

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9041

Countries

Kiribati

Project Name

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

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

7/17/2018

Review completed by PM

4/29/2020

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

FI, 7/18/18:

Yes. A PIF-approved sub-component has been adjusted to reflect the fact that other initiatives in the country are addressing one of the actions that had been proposed. Instead, the knowledge management and sharing element has been strengthened.

However, agency is requested to refer to comment for item 3, below.

FI, 5/17/2019:

Cleared. Please note that the specific review comments provided in the interim on this item were somehow deleted due to a Portal glitch.

PPO comment, 6/18/2019:

On pgs 58–59 of the ProDoc, UNDP states that there are certain execution functions for which it would be responsible that “will be provided only upon Government request”. However, according to the GEF Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle, if a GEF Agency is considering execution of some project activities, the documentation must include an explicit request signed by the GEF OFP(s) of the participant country(ies) and this has to be submitted by the time of CEO Endorsement request at the latest. Thus, if such a written request from the OFP is not submitted, the ProDoc (and any other documents that reflect UNDP intent to execute any project activities) needs to be amended to remove reference to such intent.

Recommended action: The Agency is requested to either remove all references to execution of any project activities, or to submit a document from the OFP requesting Agency execution of specific activities (with rationale).

4/29/20:

A supporting letter from the Government of Kiribati has been uploaded.

May 20, 2020:

Regarding Implementation arrangements, UNDP's intent of providing services "only upon Government request" was removed. However, UNDP is shown as the Senior Supplier, who by definition "... must have the authority to commit or acquire supplier resources required." Please ask UNDP to remove themselves from that role and instead, put the Executing Entity.

FI, 9/14/2020:

Cleared. The agency has made the requested change.

Response to Secretariat comments

Sk 04/08/2020

Submitting joint letter from the OFP and the IP requesting UNDP for the provision of project support services

sk: 08/24/2020

The ProDoc has been updated and replaced with the new template (agreed between UNDP and GEF on March 2020 where the section VII on "Governance and Management Arrangements" where UNDP's roles are clearer.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project spans five outer islands of Kiribati: North Tarawa, Makin, Kuria, Onotoa and Kirimati. It will promote a "Whole of Islands" approach to adaptation in these islands, which focuses on the need to consider climate change adaptation and disaster risk management across all socio-economic sectors, and on building stronger ecosystem-based solutions.

The project has four components that will support:

- 1) National and sector level policy, by reviewing and providing recommendations for required updates of legal frameworks from a CCA and disaster risk management (DRM) perspective; as well as developing monitoring frameworks, databases, tools, and strengthened coordination of island-level decision-making bodies.
- 2) Integrated vulnerability assessments on the five islands, which will be used to finalize implementation and investment plans in consultation with relevant stakeholders);
- 3) A range of investments to build climate resilience of the populations of the five islands, such as: agro-forestry and livestock interventions, establishment of seed centers for resilient and high-yielding crop varieties, water management systems for irrigation as well as installation of additional adaptation technologies for the water sector; identification and implementation of 'climate-proofing' and retrofitting of vulnerable community infrastructure; and installation of an automated weather station; and
- 4) Cross-sectoral knowledge management and communication activities, which include: capturing of lessons learned, awareness/outreach strategies, facilitation of outreach events and national and regional fora, best practice case studies from across the five islands, and a regional conference to share lessons learned.

FI, 12/18/18:

Please update Table A to reflect the strategic objectives corresponding to the CCA Strategy 2018-2022.

FI, 5/17/2019:

Cleared. Please note that the specific review comments provided in the interim on this item were somehow deleted due to a Portal glitch.

Response to Secretariat comments

SK: 04/08/2020

Table A, CEO endorsement:

Former CCA-strategy (PIF/ CEO endorsement)		Replace with... CCA Strategy 2018-2022	LDCF	Co-financing
CCA-1	5,750,000	Objective 1	5,775,000	46,061,000
CCA-2	1,575,500	Objective 2	3,150,000	6,449,920
	8,925,000	Total	8,925,000	52,510,920

Response to FI, 12/18/18:

Table A in CEO endorsement has been updated.

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	42,945,500
CCA-2	Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact	LDCF	1,575,000	866,649

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
CCA-3	Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation	LDCF	1,575,000	2,089,007
total Project Cost(\$)		8,925,000		45,901,156

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

FI, 7/18/18:

Further information is requested.

1) Agency is requested to kindly submit a version of the PAD that does not truncate the left side of the budget (see pgs. 62-72).

2) Agency is requested to seek other sources of support to cover the cost of vehicles, conference-related-travel and full-time staff.

FI, 12/19/18:

1) For the row that identifies "Grant" cofinance in Table C, please select whether this is investment mobilized or recurring expenditure.

2) GEF PPO has advised that staff and vehicle costs, which relate to project management, are specifically excluded from permissible project management costs (please refer to Table C of Annex 8 of the 'Guidelines of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy'). PPO has advised that such costs be covered by co-financing sources.

FI, 3/28, 2019:

Many thanks for the additional information provided. Regarding staff, could UNDP please confirm that project staff to be financed under GEF's PMC will not come either from government staff or Agency staff?

Also: The justification provided regarding vehicle purchase for this project (one car and five motorbikes) is adequate. Regarding vehicles, however, we require that UNDP and the government agree on procedures with regards to re-use of project vehicles after project completion, following best practice for similar projects. Possible solutions include transfer of such vehicles to the government for further use in other projects, or direct transfer to other similar projects in need. Could UNDP please confirm that such measures will be taken?

FI, 5/17/2019:

Cleared. Thank you.

Response to Secretariat comments

1) Updated in Project Document

2) UNDP is not aware of GEF policy restricting the procurement of vehicles. Based on previously approved projects, procurement of vehicles and other hardware is permitted if there is a clear justification provided for such procurement.

The following is the justification:

Vehicle

Despite the small size of the capital island, South Tarawa, distances between government offices of the implementing partner and responsible executing partners are great (more than 1 hour), and public means of transport are very limited and unreliable. Mobility of the project management unit is required on almost daily basis to enable implementation and follow-up with executing agencies spread across South Tarawa where face-to-face meetings is the norm rather than via email which can be unreliable due to poor internet connectivity. The travel cost through hiring vehicles for individual travel or other alternatives for the project period would therefore be more than or equivalent to the cost of the vehicle.

At the five beneficiary islands, motorized means of transport are very limited and there is no public transport or limited (such as in the case of Kiritimati). Based on experience from previous and ongoing projects, limited accessibility is hampering implementation and engagement, particularly in the most isolated communities. Therefore, motorcycles for each of the Project Islands Technical Support Officers are required to enable frequent and systematic outreach, information sharing and monitoring.

Full-time staff

Experience from other projects in Kiribati has shown, that dedicated full-time staff is required to ensure adequate project progress. While permanent government staff play a lead role in project implementation through their technical support, a strong project set-up is required to ensure day-to-day project management. Therefore, the project has budgeted for a full-time project manager, a project procurement/ finance assistant and a project communications officer. These roles are crucial to ensure their respective functions to achieve the goals of the project.

Conference-related travel

The regional WoI-conference during the last year of the project serves two purposes: 1) to present results and discuss replication/upscaling of the WoI-approach to other outer islands in Kiribati, and 2) to ensure South-South knowledge-sharing. To promote upscaling and allow direct sharing of experiences between islands within Kiribati, strong local participation from the 5 beneficiary islands as well as from Kiribati's other 16 outer islands is required. In-country travel in Kiribati is expensive due to the remoteness of the outer islands, sometimes requiring international transfer, and therefore a substantial budget is required for travel/registration and/or accommodation of local participants from all 21 outer islands. The proposed budget for the WoI-conference is expected to cover local participation, venue, publications and materials, whereas international participation will be covered from other sources. The project will consider sharing some of these costs with other projects that may be active by the last year of project implementation when the conference will take place. This can be revisited during mid-term or a period closer to the conference dates and any savings due to cost-sharing can be re-allocated for further knowledge management needs.

Response to FI, 12/19/18:

1) Investment Mobilized

2) After consultation of the guidelines, UNDP would like to clarify the following:

Regarding staff cost

Budgeted costs are for project support personnel (project manager, project procurement/administrative specialist, and cost-shared project finance specialist) and not government staff. The project finance specialist role is cost-shared by 2 other projects to support project-related finance for the 3 projects under the Kiribati Climate Finance Division. Based on experience from UNDP projects currently under implementation in Kiribati, administrative project delays are expected to be minimized substantially by strengthening financial management support of the project

Regarding vehicle costs

Outcome 1, 2, 3 and 4 – national level

Implementation of the project requires substantial coordination and interaction with government offices spread across South Tarawa, that can only be facilitated by vehicle as earlier described. Despite the small size of the capital island, South Tarawa, distances between government offices of the implementing partner and responsible executing partners are great and public means of transport are very limited and unreliable. While some government offices are in proximity to the implementing partner's office (Office of the President, National Strategy and Policy Division, Climate Change Unit (OB NSPD)) in Bairiki, the main executing partners responsible for technical outputs (MELAD, MISE, KiLGA) are located more than 1 hour by car:

- OB, MFMRD, MFED, MWYSA, MIA, MJ, others: walking distance
- MELAD ECD: 45 min
- MELAD-ALD: 60 min
- Parliament: 30 min
- MISE: 15 min
- KiLGA: 20 min

The project vehicle will serve for implementation of activities under the 4 project outcomes by OB NSPD (key areas listed below), due to their double role as both KJIP and KNEG secretariat, as well as for external technical assistance support required under each outcome:

- Outcome 1:
 - o Support sectors to review and carry-out CCA&DRM mainstreaming in legal frameworks
 - o Support sectors in mainstreaming of CCA&DRR in strategic and operational plans,
 - o Strengthen cross-cutting CCA&DRM-coordination (in particular with MELAD, MISE, MFED)
 - o KJIP implementation coordination and monitoring
 - o Sensitize national and island decision-makers (Parliament, mayors)
- Outcome 2:
 - o Review and update IVA with key sectors
 - o Review and update Island Council Strategic Planning-methodology and WoI-planning with KiLGA and KNEG (all sectors)
- Outcome 3:
 - o KNEG/TAC coordination of technical interventions under MELAD, MISE and MFMRD
 - o External technical assistance support to MELAD, MISE and MFMRD

- Outcome 4:
 - o Coordination of sector inputs to knowledge management and communication strategy
 - o Facilitate CCA&DRM and WoI-communication and knowledge sharing at national level (Mayor's forum, Parliament, KNEG, etc.)

Considering the extent of tasks requiring involvement of OB NSPD as KJIP and KNEG lead, it is estimated that the project require access to a vehicle on a full-time basis. There are no taxis or car rental companies in Kiribati, and car hire therefore must be done through a long-term agreement with a private owner or hotel with limited availability. Country office experience from other projects demonstrates that the travel cost through hiring vehicles for individual travel or other alternatives for the project period are more than or equivalent to the cost of purchasing the vehicle, please refer comparative analysis below.

Outcome 2 -island-level:

At island level, motorcycles are as described earlier required to ensure mobility of the Project Islands Technical Support Officers in order to support implementation of project activities related to community outreach, in particular:

- Outcome 2:
 - o Community outreach and planning related to IVA-processes, ICSP- and WoI-consultations
 - o Coordination of activities with Community Disaster Management Communities
 - o Planning of CCA&DRM community awareness and outreach programmes and related trainings
- Outcome 3:
 - o Coordination and planning with islands extension officers (agriculture assistant, water technician, social welfare officer)
 - o Outreach to community groups, schools and communities for planning, coordination and execution of adaptive interventions

At the five beneficiary islands, motorized means of transport are very limited and there is no public transport or limited (such as in the case of Kiritimati). Options for long-term vehicle hire is not available and short/term rental is very costly. Communities are spread out on the small, but often long and narrow islands, with distances from one end to the other spanning more than 1 hour by car. Based on experience from previous and ongoing projects, limited accessibility is hampering implementation and engagement, particularly in the most isolated communities. Therefore, motorcycles for each of the Project Islands Technical Support Officers are required to enable frequent and systematic outreach and coordination.

Comparative analysis of vehicle purchase vs. rental

		Purchase and maintenance costs	Rental costs
Outcome 1-4	Car	USD 38,000	USD 57,500 <i>(USD 250/week x 46 weeks x 5 years)</i>
Outcome 2	Motorcycles, 5 islands	USD 50,000	USD 230,000 <i>(USD 200/week x 46 weeks x 5 years x 5 islands)</i>
	Total	USD 88,000	USD 287,500

The above analysis demonstrates that vehicle hire entails much higher expenditures to the project than vehicle purchase. Therefore, purchase of vehicles is the preferred and recommended option.

Response to FI, 3/28/2019:

Staff:

Confirmation that the project staff to be financed under the PMC will not come from either the Government or UNDP. These will be newly recruited positions dedicated to support the implementation of the project.

Assets transfer after project completion:

Confirmation that UNDP's practice is that all project assets (which includes the vehicles) are transferred to the Implementing Partner, usually at the end of the project. Assets may be transferred to the government for project activities managed by a national institution at any time during the life of a project or transferred to another UNDP-financed project. For UNDP's practice on asset transfer between two projects within UNDP or transferred to the Implementing Partner or other entity, there is no expectation of funds being received. Procedures for the transfer of assets is reviewed and endorsed by the Project Board following UNDP's rules

and regulations, which includes an agreement signed between UNDP and the Implementing Partner. In all case of transfer, a transfer document must be prepared and kept on file.

Guidance for UNDP project closure including transfer or disposal of assets is available on page 60 in Prodoc and https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PPM_Project%20Management_Closing.docx&action=default

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Update, FI, 9/14/2020

COVID-19: Please see item 12 below ("Recommendation" section) on request to please consider how the project will (a) deliver envisaged adaptation benefits and support resilient recovery, and (ii) consider risks, amid the COVID-19 situation.

(Previous review):

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

SK: 11/04/2020

COVID-19 context, impacts, co-benefits, and risk analysis have been added to the following sections:

Project document: II. Development challenge, III. Strategy, and Annex E. Risk Log.

CEO endorsement: 1. Global environmental and adaptation problems, 3. Proposed alternative scenario, and A5 Risks.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, letters confirming co-financing have been provided.

PPO comment, 6/18/2019:

The co-financing document from the Government indicates a co-finance amount of nearly \$45.6 million represented in projects that are all under execution (some for five years or so). Thus the Agency is requested to please provide realistic, current amounts of co-financing that reflect the available amounts and the actual contribution to the project's objectives, as per the definition of co-financing. Additionally, once the amount is defined, the proper type of co-financing has to be selected in Table C (all is currently shown as 'in-kind'. Please identify the loan or grant amounts where applicable).

PPO, May 20, 2020:

The issues highlighted were not addressed as the co-financing document from UNDP and the Government indicates a co-finance amount of \$240,000 and \$52.2 million (respectively) represented in projects/activities that have all already started. The same comment provided months ago still applies: it is not possible that the whole amount represented is actual co-financing considering that some projects have been under execution for three years or so. Please ask the Agency to provide a realistic co-financing amount commensurate to the available amounts and the actual contribution to the project's objectives, as per the definition of co-financing.

FI, 9/14/2020:

Cleared. The agency has provided updated the co-finance section and provided assurance that the revised amounts, titles and timelines of co-finance are accurate. Grant and in-kind co-finance amounts have been separated in the table.

Response to Secretariat comments

SK: 04/08/2020

Submitting letter from the IP on co-finance of \$52,270,920 taking into consideration updates to the projects due to time elapsed since first submission for CEO endorsement in May 2018. This information is updated in the Project Document on pages 2 and section VII. Financial Planning and Management (page 58)

SK: 08/24/2020

Co-financing information submitted mid-2018 has been reviewed and updated. At the time of submission, several parallel co-financing projects were still in the formulation stage, but they have now been finalized and have started implementation in late 2019 or 2020. Therefore, the revised co-financing letter is reflecting accurate project titles, timeline and amounts of co-financing projects. For each of the projects, actual contributions towards the project's objectives have been identified, and only the relevant budget of the selected outputs/outcomes for the time period 2020-2025 have been indicated as co-financing (not the total value of the projects). With these updates, UNDP and government co-finance amount to respectively USD 819,667 and USD 47,723,920. Besides UNDP cash co-finance of USD 50,000, the remaining of 769,667 USD sources are in-kind co-finance.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the AMAT has been submitted.

FI, 5/17/2019:

Cleared for the time being. Please note that the updated CCA results framework with the CEO Endorsement stage indicators will be shared with agencies shortly and will need to be retro-actively submitted.

FI, 4/29/20:

Cleared. Agency has now filled and submitted the GEF-7 results framework.

Response to Secretariat comments

SK: 04/08/2020

Updated CCA results framework submitted.

The project logical framework and related targets (namely project indicators 4 and 7) have been revised accordingly to align with the CCA framework tracking tool instead of the AMAT. The changes are reflected in the new Project Document with this submission including references to the correct CCA results framework

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

FI, 7/18/18:

Further information requested.

Unable to locate within submission a section detailing how the proposed project will build on, synergize with, or support completed, existing or planned related initiatives in the country. Agency is kindly requested to provide this information or specify where it may be found.

FI, 12/18/18:

As requested earlier, could the agency please provide details of how the synergies and coordination are being accomplished with the listed projects?

FI, 5/17/2019:

Cleared. Please note that the specific review comments provided in the interim on this item were somehow deleted due to a Portal glitch.

Response to Secretariat comments

The project document p. 15 “Linkages to recent and parallel CCA&DRM projects”, p. 36-37 “Partnerships” and annex M “List of relevant recent and parallel projects” describe how the project builds on, develops and support related past, current and planned projects and initiatives.

The project will enhance coordination efforts at 3 levels: 1) local level through the involvement of Islands Councils and the Ministry of Internal Affairs; 2) national level through the Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change (KNEG) as coordinating national expert committee for all initiatives related to Climate Change; and 3) through the Whole-of-Island partner network at regional/global level.

“Linkages to recent and parallel CCA&DRM projects” (p. 15)

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 (p. 36-37)

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 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).

Response to FI, 12/18/18:

UNDP would like to emphasize that the project design has a strong focus on coordination and cooperation. Project outcome 1 supports institutional strengthening at national level, with enhanced coordination and cooperation as a key element; project outcome 2 supports island level planning for CCA&DRM with the aim of enhancing coordination; project outcome 3 support adaptive interventions in 5 targeted islands based on technical assessment of status quo and cooperation of

parallel initiatives; and outcome 4 support knowledge management and -sharing. All outcomes are designed to assess and build on experience, support coordination with parallel interventions, and identify opportunities for cooperation and creation of synergies.

During the PPG, stakeholders have expressed the need and interest to enhance coordination and synergies in the area of CCA&DRM, in particular in relation to the projects/areas listed in the table below. Therefore, a number of activities/outputs under each outcome are specifically targeting the establishment and/or strengthening of cooperation and coordination mechanisms, as indicated in the table. These activities/outputs and their correlation with parallel projects are presented below the table and further described in the project document.

Project / area of coordination	Sector	National CCA coordination	Island WoI-planning	International donor coordination
KJIP Secretariat and KNEG	OB, all	1.1.3.1 1.1.3.2.	2.1.2.	4.1.1.2.
Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change (UNDP-GEF-LDCF)	MELAD	1.1.3.3. 3.1.3.3.	2.1.2.	4.1.1.2.
Resilient Islands, Resilient communities (FAO-GEF-R2R)	MELAD (MFMRD, MISE)	1.1.3.3. 3.1.1. 3.1.3.3.	2.1.2.	4.1.1.2.
Outer Islands Infrastructure Project (ADB, WB)	MISE	1.1.3.3. 3.1.3.	2.1.2.	4.1.1.2.
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)	MISE (LINNIX)	1.1.3.3. 3.1 .2.	2.1.2.	4.1.1.2.
ISACC – Institutional Strengthening for PICs to Adapt to Climate Change (SPC, GiZ)	MFED	1.1.3.3.	2.1.2.	4.1.1.2.
WASH in Schools; WASH and Nutrition; WASH in schools and health care facilities in Line islands (UNICEF)	MoE, MHMS	3.1.1. 3.1.2.	2.1.2.	4.1.1.2.

Description of activities/outputs targeting improved CCA&DRM cooperation and coordination:

- 1.1.3.1. and 1.1.3.2. In order to enhance CCA&DRR-coordination across all sectors, the project aims to strengthen the KJIP secretariat and the KNEG (Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction), consisting of appointed members from all sectors, including NGO-representatives. The project will strengthen KJIP secretariat and KNEG mandates/processes as well as capacities of KNEG-members in order to enhance coordination and synergies between sector-specific interventions. The Technical Advisory Committee of the project will be the KNEG to ensure representation of all sectors in project-related matters.
- 1.1.3.3. The project will support improved coordination between the KJIP secretariat (Office of the President), the newly established Kiribati Climate Finance Division under the MFED, and sectors closely involved in the implementation of CCA&DRM projects, such as the Ministry of Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy (MISE) and Ministry of Environment, Lands, Agriculture Development (MELAD). In this regard, the first step will be to establish a joint mechanism for cross-cutting and regular CC&DRM coordination, including national stocktaking mechanisms for CC&DRM related projects.

MELAD is the implementing agency for the two GEF-supported projects currently under implementation “Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change” and “Resilient Islands, Resilient communities (R2R)-project” whereas MISE is the lead sector for 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), and MFED for the project “Institutional Strengthening for PICs to Adapt to Climate Change” (SPC, GiZ).

- 2.1.2. At outer island-level, the project will support Island Councils to review or formulate Island Council Strategic Plans (ICSP) and actionable WoI-implementation and investment plans. The plans will be developed based on IVAs, consultations and take into account past and ongoing efforts, including integration and alignment with parallel projects under implementation and existing island plans, such as Community Based Integrated Mangrove and Resource co-management Plans and Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Plans (CBDRM). In this way, Island Councils will become equipped with consolidated and coordinated island-plans for future investments.

Further, Project Islands Technical Support Officers will be established within the five Islands Councils with the aim of supporting project implementation and ensuring coordination with existing and ongoing initiatives. The context of each of the five targets project islands are very different, and therefore adaptive interventions and community outreach initiatives need to be tailored to each island based on past and ongoing interventions.

- 3.1.1. Through this output, the project will support MELAD’s work towards Climate-resilient agriculture and livestock practices, including identification of synergies and opportunities of cooperation with parallel projects, in particular the GEF-FAO-project “Resilient Islands, Resilient communities”, WASH and Nutrition (UNICEF).
 - 3.1.2. Through this output, the project will support MISE to improve water security in the 5 targeted project islands, including cooperation and identification of synergies with parallel projects, in particular water security projects in Kiritimati island (EU) and UNICEF-supported projects (WASH in Schools; WASH and Nutrition; WASH in schools and health care facilities in Line islands).
- 3.1.3 Through this output, the project supports the work of MISE and MFMRD in the areas of shoreline protection and climate proofing of infrastructure measures, including cooperation and identification of synergies with parallel projects, in particular the GEF-FAO-project “Resilient Islands, Resilient communities” and the “Outer Island Infrastructure project”.
- 3.1.3.3. This activity specifically supports enhanced cooperation mechanisms/procedures under the Foreshore Management Committee comprising among others MELAD, MISE, and MFMRD. Various divisions within MFMRD, MISE and MELAD ensures different roles related to the regulation and implementation of activities in coastal zones, including mining of raw materials, that challenges effective coastal management. These aspects are highly relevant to the two GEF-supported projects currently under implementation “Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change” and “Resilient Islands, Resilient communities (R2R)-project” under MELAD.
 - 4.1.1.2. Coordination and cooperation with international and resident donors involved in parallel projects will 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 considered to broaden the network with new partners, including resident partners in Kiribati.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

FI, 7/18/18:

Adjustment requested. In particular, south-south knowledge sharing and exchange is an important element of the KM plan, and includes a focus on experience

implementing the "Whole-of-Islands (WoI)" approach. One proposed avenue of dissemination is a WoI Conference for the region. However, the agency is requested to seek alternative sources of funding to cover conference-related travel/registration or accommodation.

FI, 12/18/18:

Cleared. Agency has confirmed that alternate sources of funding will be sought for international participants attending the conference, and that remaining conference costs may be shared with other funding sources.

Response to Secretariat comments The regional WoI-conference during the last year of the project serves two purposes: 1) to present results and discuss upscaling of the WoI-approach to other outer islands in Kiribati, and 2) to ensure South-South knowledge-sharing regionally. To promote upscaling and allow direct sharing of experiences between islands within Kiribati, strong local participation from the 5 beneficiary islands as well as from Kiribati's other 16 outer islands is required. In-country travel in Kiribati is expensive due to the remoteness of the outer islands, sometimes requiring international transfer, and therefore a substantial budget is required for travel/registration and/or accommodation of local participants. The proposed budget for the WoI-conference is expected to cover local participation from 21 outer islands, venue, publications and materials, however international participation will be covered by other sources. The project will consider sharing some of these costs with other projects that may be active by the last year of project implementation when the conference will take place. This can be revisited during mid-term or a period closer to the conference dates and any savings due to cost-sharing can be re-allocated for further knowledge management needs.

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

No. Agency is requested to respond to comments provided by STAP.

FI, 12/18/18:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP-comments	Agency response
1. The PIF provides a broad overview of the proposed project, naming indicative outputs. Although the budget is fairly large, it would be important in the full proposal to ensure the outcomes and outputs can be realistically achieved with the available human and financial resources.	The project design is tailored to meet all 4 project outcomes and targets as described in the PIF. Section III Results and Partnerships (pp. 17) describes the required sequence of activities under each output required to meet the 4 outcomes. Required supportive human resources (full time and TA) and capacity development have been planned and budgeted to ensure project progress and compliance.
2. Given the large number of on-going or planned adaptation projects, STAP would appreciate a more comprehensive explanation of how coordination and collaboration will be fostered across the projects.	The project document p. 15 “Linkages to recent and parallel CCA&DRM projects”, p. 36-37 “Partnerships” and annex M “List of relevant recent and parallel projects” describe how the project builds on, develops and support related past, current and planned projects and initiatives. The project will enhance coordination efforts at 3 levels: 1) local level through the involvement of Islands Councils and the Ministry of Internal Affairs; 2) national level through the Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change (KNEG) as coordinating national expert committee for all initiatives related to Climate Change; and 3) through the Whole-of-Island partner network at regional/global level.

<p>3. STAP would appreciate fuller details on which climate change projections will be used, including the time frame(s) of interest and why particular model(s) were chosen. It would be helpful to know who will choose the models and how the projections will be communicated to the stakeholders. It also would be helpful to incorporate different possible future socioeconomic development pathways (e.g. Shared Socioeconomic Pathways) when considering which adaptation options could be more resilient in coming decades.</p>	<p>The Project is using existing projections of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) document of the Government of Kiribati which is the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KJIP updated 2018). The reference for these projections is the “<i>Kiribati Meteorological Service, Australian Bureau of Meteorology and Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, 2011, Climate change in the Pacific: Scientific assessment and new research. Volume 1: Regional Overview. Volume 2: Country Reports Chapter (6): Kiribati. Kiribati Country Brochure</i>” under the Pacific Climate Change Science Program (PCCSP).</p> <p>Kiribati, like many other Pacific Island Countries are reliant on the PCCSP’s climate projections as the most reliable research conducted thus far for climate change projections for individual countries. The PCCSP’s climate projections were derived using output from global climate model simulations of the future climate, performed as part of the international Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP3). The projections focused on simulations corresponding to three Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) future scenarios representing B1 (low), A1B (medium) and A2 (high) greenhouse gas emissions respectively, for three 20-year time periods (centred on 2030, 2055 and 2090). A number of methods were then used to enhance the resolution of the CMIP3 output locally for downscaling.</p>
<p>4. In Component 1, STAP would appreciate descriptions of who will undertake the outputs and how they will be accomplished.</p>	<p>The project document pp. 17-21 describes the required sequence of activities under each output required to meet outcome 1.</p>
<p>5. In Component 2, STAP would appreciate further details on the selection criteria for selecting the pilot sites, and how the activities in those sites will be coordinated with other on going or planned adaptation projects.</p>	<p>The selection criteria for the 5 beneficiary islands of the project are described in the section “Targeted project islands and beneficiaries” of the project document pp. 13-14.</p> <p>On each of the 5 beneficiary islands, pilot sites as well as criteria for the selection of technologies will be established during the first year of the project through technical assessments (for example water resources assessments) and establishment of baseline information (Integrated Vulnerability Assessments).</p> <p>Coordination of activities with past/ongoing/planned initiatives in each beneficiary island and pilot sites will be ensured through a phased approach consisting of 1) establishment of baseline for each island (through integrated vulnerability assessments), and 2) Formulation of a Whole-of-Island development plan based on baseline data and needs. Further, the involvement of both the multi-sector KNEG at national level and the Islands Councils at subnational levels in the above 2 steps will enable coordination.</p>

<p>6. In Component 3, STAP suggests considering including representatives from the ministry of health or other health experts to ensure that outputs on food and water security also promote human health and wellbeing. For example, water storage systems could increase the numbers of cases of vectorborne and waterborne diseases, such as dengue. If such a risk is likely, then additional efforts may be needed as part of the project.</p>	<p>The project recognizes the importance of promoting human health in relation to food and water security. The Ministry of Health is a member of the multi-sector KNEG, that serves as Technical Advisory Committee for the project. Under outcome 3, the project will align with and make use of existing resources with a number of on-going projects with similar objectives. These projects include other UNDP-supported projects (UNDP-LDCF Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change), UNICEF-supported projects in cooperation with Ministry of Health (WASH in Schools; WASH and Nutrition; WASH in schools and health care facilities in Line islands), and the EU (water security projects in Kiritimati island).</p>
<p>7. It would be helpful for the full proposal to include further details on how the activities within the components will be accomplished, who will undertake these activities, the methods that will be used, and the number of pilot sites that will be included. It also would be helpful to provide the criteria that will be used to select the techniques, technologies, and solutions tested elsewhere for implementation in the proposed project.</p>	<p>In section III (pp. 17-36) of the project document, each output under the 4 outcomes are described in detail, containing information about how the components will be accomplished and by whom. Selection of pilot sites on each of the 5 beneficiary islands as well as criteria for the selection of technologies will be established during the first year of the project through technical assessments (for example water resources assessments) and establishment of baseline information (Integrated Vulnerability Assessments).</p>
<p>8. STAP looks forward to more information in the full proposal on how best practices and lessons learned will be identified, including the criteria to be used and who will do the identification. STAP also looks forward to information on indicators for monitoring, evaluating, and learning from the activities that will be undertaken, and for measuring the benefit of the interventions.</p>	<p>During the PPG, outcome 4 was added to address knowledge management and communication, including best practices and lessons learned. The project communication and knowledge management strategy will be developed during year 1 and establish a methodology to systematically capture best practice and lessons throughout the project. During the last year of the project, lessons learned will be published and presented at a knowledge sharing conference, also addressing options for scaling up to other islands in Kiribati. The Project Results Framework (project document pp. 41-47) presents indicators and details for monitoring, including baseline, targets, risks and assumptions. An independent Mid-Term Review provides an opportunity to revisit those based on project progress where best practices and lessons learnt will be further captured including recommendations moving forward. Finally, an independent Terminal Evaluation at the end of the project will further add to a final elaboration on the best practices and lessons learnt.</p>
<p>9. STAP encourages including an explicit activity to develop a plan for scaling-up, including estimating the human and financial resources required.</p>	<p>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. At this stage options and estimates for required human and financial resources will be developed.</p>
<p>10. STAP appreciates the attention to gender considerations throughout the PIF and looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full proposal.</p>	<p>The project includes a comprehensive Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI)-plan, developed based on literature reviews, assessments and consultations at national and island level. 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. The GESI-action plan is described in the project document pp. 38-39 and included as annex G</p>

11. It would be helpful for the full proposal to provide greater clarity on the co-financing. For example, Section C of the PIF states that NZAP will in-kind co-financing of \$10M. However, page 12 lists one NZ project of \$5,000	Co-financing contributions have been reviewed and updated since the PIF-stage to reflect the actual co-financing from various sources. Due to delays between the approval of the PIF and the PPG, co-financing figures from the PIF are no longer accurate.
12. In the section on project risks (page 14), the mitigation measure for the second risk (unsustainable implementation practices) doesn't really explain how that risk would be managed and reduced.	The unsustainable practice of paying sitting fees is no longer practiced and has therefore not been included as a risk of the project.

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

FI, 7/18/18:

No. Agency is requested to respond to comments provided by the US and Germany.

FI, 12/18.18:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Comments from Germany	Agency response
-----------------------	-----------------

Germany welcomes that the PIF is in line with Kiribati's priorities in climate change adaptation and outer island development, inter alia the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan and the Kiribati Development Plan. However, rather than adaptation planning alone, the Whole of Island Approach intends to support sustainable outer island development planning as a whole, programmatic and better-coordinated efforts are therefore sought on Outer Islands. This requires great coordination and communication efforts at local, national and partner level. Germany kindly recommends elaborating on the coordination of the stakeholders mentioned in component 3.

Germany appreciates the stakeholders thus far listed in the PIF, nonetheless kindly suggests considering listing the Kiribati Local Government Association (KiLGA), as one of the key CSO.

Communication and coordination efforts will be crucial to the success of the project, and therefore play a key role across all four components. The project adopts a phased approach, where the first years of project implementation will focus on institutional capacity building and strengthening – including establishment/strengthening of coordination and communication tools and mechanisms, technical assessments, and holistic, risk-informed Whole-of-Island planning in the five beneficiary islands. Implementation of adaptive solutions under component 3 will primarily take place during the second half of the project based on WoI-planning and technical assessments.

At island level, CCA&DRR-related capacities of Island Councils and Islands Development Committees will be developed, and support for coordination and communication provided through the establishment of dedicated Island Project Support Officers. Community awareness and outreach programmes will be planned to ensure meaningful participation and engagement from all island communities in the 5 project islands.

At national level, the project will strengthen communication and coordination tools of the multi-sector Kiribati National Expert Group on climate change and disaster risk reduction (KNEG), that will also act as Technical Advisory Committee of the project. Internal communication and knowledge sharing within the project Technical Advisory Committee will be crucial to ensure successful implementation of this phased approach. To enable and promote information sharing, coordination and communication support will be provided to the implementing partner through the PMU.

Finally, at regional level, coordination and cooperation with the above-mentioned projects and partners will 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 relevant government representatives.

Duly noted. KiLGA is a key partner for local governance in the outer islands and expected to play a key role during project implementation in relation to formulation of Island Council Strategic Plans. In this role, KiLGA will be a member of the Project Technical Advisory Committee.

<p>In addition, Germany would like to mention a few programs that might overlap with some of the proposed activities, particularly regarding component 1:</p> <p>a. “Climate finance readiness” implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH on behalf of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Australian Government (DFAT)</p> <p>b. “Institutional Strengthening in Pacific Islands Countries to Adapt to Climate Change (ISAAC)” implemented by the Pacific Community (SPC) and funded by USAID</p> <p>Therefore, Germany kindly suggests inviting representatives of the abovementioned organizations to coordination meetings in order to avoid duplication of efforts and create synergies where possible.</p>	<p>During the PPG, meetings with GiZ and relevant ministries of the Government of Kiribati were held to discuss possible overlaps. On this basis, one output from the PIF (1.1.2) was removed to avoid duplication of efforts.</p> <p>During project implementation, the existing WoI-partner network will be activated to further enable coordination, information sharing and creation of synergies.</p>
<p>Lastly, component 3 mentions under output 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”. Sustainable food security systems should include coastal fisheries measures, not only agriculture and livestock, as traditional food consumption depends highly on sea products. Germany kindly suggests adding coastal fisheries measures to output 3.1.1.</p>	<p>Coastal fisheries play a crucial role for sustainable food security systems in Kiribati, however interventions targeting coastal fisheries are addressed by the UNDP-LDCF-supported project “<i>Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change</i>”, and therefore not included in this project.</p>
<p>US comments</p> <p>Provide more information on ways in which UNDP will encourage the Government of Kiribati to promote coordination between Ministries involved in component 1, including through planned institutional arrangements;</p>	<p>The project will promote coordination through strengthening of the multi-sector Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction (KNEG), through amongst other enhanced definition of roles and responsibilities, capacity building, standardization of processes and tools for communication and coordination. In addition, improved coordination with the newly established Kiribati Climate Finance Division under the MFED and sectors closely involved in the implementation of CCA&DRM projects, such as the Ministry of Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy (MISE) and Ministry of Environment, Lands, Agriculture Development (MELAD), will be supported. In this regard, the first step will be to establish a joint mechanism for establishing an overview/stocktaking of CCA&DRM projects implemented in Kiribati.</p>

<p>Expand on how best practices will be shared among the five pilot islands in component 2 and 3 given the vast distances between islands and acknowledged communication challenges faced by the islands;</p>	<p>During the PPG, outcome 4 was added to the project to address knowledge management and communication, including best practices and lessons learned. The project communication and knowledge management strategy will be developed during year 1 and establish a methodology to systematically capture and share best practice and lessons throughout the project.</p> <p>At the five beneficiary islands, Project Islands Technical Support Officers will be established within the Islands Councils. The Project Island Technical Support Officers will be capacitated to support the project implementation activities during the project period, while also contributing to improved data gathering, information sharing and serve as a communication link between outer island and national level agencies and processes. At national level, a dedicated communications officer in the PMU will, together with the project manager and implementing partners, facilitate knowledge sharing of best practices through regular monitoring visits.</p>
<p>Elaborate on how the work proposed in the pilot islands in component 2 and 3 can be scaled to additional islands;</p>	<p>The project will build on the Whole-of-island approach that has been piloted, by improving and refining the methodology. The phased WoI-approach will establish a foundation for development planning in outer islands and lead to effective prioritization of project interventions beyond the project. It is expected that the project will ensure the foundation within GoK for this approach to be replicated in all outer islands through government or other project funding. Further, 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 beyond the project.</p> <p>The Project will be implemented by existing national and island level structures, mechanisms and tools in place such as the KNEG, Islands Councils, the IVA-methodology and WoI-approach, to ensure ownership and sustainability.</p> <p>Under outcome 4, strategies and plans for scaling up will be discussed with representatives from national and subnational levels at a WoI-conference during the last year of the project.</p>

<p>Provide more information on what practices will be utilized in order to establish trust with local island populations in order to increase the success of activities in component 3 that require their willingness to adopt new practices such as introducing climate-resilient crop varieties;</p>	<p>Community involvement and support is essential to ensuring adoption, ownership and sustainability of adaptive measures during and beyond the life of the Project. Improving local understanding and knowledge of the negative impacts of climate change on people’s livelihoods, health and overall well-being is critical to changing attitudes and practices and empowering communities to play their part in reducing vulnerabilities.</p> <p>Under outcome 2, Project Islands Technical Support Officers will be established within the Islands Councils at the five beneficiary islands, to build relationships and foster engagement that will support project implementation. Communication strategies and the use of materials will be planned and customized to each island by the Project Communication Officer and the Island Technical Support Officer with support of a GESI-expert and in close consultation with the Island Council and key extensions officers at each of the five beneficiary islands, including teachers, water technicians, agricultural officers and the Assistant Social Welfare Officer (ASWO). Through a training-of-trainers approach, both formal and informal pathways of engaging different target groups will be used. This will include user-friendly information on the WoI-approach, the impacts of climate disasters and climate change and possible adaptive solutions, to build resilience and reduce negative impacts. This information will be linked to interventions carried out under Outcome 3, where more specific technical trainings and learning-by-doing activities will be supported. A mix of awareness raising methods will be used such as trainings/consultations through Islands Councils, schools and community-based groups, displaying posters and distributing pamphlets, radio broadcasts as well as more innovative awareness techniques such as interactive theatre plays and customized games.</p>
<p>Provide more information on what steps UNDP plans to take in order to mitigate the risk of “historically unsustainable implementation practices will stymie long-term project impacts” listed in section 4.</p>	<p>The unsustainable practice of paying sitting fees is no longer practiced and has therefore not been included as a risk of the project.</p>
<p>Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental nongovernmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program;</p>	<p>Duly noted. The stakeholder engagement plan describes how and when different stakeholders will be involved. If additional stakeholders or roles are identified during project implementation they will be included.</p>
<p>Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.</p>	<p>During the PPG, outcome 4 was added to address knowledge management and communication, including best practices and lessons learned. The project communication and knowledge management strategy will be developed during year 1 and establish a methodology to systematically capture and share best practice and lessons throughout the project. During the last year of the project, lessons learned will be published and presented at a knowledge sharing conference, also addressing options for scaling up to other islands in Kiribati.</p>

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

FI, 11/5/2020:

Yes, cleared. The agency has discussed ways in which the project can provide benefits in the context of the COVID situation, as well as potential risks COVID poses to the project, and their mitigation.

FI, 9/15/2020:

Not yet. We are unable to find, in the ProDoc or the CEO Endorsement Request, discussion on changing project context given COVID-19. (This is being asked of all projects.)

(a) Please include discussion on how the proposed project can deliver adaptation benefits (and relevant COVID recovery co-benefits) to vulnerable communities that are dealing with the additional constraints COVID-19 is posing.

(b) Risks matrix/section: Please include discussion on potential risks that COVID-19 poses to project implementation (e.g., stakeholder consultations, timelines, disruptions, etc.) and how these risks will be mitigated.

FI, 7/18/18:

Not yet. Agency is requested to provide responses to comments for items 3, 8, 10 and 11 (STAP, Council comments).

FI, 12/19/18:

Not yet. Agency is requested to kindly address comments for items 2, 3 and 8.

FI, 3/28/2019:

Pending confirmation by UNDP of the two GEF Sec comments of 3/28/2019 for item 3.

FI, 5/17/2019:

Cleared. (However, the agency is requested to note comment for item 6.)

6/18/2019:

Not yet. Please see comments of 6/18/2019 for items 1 and 5, identified during PPO Review.

5/20/20:

Not yet. Please see PPO comments of May 20 for items 1 and 5.

Response to Secretariat comments

SK: 11/04/2020

COVID-19 context, impacts, co-benefits, and risk analysis have been added to the following sections:

Project document: II. Development challenge, III. Strategy, and Annex E. Risk Log.

CEO endorsement: 1. Global environmental and adaptation problems, 3. Proposed alternative scenario, and A5 Risks.

a) Kiribati is one of the few countries in the world with no cases of COVID-19 to date. COVID-19 impacts are therefore limited and only related to international border restrictions (both air and sea) and related international travel restrictions, import constraints, and local travel constraints. With no COVID-19 cases, there is no community transmission and no limitations to work environments and social life so far. The government declared a State of Public Emergency on 26 March 2020 and has developed a National COVID-19 Preparedness and Response Plan with focus on Health, Education, Communication and ICT, Transport, and Economic sectors, in order to address the current situation and prepare for possible future scenarios and recovery.

The project will support climate action as an enabler for resilient recovery and transformative, sustainable development. At national level, the Project will support capacity development of the Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management related to mainstreaming of CCA&DRM (including consideration of COVID-19/pandemic preparedness, recovery and response). At island level, project support to enhance outer island climate resilience capacities and planning will be carried out to provide co-benefits and support COVID-19/pandemic preparedness and resilient recovery to the degree required, mainly via Integrated Vulnerability Assessments, the development of Island Strategic Plans, Whole-of-Islands implementation plans, Community-Based Disaster Risk Management Plans, and community awareness campaigns, as well as CCA&DRM gender and social-impact studies. The project's target to enhance sustainable agriculture in 5 outer islands will contribute to the government's COVID-19 Agriculture Revitalization Plan for improved food security and self-sufficiency of the outer islands. Further, the project's focus on ensuring access to clean and safe water at 5 outer islands, as well as related capacity development and awareness for improved hygiene and sanitation, will contribute to island-level COVID-19 response measures.

b) The project risk log has been updated to include current and potential risks that COVID-19 poses to project implementation as well as risk mitigation measures. The project will need to plan, monitor, and adapt to the changing global and national COVID-19 context at inception and throughout implementation.

.....
 Addressed as requested.

Review Dates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Response to Secretariat comments

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/18/2018	4/8/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/19/2018	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/28/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/17/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/18/2019	

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

CONTEXT

This GEF-6 project targets the LDC SIDS of Kiribati, comprised of 33 highly vulnerable atolls. It seeks to address adverse impacts of climate change such as salt-water inundation, droughts, storm surge, pest- and vector- borne disease, and food and water insecurity, which pose challenges to sustainable, resilient and inclusive development. The project will target communities in five districts of various atoll islands: Northern Gilberts Islands Group (Makin & North Tarawa); Central Gilberts Islands Group (Kuria); Southern Gilberts Islands Group (Onotoa) & Line and Phoenix Islands Group (Kiritimati). It will focus on building climate resilience across a spectrum of socio-economic and environmental areas, including health, food security, education, water security, coastal erosion and ecosystems.

COMPONENTS AND RESULTS

The project has four components, that include the following activities:

- National and sectoral institutional strengthening, including improved policy mainstreaming of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management through strengthened cross-sectoral coordination. The project will also better enable the Government to implement, monitor and enhance Kiribati's Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KJIP; 2014-23).
- Improved hardware and software to strengthen early warning systems;
- Water capture/storage and food security adaptation measures, including climate-resilient agriculture and livestock (supply, production, storage and processing), cultivation of high yielding crop varieties in seed centers, and provision of open pollinated seeds and tools to farmers.
- Shoreline resilience and protection;
- Rainwater harvesting and storage, groundwater infiltration galleries, and pump/pipe systems.
- Knowledge management and awareness-raising activities.

The project will deliver direct adaptation benefits to approximately 20,000 people, i.e., 17% of Kiribati's population; mainstream climate resilience in 19 policies and plans; and train over 4,400 people in identifying and managing climate risks. The project will aim to ensure that the adaptation investments will be gender specific and targeted as appropriate at vulnerable groups.

SCALE UP / GENDER / COVID

The project will strengthen long-term adaptation capacity by using a ‘Whole of Islands’ approach to support priority adaptation needs of communities on five in an integrated manner. Lessons learned from project interventions will be replicated in all outer islands through Government or other donor funding. It will ensure complementarity with related initiatives underway or planned on the islands.

For maximal effect and value addition, the LDCF project will align with several ongoing development initiatives in Kiribati, for example in food security, water and sanitation, and urban development, which contribute \$48.5 million in co-finance.

A comprehensive Gender Analysis was carried out for the project during the design phase, and a Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) analysis and plan were also formulated. 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.

Though Kiribati so far does not have cases of COVID-19, the project is taking into consideration potential risks pertaining to it, and has proposed mitigation measures. The project can also deliver benefits on these islands in the COVID context; to it are In terms of COVID-19 co-benefits, the project’s target to its enhancement of sustainable agriculture will contribute to improved food security and self-sufficiency of the outer islands. Further, the project’s focus on ensuring sustainable access to clean and safe water, as well as related capacity development and awareness for improved hygiene and sanitation, will contribute to island-level COVID-19 response measures.