA&DRM in legal frameworks, strategic and operational plans

	<p>Indicator 4: Extent to which capacities of OB National Strategic Policy Division (NSPD) to prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures has improved</p> <p><i>(AMAT Indicator 10: Capacities of regional, national and sub-national institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures)</i></p>	<p>Baseline and impact measurement through scorecard (AMAT) assessment:</p> <p>Baseline: OB NSPD score 4</p>	<p>OB NSPD: at least score 6</p>	<p>OB NSPD: at least score 9</p>	<p>Data source: AMAT scorecard assessment during MTR and TE, project reports</p> <p>Risks: Changing government leadership at national and local level resulting in project delays or refocus; Government staff and KNEG/committee membership turnover in terms of retaining capacity/knowledge.</p> <p>Assumptions: With the support of the Project OB NSPD is able to enhance CCA capacities</p>
	<p>Indicator 5: Number of frameworks and tools enhanced to support KJIP-monitoring and CCA&DRM data management and analysis, including gender disaggregated data</p>	<p>KIVA database established 2017-2018</p>	<p>Total at mid-term: 3</p> <p>KJIP M&E framework developed</p> <p>KIVA database tool developed for KJIP-monitoring at national and subnational levels</p> <p>GIS-platform strengthened</p>	<p>Total at project-end: 4</p> <p>KIVA database data analysis tool/module developed for key sectors</p>	<p>Data source: KIVA database, GIS-platform, project reports</p> <p>Risks: Government staff and committee membership turnover in terms of retaining capacity/knowledge.</p> <p>Assumptions: Government sectors are willing to coordinate and enhance monitoring and data management</p>

Component 2: Island level climate change resilient planning and institutional capacity development	Outcome 2.1 Capacity of island administrations enhanced to plan for and monitor climate change adaptation processes in a Whole-of-Island (WoI) approach:				
	<p>2.2.1 Island and community level vulnerability and adaptation (IVA) assessments revised and/or developed at 5 islands</p> <p>2.1.2 Island Council Strategic Plans formulated/reviewed, integrating whole of island adaptation action plans in 5 islands</p> <p>2.1.3 Tools and mechanisms to develop, stock, and share data, knowledge, and information on CC and DR enhanced at the island level – with the option of exploring the software and hardware to strengthen information and communication mechanisms for early warning system (EWS)</p> <p>2.1.4 I Kiribati population in 5 islands receives formal and informal training and awareness raising programmes on climate change and disaster risk management</p>				
Indicator 6: Number of GESI-sensitive plans supporting Island-level strategic development (ICSP), WoI-planning and community-based disaster risk management (CBDRM) planning based on identified and prioritized vulnerabilities (IVA)	0	Total at mid-term: 10 plans	Total at project-end: 10 plans	Data-source: KIVA database, ICSP, WoI-implementation and investment plans, CBRDM-plans, project reports	
<i>(Link to AMAT indicator 13: Sub-national plans and processes developed and strengthened to identify, prioritize and integrate adaptation strategies and measures)</i>	IVA completed for 8 islands (1 project island - Kiritimati) 7 Island Council Strategic Plans developed (0 in project islands)	5 ICSP reviewed/developed 5 WoI-implementation plans developed and operationalized		Risks: Changing leadership at national and local level resulting in project delays or refocus; Climate-induced disasters such as drought and flooding will disrupt or delay the project; Dependency on domestic flights/boat transfers for transport of personnel and equipment to remote outer islands will delay project implementation. Assumptions: KNEG and Islands Councils are willing to work collaboratively to develop and implement Island Council Strategic Plans and WoI-implementation plans in each of the five project islands.	

	<p>Indicator 7: Extent to which capacities of Island Councils to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures has improved</p> <p><i>(Link to AMAT Indicator 10: Capacities of regional, national and sub-national institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures)</i></p>	<p>Baseline and impact measurement through scorecard (AMAT) assessment:</p> <p>Baseline:</p> <p>Island Councils score 1</p>	<p>Islands Councils: at least score 4</p>	<p>Islands Councils: at least score 8</p>	<p>Data source: AMAT scorecard assessment during MTR and TE, project reports</p> <p>Risks: Changing government leadership at national and local level resulting in project delays or refocus; Limited capacities and human resources cause insufficient commitment and attention to project activities and implementation; Island Council staff and committee membership turnover in terms of retaining capacity/knowledge.</p> <p>Assumptions: Islands Councils are able to integrate CCA&DRM in strategic and operational plans and enhance CCA-capacity with support of the Project</p>
	<p>Indicator 8: Extent to which population reached through community outreach and awareness activities (gender disaggregated data)</p> <p><i>(Link to AMAT indicator 5: Public awareness activities carried out and population reached)</i></p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Total at midterm: 6,000 people</p>	<p>Total at project- end: 14,500 people</p> <p>(100% of population at 5 islands above 5 years of age)</p>	<p>Data source: Outreach-plans and records of awareness activities</p> <p>Risks: Climate-induced disasters such as drought and flooding will disrupt or delay the project; Community engagement and participation negatively affected due to addiction (gambling and alcohol).</p> <p>Assumptions: CBOs and communities in the target areas are committed to participating in awareness activities and outreach programmes.</p>

Component 3: Whole of Island implementation of water, food security and infrastructure adaptation measures	Outcome 3.1 Community capacities enhanced to adapt to climate induced risks to food and water security and community assets				
	<p>3.1.1 <i>Climate-resilient agriculture and livestock practices (including supply, production and processing/storage aspects) are introduced in at least 5 additional islands and communities</i></p> <p>3.1.2 <i>Water supply and storage facilities enhanced and/or installed at 5 additional islands and communities</i></p> <p>3.1.3 <i>Shoreline protection and climate proofing of infrastructure measures implemented at 5 additional islands and communities</i></p>				
<p>Indicator 9: Number of agricultural nurseries, community-groups, schools and farmers practicing and promoting climate-resilient agroforestry practices in the areas of climate-resilient crop-diversification, water use, land-use, compost, and livestock-production</p> <p><i>(Link to AMAT indicator 4: Extent of adoption of climate-resilient technologies/ practices)</i></p>	<p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Baseline to be validated at project year 1 by MELAD for each of the 5 targeted islands</p>	<p>Total at project mid-term:</p> <p>5 agricultural nurseries</p> <p>5 schools</p> <p>5 community-groups</p>	<p>Total at project end:</p> <p>5 Agricultural nurseries</p> <p>10 Schools</p> <p>15 Community-groups</p> <p>300 farmers (1,800 people living in farming households)</p>	<p>Data source: KIVA database, training and implementation records.</p> <p>Risks: Climate-induced disasters such as drought and flooding will disrupt or delay the project; Introduction of climate change- resilient species (flora) negatively impacts local ecosystems and biodiversity; Dependency on domestic flights/boat transfers for transport of personnel and equipment to remote outer islands delays project implementation.</p> <p>Assumptions: All extension officers, schools, community-groups, and farmers are committed to participating in the project activities and adopting climate-resilient technologies and practices.</p>	

	<p>Indicator 10: Number of islands with sufficient quantity of safe drinking water, and related improved capacities for operation and maintenance, given existing and projected climate change</p> <p><i>(Link to AMAT indicator 4: Extent of adoption of climate-resilient technologies/ practices)</i></p>	0	<p>0</p> <p>Water Resources Assessments carried out for all project islands</p> <p>Technology assessment</p>	<p>5 islands</p> <p>Water adaptation technologies in place to provide sufficient quantity of safe drinking water in 5 islands</p>	<p>Data source: KIVA database, training and implementation records.</p> <p>Risks: Climate-induced disasters such as drought and flooding will disrupt or delay the project; Installation of improved WASH technologies and retrofitting of infrastructure temporarily affect biological or human environments; Dependency on domestic flights/boat transfers for transport of personnel and equipment to remote outer islands delays project implementation.</p> <p>Assumptions: All extension officers and communities are committed to participating in the project activities and improved WASH technologies and practices. Involvement in the design and implementation of the project interventions and ongoing communication on the expected benefits will result in long-term support to the project and adoption of new knowledge, skills and practices in water management systems.</p>
	<p>Indicator 11: Number of community infrastructure and costal infrastructure in high risks zones assessed and retrofitted according to safety standards and gender responsive design protocols</p> <p><i>(Link to AMAT indicator 4: Extent of adoption of climate-resilient technologies/ practices)</i></p>	<p>0</p> <p>Baseline to be validated during project year 1 by MISE-CEU for each of the 5 targeted islands</p>	<p>0</p> <p>Vulnerable public and community assets in high risk zones identified, assessed and prioritized</p>	<p>5 community/coastal infrastructures</p>	<p>Data source: KIVA database, training and implementation records.</p> <p>Risks: Climate-induced disasters such as drought and flooding will disrupt or delay the project; Installation of improved WASH technologies and retrofitting of infrastructure temporarily affect biological or human environments; Dependency on domestic flights/boat transfers for transport of personnel and equipment to remote outer islands delays project implementation.</p> <p>Assumptions: Based on cost-benefit analysis and technical assessments, retrofitting of infrastructure is feasible within allocated budget.</p>

Component 4: Whole-of-Island communication and knowledge management	Outcome 4.1. Effective communication and coordination supports knowledge sharing and upscaling of the project approach			
	<p>4.1.1 <i>Whole-of-Island communication, engagement and coordination strengthened at national, island and community levels</i></p> <p>4.1.2 <i>Whole-of-Island lessons learned captured and shared with national and regional stakeholders to promote project replication and upscaling</i></p>			
Indicator 12: Number of communication and knowledge management materials and events on WoI approach supported	0	Total at mid-term: 3	Total at project-end: at least 6	Data source: Communication strategy and project reports.
		1 WoI and CCA&DRM-knowledge management and communication strategy for national level and project islands	2 WoI-regional partner meetings	Risks: Limited manpower and limited connectivity to outer islands reduces information sharing and feedback loops
		1 GESI-research publication	1 WoI-lessons learned publication	Assumptions: National and regional partners in WoI-network are committed to enhance coordination and information-sharing.
		1 WoI-regional partner meetings	1 national WoI-forum for islands, national and regional stakeholders by the end of the project	Interest from regional partners/countries to participate in WoI meetings

[1] Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

[2] Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

[3] Data collection methods should outline specific tools used to collect data and additional information as necessary to support monitoring. The PIR cannot be used as a source of verification.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Review criteria	Questions	Secretariat comments at PIF/work programme inclusion	UNDP responses at PIF stage	UNDP response at application for CEO endorsement	Reference in Project Document / CEO endorsement template
Responses to GEF Secretariat PIF review March 16th 2015:					
	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	NA	Yes, it is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.	NA	Project document: Section II, pp. 10-11 CEO endorsement template: A1.5 pp. 10-11

<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>The GEF has made significant adaptation-relevant investments in Kiribati through previous projects, but the PIF does not clarify how the proposed project will build upon the capacities built and investments made.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please briefly outline how the current project will build upon the previously-financed adaptation-relevant measures that the GEF and other donors have supported.</p>	<p>The proposed project will build on previously-financed and ongoing adaptation-related measures supported by GEF. Key initiatives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA), LDCF, US\$ 200,000, 2005 – 2007, UNDP with Ministry of Environment and Social Development · Kiribati Adaptation Program – Pilot Implementation Phase (KAP-II), GEF TF, US\$ 1.8 million, 2006 – 2010, World Bank with Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Republic of Kiribati · Increasing Resilience to Climate Variability and Hazards (KAP III), LDCF, US\$ 3 million, 2011-2016, World Bank / Aus-AID, JICA, GFDRR with Office of the President (OB), Ministry of Environment, Land and Agric. Development, Ministry of Public Works and Utilities, Meteorological Office · Enhancing National Food Security in the Context of Global Climate Change, LDCF, US\$ 4,45 million, 2015 – 2020. UNDP with Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD) · R2R Resilient Islands, Resilient Communities, GEF TF, US\$4,72 million, 2015 – 2020, FAO with MELAD <p>The proposed project will build on the abovementioned projects by:</p> <p>1. Implementing and/or addressing gaps and lessons learned of climate change adaptation policies and plans developed by previous GEF investments, such as: NAPA, KJIP, KDP, National Water Strategy and Master Plan (by KAP-II). This will inform and be reflected within Components 1 and 2 of the proposed project.</p> <p>2. Reviewing, enhancing and/or geographically scaling methodologies and tools developed by previous and ongoing GEF investments, such as disaster/flood management measures implemented in Tarawa (KAP-II), water resource management and coastal protection / mangrove rehabilitation efforts supported in Tarawa (KAP-II)</p>	<p>The Project design is concurrent with the response given at PIF stage. The Project will build upon previous adaptation investments as further specified in the relevant sections of the CEO endorsement template and the project document.</p> <p>The project design integrates lessons learned and builds on the work of previous and current CCA&DRM projects in Kiribati including the recent NAP-review (also including recommendations for Strengthening Gender Considerations in Kiribati's National Adaptation Plan Process), establishment of the KIVA database, piloting of the WoI-approach, UNICEF's WASH and food security interventions, the Kiriwatsan Project I-II, the Building Safety and Resilience in the Pacific project (BSRP), the IFAD Outer Island Water and Food security project, and the Kiribati Adaptation Project (KAP I-III). Evaluations from several large adaptation projects ending in 2018 will be further reviewed at the project inception during the detailed project planning. As such, project interventions have been designed to build on methodologies and resources developed by previous and current projects.</p> <p>The Project has several linkages to the GEF-LDCF Food Security project, in particular support to IVA-processes, improvement of Early Warning Systems (EWS), and improved food security through agriculture. The Project is building on existing lessons from IVA data collection and use, EWS implementation and operationalization, and training materials for extension officers and schools. During the parallel implementation of the projects, synergies and coordination will be further ensured through the KNEG. Linkages and synergies with the GEF-project Resilient Islands, Resilient communities (R2R)-project (approved 2018) will also be further explored during implementation, in particular in relation to agroforestry cooperation and engagement of agricultural extension officers, community outreach planning and materials, and monitoring.</p> <p>During implementation, technical interventions under Outcome 3 will be further developed and aligned with parallel projects by various government sectors, working in</p>	<p>Project document: Section I, p. 8, Section II, pp. 13-14</p> <p>CEO endorsement template: A1.2. pp. 6-7</p> <p>B1. pp. 25-26</p>
---	--	---	--	---

<p>3. Does the PIF Sufficiently indicate the drivers of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>More information is requested on sustainability and scale-up.</p> <p>Sustainability: The project includes strong capacity building elements and, in seeking to embed climate change adaptation considerations at the policy level, will contribute to sustained and resilient long-term planning. However, more information is requested on how the LDCF investments will be sustained and maintained after 5 years, when the project closes.</p> <p>Scale-up: The project is being implemented on a pilot basis in selected areas of specific islands. Please discuss whether it will be feasible to scale up these approaches on other islands of Kiribati and the Pacific region generally.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement:</p> <p>Several LDCF projects provide adaptation benefits at the ecosystem, community and governance levels. Please discuss how the LDCF contribution to the 'Whole of Island' adaptation approach in Kiribati is particularly innovative.</p>	<p>Sustainability</p> <p>The project aims to ensure sustainability through strengthening institutions, policies and legal frameworks. Institutionally, along with the recently approved LDCF financed project, “Enhancing National Food Security in the Context of Global Climate Change”, this project will strengthen the Office of Te Beretitenti (OB) to enhance coordination capacity between both central and line ministries and departments to plan and implement climate change adaptation initiatives. This will be done through supporting the Project Management structure and capacities within the OB to coordinate and oversee all climate related initiatives in Kiribati comprehensively. This will enable further coherence in climate change governance through ensuring consistencies in programming and policy-making.</p> <p>In addition to strengthening institutions, the project will explore translating climate change policies into legal frameworks, as done so in FSM and planned in Tonga. UNDP is already working on strengthening climate change governance with Kiribati parliament and legislative bodies, and further support in this area will help ensure that implementation of CCA efforts can be continued under legal mandate or other policy instruments after the project period. This is particularly important in light of the fact that Kiribati is expecting leadership change in the coming year. Current President Tong has been a strong climate change champion, but his third term will be completed in 2016. Therefore, climate change mainstreaming within national development planning, budgeting, and policy frameworks is required for sustaining and ensuring CCA as a central issue and mandate for Kiribati’s sustainable development.</p> <p>Scaling Up</p> <p>Integrated island level approach to climate change adaptation proposed under the Whole of</p>	<p>The Project design is concurrent with the response given at PIF stage. The Project design addresses innovativeness, sustainability and upscaling as further specified in CEO endorsement template and project document. Below is a summary of relevant sections:</p> <p>Innovativeness</p> <p>While the Whole-of-Island approach is an existing approach, it is still relatively new to the region and Kiribati, where it is yet to be adopted in a structured manner. The project is building on existing mechanisms and methodologies for WoI-planning (piloted in 1 island, Abaiang); however, addressing identified gaps by including new aspects and perspectives. Compared to other community- and governance levels adaptation interventions addressing specific sector needs, the WoI-approach offers an integrated multisector approach based on data-informed multi-sector vulnerabilities and priorities. In this way, the WoI approach encompasses sector needs and enables subnational and national government to identify, prioritize and allocate funding for adaptation gaps and needs in a holistic manner, taking into consideration existing investments.</p> <p>At present, the IVA-process (IVA carried out in 8 islands by the end of 2018), while identifying numerous crosscutting vulnerabilities, and the WoI-approach (piloted in 1 island), lack translation into integrated, planned action. The project will therefore enhance innovative data analysis and use for the formulation of island-level strategic plans as well as WoI-implementation and investment plans, enabling Island Councils and the government to plan, prioritize and identify funding needs and sources. Under Outcome 3, the use of innovative measures and technologies will be explored through sector-specific technology-assessments to identify the most appropriate and site-specific solutions in the areas of climate-resilient agro-forestry, water adaptation, and coastal protection.</p> <p>Sustainability and Upscaling</p> <p>The project is expected to have a lasting and enabling impact by building capacities and establishing</p>	<p>Project document: p. 38</p> <p>CEO endorsement template: A1.6. pp. 10-11</p>
---	--	---	--	---

	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Yes. Kiribati is highly vulnerable to adverse impacts of climate change in myriad ways, spanning exacerbation of extreme events (coastal storms, droughts, floods), salt-water inundation, pests and disease, and consequent impacts on food security, infrastructure, and other sectors.</p> <p>The proposed project aims at supporting development that is climate-resilient, by strengthening capacity across multiple stakeholder groups (communities, including women and youth groups; national government; island councils) on climate change adaptation, and supporting investments in climate resilience (climate-resilient crop varieties, adaptive land use and farming techniques, enhancement of water storage and use efficiency, protection of freshwater aquifers, etc.).</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>
--	---	-----------	--	-----------	-----------

<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBSs?</p>	<p>Further information is requested.</p> <p>1) Component 2 includes the revision or development of island and community vulnerability and adaptation assessments. LDCF resources are generally not intended for this purpose; is it possible to seek resources for the assessments elsewhere instead?</p> <p>2) This PIF request is for overall LDCF financing of almost \$10 million. Yet the UNDP is contributing only \$50,000 in grant co-financing, and all remaining co-financing from other sources is in-kind. Please explain the Agency's decision to contribute exceedingly low resources in co-financing for this otherwise ambitious project.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement:</p> <p>a) Please specify which islands in Kiribati the LDCF resources will support resilience measures on. If there are parallel adaptation efforts ongoing on these islands, how can we track adaptation benefits being provided through the LDCF?</p> <p>b) Component 3</p>	<p>1) In order to mainstream climate change adaptation within their medium to long-term development planning and budgeting process, the Government of Kiribati has expressed its strong interest and need to make policy decisions more evidence-based. The added perspective that the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process will have to the existing Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2014 – 2023 (KJIP) is the information of sector and island level climate change vulnerability and adaptation assessments. Therefore, conducting and/or enhancing existing V&A is a crucial component to strengthening island level climate change resilient planning and institutional capacity development.</p> <p>During the project design phase, the project will explore alternative resources that can finance and/or co-finance the proposed V&As. V&A in some villages in the 2 islands (Abaiang and Kuria) have been conducted by University of South Pacific through support from the European Commission. The project will explore during the design phase whether this effort can be expanded to other sites through their support.</p> <p>2) UNDP has limited programming budget in the Pacific including Kiribati. In Kiribati, UNDP is currently the GEF agency for “Enhancing National Food Security in the Context of Global Climate Change” project where UNDP in-kind co-financing of USD 140,000 has been allocated. At the PIF stage, US\$ 50,000 of grant co-financing has been identified for the continuation of the ongoing support from UNDP on climate change governance. UNDP is currently working on further expanding this initiative, in which case will be able to further provide grant and in-kind co-financing for the proposed LDCF project. UNDP co-financing information will be updated and reflected during the project design phase.</p>	<p>1) Vulnerability and Adaptation assessments</p> <p>V&A (Integrated Vulnerability Assessments – IVAs) have been carried out with national co-financing in 8 outer islands through support from various projects, mainly through the KAP-III and the LDCF-Food security project. For the project islands, the IVA has been carried out for 1 island (Kiritimati, with piloting of the KIVA database tool). For the other 4 project islands, funding is not available, and no other sources has been identified during project design. The WoI-approach builds on the IVA-information as evidence-base, and therefore it is crucial for the project, that IVA’s are carried out/reviewed at the beginning of the project. Waiting for co-financing would include a risk of jeopardizing the WoI-approach and project timeline, and therefore the project has been designed to conduct and/or enhance existing IVAs in the project islands – including strengthening of the IVA methodology and data analysis capacities.</p> <p>2) UNDP co-financing</p> <p>During the project design phase, identified UNDP co-financing amounts to USD 50,000 (grant) towards Outcome 4 and USD 190,000 (in-kind) towards strengthening of Early Warning Systems.</p> <p>a) Targeted project islands</p> <p>The project will target resilience measures on the following five (5) outer islands: North Tarawa, Makin, Kuria, Onotoa, and Kiritimati. The island selection has been done by the government (OB) and the KNEG based on a detailed selection methodology with transparent criteria and related indicators and data sources developed as part of the piloting of the WoI-approach in Abaiang. During the project design phase, the criteria and data sources were reviewed and updated. The criteria cover both human/socio-economic and environmental vulnerabilities (health, literacy, food security, water security, erosion, biodiversity (refer project document Annex K). The Project Islands that have been endorsed by Cabinet are also representing geographical coverage of Kiribati’s different islands groups, with the total population of the five islands representing approximately 16% of the total population of Kiribati.</p>	<p>NA</p>
---	--	--	--	-----------

<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>Yes, for PIF stage. A broad range of stakeholder groups has been identified, and relevant gender concerns have been broadly mentioned.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement:</p> <p>Please provide more information on how vulnerable community groups will be consulted and engaged during project design and implementation.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>The Project design phase and implementation involve participation of multiple stakeholders at national, island and community-levels as described in the relevant sections of the project document and CEO endorsement.</p> <p>During the project design phase, a Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) specialist was engaged to carry out GESI-consultations (along with UNDP country staff, OB staff and a national consultant), GESI-analysis, and formulate a GESI-action-plan. Vulnerable community groups (project direct beneficiaries) have been consulted during the project design process through islands consultations with community representatives in 4 of the 5 project islands (consultations in one island were cancelled due to flight cancellations). These consultations included one-to-one interviews as well as a series of focus group sessions aimed at assessing the impacts of climate change on all members of society, with special emphasis on the most vulnerable. The GESI-action plan identifies specific project strategies and actions to mainstream GESI-perspectives, that has been built into relevant activities under all project outcomes (project document annex G).</p> <p>During the project inception and as part of the project Communications and Outreach- and Knowledge Management strategies, a detailed GESI-sensitive stakeholder engagement plan will be developed.</p> <p>While project design consultations involved relevant civil society organizations, the role of those during project implementation has not been defined, besides the involvement of the Kiribati Local Governance Association (KiLGA) for the formulation of Island Council Strategic Plans. The number of NGO's in Kiribati is very limited, and none of the NGO's are present in the 5 project islands. However, community-based groups such as women's and youth groups present in the 5 project islands have been identified as possible channels for community engagement and awareness. For this purpose, island-specific engagement and outreach plans will be developed based on the communication and outreach strategy.</p>	<p>Project document: pp. 37-38</p> <p>Annex F: Stakeholder engagement plan</p> <p>Annex G: GESI analysis and action plan</p> <p>CEO endorsement template: A.3. and A.4. pp. 12-18</p>
---	--	-----------	--	---

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 200,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Technical review	45,000	23,712.09	21,287.91
Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	45,000	23,712.09	21,287.91
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments	45,000	23,712.09	21,287.91
Component D: Validation workshop	40,000	21,077.42	18,922.58
Component E: Completion of final documentation and submission package	25,000	13,173.38	11,826.62
Total	200,000	105,387.07	94,612.93

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

N/A

ANNEX: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

<input type="checkbox"/>

Submitted to HQ

Go To Home