

# Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu – Phase II (VCAP II)

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10415

**Countries**

Vanuatu

**Project Name**

Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu – Phase II (VCAP II)

**Agenices**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

10/12/2019

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Fareeha Iqbal

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### Focal area elements

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Yes. All issues of 11/4 have been adequately addressed.

FI, 11/4/2019:

Cleared for CCA. Thank you for including CCA-3.

However, please make the following corrections/adjustments to Tables D, E, C, and B:

1) Table D and Table E:

(a) Please delete the row for CCM in Table D, and instead add the requested CCM STAR amount to the amount corresponding to the LD STAR request. This way, the LD request in Table D will match the LD amount shown in Table A.

(b) Please also delete the CCM row in Table E, and instead add the PPG amount for CCM to the LD amount shown.

2) Table C (Co-financing):

(a) Please fill out the missing field for the first seven rows, i.e., whether this is recurrent expenditure or investment mobilized;

(b) In the second-last row of Table C, "in-kind" co-finance has been categorized as "Investment mobilized". Please note that where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines ([http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf))

c) Immediately below Table C is a section asking the agency to describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified. The explanation currently provided has been identified by PPO as not sufficient. Please provide a suitable explanation.

B) There are activities in this project described as biodiversity mainstreaming and, thus, should be classified as BD 1-1. Please include this in Table B.

FI, 10/17/19:

For CCA: We note that the Meta-information excel page states that this project is explicitly related to NAPs. Thus it will also be aligned with CCA objective 3 "Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation". Please include CCA-3 in Table A.

For Land Degradation (FI on behalf of ABS):

Please see comments entered under review item 4 of Part II of the review sheet.

## **Agency Response**

### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

1. CCA-3 is added in Table A.

2. Additional LD focal area element has been added.

#### **UNDP Responses: 8 November 2019**

1. Tables D & E have been revised accordingly.
2. Cofnancing – changes have been in accordance with the comments.
3. BD 1-1 is included in Table A (not B).

#### **Indicative project/program description summary**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Yes, cleared.

Please consider how this project could support offshore marine conservation during PPG. Vanuatu is a major target for foreign fishing vessels, which if not well managed undermine the food security, economic development and biodiversity of the country.

FI & SW, 11/4/2019:

1) Further information is requested for CCA. Table B now includes appropriate CCA outputs and outcomes, including INV components. However, please provide further details on the types of CCA investments that will be undertaken. The text for Output 1.3.2 mentions a range of vulnerabilities and specifies some of the soft measures that might be undertaken. What are examples of the kind of hard CCA interventions that this project is likely to support?

2) Please provide a few lines summarizing the "big picture" vision on what this project is about; how do the pieces fit together (beyond at the individual FA-level) to deliver a robust project that will deliver integrated benefits?

3) The objective continues to mention biodiversity conservation as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Some of the activities here may not improve resilience or other human benefits, but are still important and are why the project needs biodiversity resources from the GEF.

4) Component 1 - It is confusing how the project will support 6 PAs in developing management plans, but will overall support 12 PAs. How can effective management even be defined (1.1.1) without a management plan? "Effective management initiated in" doesn't entirely make sense as a output as effective management is the result of the implementation of a suite of activities rather than a single step - it is an outcome. Output 1.1.3 therefore would actually fall underneath 1.1.1 and appears to only be undertaken in 6 PAs that have management plans and not the 12 mentioned in 1.1.1. Also, the activities described in the text under 1.1.1 are for setting the context for effective management but not the actual implementation.

5) Vanuatu's GEF-6 project (ECARE with IUCN) is in the final stages of project development, but is very similar to component 1 in content, having changed significantly from the PIF. While we are generally supportive of a focus on supporting community-based conservation as effective and efficient in the Vanuatu context and know that there is more work to be done than one project can cover, it will be very important to ensure coordination to avoid duplication and share learning with the project.

6) Marine conservation - The shift in the ECARE project means that the planned support for the creation and protection of large offshore areas is not happening. In addition to the biodiversity values of places heavily targeted by illegal fishing, addressing this issue is important for food security and economic development. There are also important questions of climate adaptation in fisheries. It would be good to see this project better address this issue.

7) Hectare numbers - For community based areas that apparently lack basic support, it's a bit surprising to see specific hectare numbers in the core indicators and specific areas where they will be working. Are these estimates? Goals?

8) IAS - The project introduction mentions IAS and other text implies the project is going to work on it. Please note that the GEF has a specific approach to IAS to ensure that limited resources are used effectively in this area. If the project decides to include more IAS work during PPG, please review the GEF-7 Biodiversity Strategy section on IAS for guidance.

9) Please see LD comment in Part II, item 6 (Core Indicators section).

FI, 10/17/19:

Not for CCA. Mostly TA activities have been entered in Table B. The LDCF grant cannot support only TA; approximately 50-80% of LDCF project grants are expected to support on-the-ground adaptation investments (INV). Please revise, or clarify in the PIF the types of adaptation investments that will be supported by the LDCF portion of the grant.

For Land Degradation (FI on behalf of ABS):

Please see comments entered under review item 4 of Part II of the review sheet.

SW:

- The project objective does not mention biodiversity diversity conservation or land degradation or even things related to them, but rather just climate adaptation. More generally, this is the problem with the project as written the activities are justified as Adaptation rather than BD or LD and, therefore, it is difficult to understand how they will provide GEBs in these areas. Biodiversity is listed as co-benefit rather than the reasoning for undertaking the work.
- Component 1 would benefit from greater explanations in the text of the document on the approaches and strategies used to achieve these objectives. The outputs read has high level outcomes.
- Overall, the project needs significant editing before many of the questions below can be assessed for biodiversity.

## **Agency Response**

### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

CCA: The component types have been changed to reflect the types of interventions which are also explained in more detail in the PIF (section xxx).

The project framework in Table B was re-structured in response to the comments. Separate outcomes and outputs have been specified for BD, LD and CC-A. Corresponding indicative activities have been specified in section X. These changes could provide information on the 3 focal areas covered by this proposal.

### **UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

- (1) Table B has been updated. Examples of CCA investments in hard infrastructure are indicated in 1.3.2
- (2) Big picture updated in 1A-3
- (3) Project objective is updated with biodiversity as an outcome
- (4) Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2 have been updated. Thank you for feedback.
- (5) Consultations with IUCN and ECARE have been ongoing for the past month. This is updated in section 1A-2. There are many synergies to be identified in PPG.

(6) Marine conservation is noted. The current PIF highlights both terrestrial and marine PAs. Illegal fishing will be addressed in coastal PA management.

(7) The specific areas have been calculated for known sites detailed in the NBSAP and conservatively estimated for the new community conservation areas to be considered. These targets will be refined and developed in associated with other key targets in the PPG process.

#### **Co-financing**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 11/1/2019:

Yes for PIF stage. Please see CEO Endorsement stage comment.

FI, 10/17/19:

Not yet for LDCF.

1) It is not clear how the sources of co-finance listed in Table C, which appear to be parallel initiatives, relate to or link with the proposed project. According to the Updated GEF Co-financing Policy, co-finance should "support the implementation of the GEF-financed project and the achievement of its objectives". How the initiatives in Table C will do so is not clear.

2 We would expect a project grant request of this size to mobilize meaningful new resources for the country. Further, the amount to be contributed by UNDP is only in-kind, and low. While there is no minimum requirement for co-finance mobilized, we strongly encourage GEF agencies to contribute larger amounts of grant finance to demonstrate country commitment, especially in highly vulnerable LDC SIDS.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

1. Additional information on cofinancing has been provided in Section IA-5

2. Cofinancing from UNDP has been explained in the same section.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019.**

The comment at CEO endorsement stage is noted

**GEF Resource Availability**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Yes.

FI, 10/17/19:

Yes for LDCF.

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Yes, thank you.



SW 11/4/2019:

Yes, however this project requests \$6.5 M of Vanuatu's available STAR resources of \$6.9 M. We would like to ensure that Vanuatu uses its full STAR allocation and, therefore, encourage the agency to discuss the possibility of using the full STAR allocation in this project. The Vanuatu OFP may also have plans to participate in a regional project or use the resources for SGP, but we would like to make sure that there are plans for the full amount.

10/24/2019

Yes.

### **Agency Response**

**UNDP Response: 8 November 2019**

This has been clarified by the GEF OFP to GEF Sec that the amount will go to SGP.

**The focal area allocation?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/24/2019

Yes.

### **Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 10/17/19:

Yes. Under the \$10 M per-country cap for the LDCF in GEF-7, Vanuatu has \$7.5 M remaining.

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 11/4/2019:**

Cleared. However, please note LD comments below for project preparation stage:

LD comment on behalf of ABS, 11/4/2019:

- 1) At PPG, to encourage sustainability and upscaling, we suggest including training for beneficiaries, agriculture extension officers and other relevant stakeholders who may continue to be involved in the project interventions as well as other considerations to institutionalize the new approaches that will be implemented.
- 2) At PPG we encourage you to consult the Checklist for Land Degradation Neutrality Transformative Projects and Programmes (LDN TPP) in the development of the land related aspects of the project.

FI, 10/17/19:

Yes, the amount of PPG requested is within the allowable cap.

**Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

- At the PPG will include training for beneficiaries, (e.g. agriculture extension officers) and other relevant stakeholders who may continue to be involved in the project interventions as well as other considerations to institutionalize the new approaches that will be implemented
- At PPG will consult Checklist for Land Degradation Neutrality Transformative Projects and Programmes (LDN TPP) for development of the land related aspects of the project.

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Yes, cleared.

FI, 11/4/2019:

Yes for CCA.

LD comment (on behalf of ABS, 11/4/2019):

1) The project will be looking at SLM activities, however the associated SLM indicator (4.3) is blank. This should be completed and a reminder that hectares should not be double counted with other indicators.

2) Please clarify which output(s) will deliver the 6,000 hectares of land restored and which output(s) align with the indicator 4 on area of landscapes under improved practices-1000ha.

Biodiversity (For PPG)

1) Please note that all protected areas included need to have a WDPA ID and improved METT scores.

2) The GEF Inclusive Conservation Initiative (if approved by Council) will be developing a community-based METT that may be more appropriate for the areas supported by this project.

FI, 10/17/19:

CCA comment is pending revision to LDCF-supported components (see above CCA comment for item 2).

## **Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Pls refer to response to item 2 above.

## **UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

- Noted. Indicator 4.3 has been updated. Hectares are not double counted as large areas in community managed areas, e.g. Santo island, are incorporated into PIF.
- Outputs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 focus SLM and restoring degraded land
- Points noted for PPG on biodiversity
  - o Need a WDPa IP and METT

As much as possible include GEF Inclusive Conservation Initiative

### **Project/Program taxonomy**

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Cleared.

SW 11/4/2019

No. Please remember the purpose of the tagging system is to be useful in identifying projects that do substantive work on a particular subject. Therefore, more is not better and in fact will clog up what is a hopefully useful system. Therefore, the project should not be selecting tags for IAS, the FOLUR program, Sustainable Commodity Production, etc.

## **Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted. OK Tagging updated.

## **Part II – Project Justification**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 10/17/19:

For adaptation: vulnerability to climate change has been adequately discussed.

### **Agency Response**

#### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Noted.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 11/4/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 10/17/19:

For climate change adaptation, the baseline issues have been well described. Please provide further information on the baseline projects. What are the gaps and how will the proposed project address some of them, or how will it coordinate with those projects?

## **Agency Response**

### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

The baseline projects are further described in Section 1A-5 of the PIF.

### **UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 11/4/2019:

Cleared for CCA. The LDCF-supported components and expected outcomes have been adequately described.

FI, 10/17/19:

CCA-related review comment is pending clarification/revision of LDCF-supported activities of Table B (see comment for item 2 of Part I, above).

## **Agency Response**

### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Pls refer to responses on item 2 Part I above.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Cleared.

FI (on behalf of ABS), 11/4/2019:

Please see LD-related comment in section on indicators (item 6 of Part I), above.

Comments relating to Land Degradation (FI on behalf of ABS; 10/17/19):

The project is largely an adaptation project with very few details on how the country plans to achieve the LD based targets that have been outlined in Core Indicator 3 & 4. You may refer to the Caribbean SIDS SOILCARE project (on the GEF website) for some ideas on integrating LD with adaptation for GEF eligibility. Other specific comments are below:

- For GEF 7 all projects linked to LD funding have to be underpinned by LDN, as we are supporting this Agenda across all of our objectives. LDN does not seem to be mentioned in the submission and so there would need be consideration of how this project is assisting the country to meet their LDN targets or to set their targets if they have not yet done so.
- LD is focused on productive landscapes only (forests and agricultural lands) not coastal or marine areas. So there would need to be more information on what field based interventions will be carried out to rehabilitate or restore land or encourage sustainable agriculture for not only GEBs but also for livelihoods. We would also need to know if they are targeting small farmers, extension officers, how many hectares of land, expected improvements to farmers income etc.
- Related to the above, there seems to be a mismatch between the LD objective the project is targeting (LD 1-1 which looks mainly at SLM) and the core indicator targets that have been completed. The restoration targets are the only ones that have been completed and not the SLM target. We can send them additional information on the breakdown of the LD objectives as I recognize it is not fully laid out in the programming directions document.



- We would also expect that if there are any activities related to improving of policy frameworks or planning, a truly integrated adaptation project with LD, would look at ensuring LDN considerations are mainstreamed in to adaptation plans or ensuring land use planning frameworks and other sector plans not only consider LDN but are also climate resilient. Additionally, we expect to see interventions on institutional strengthening related to LDN and monitoring of the implementation of these plans (LD2-5)

Comments relating to Biodiversity (SW):

- The listed objectives here do not match the objectives listed in Table A. Please note that for Table A Inclusive Conservation is limited to a specific program that this is not a part of.

**Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

The Indicative Project Framework has been substantively re-structured in response to the comments. We trust that the revisions adequately respond to the comments.

Inclusive Conservation (BD1-5) is not listed in Table A.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019-**

Indicators updated

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 11/4/2019:

Yes for CCA; explanation has been provided of the additionality of the proposed LDCF-supported activities.

FI, 10/17/19:

CCA-related review comment is pending clarification/revision of LDCF-supported activities of Table B (see comment for item 2 of Part I, above).

## **Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Please refer to the listing of indicative activities in the subsection on “Project Approach” which will be funded under LDCF and GEFTF. The activities are indicated for every Output. More clarity will be provided at CEO ER when the final activities will be enumerated and described.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Cleared for all CCA, BD, LD.

FI, 11/4/2019:

Yes for CCA.

FI, 10/17/19:

CCA comment is pending revisions to LDCF-supported components in Table B (see comment for item 2 of Part I).

## **Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Refer to the subsection on ‘Project Approach’ as mentioned above.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted. That this is cleared.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/4/2019:

Yes for PIF stage.

FI, 10/17/19:

Comments for adaptation: Please discuss potential for further scale-up of the activities that will be supported by the project. Please also give examples of local short-term coping strategies that could be transformed into long-term adaptation strategies.

**Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Refer to expanded discussion in the relevant section of the PIF.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted. That this is cleared.

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/4/2019:

Yes for PIF stage. The project will focus on all six of Vanuatu's provinces, with specific locations to be determined during project preparation.

FI, 10/17/19:

No. The map provided does not indicate the proposed project sites. The map is also largely unreadable and does not include pertinent information such as KBAs and PAs.

**Agency Response****UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

A map showing the KBAs is included as Figure 1. A high-resolution map for each priority site will be provided at CEO ER when the sites have been visited during the PPG.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted. That this is cleared.

**Stakeholders**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/4/2019:

Cleared for PIF stage.

FI, 10/17/19:

Please indicate which stage private sector actors and indigenous communities will be consulted on project design. (Further comments may be forthcoming after requested changes have been made for BD and LD.)

## **Agency Response**

### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Refer to expanded discussion in the relevant section of the PIF.

### **UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/4/2019:

Cleared for PIF stage.

FI, 10/17/19:

Please discuss whether women's groups will be consulted regarding project design. (Further comments may be forthcoming after requested changes have been made for BD and LD.)

**Agency Response****UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

All groups, including women and youth groups will be consulted during the PPG phase. These would be applicable during national consultations and particularly in the project sites.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 11/4/2019:

Yes.

FI, 10/17/19:

Please discuss how the "island contractors" will be engaged.

**Agency Response****UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Pls refer to response to the comment on the engagement of the private sector.

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

**Risks**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/4/2019:

Yes.

FI, 10/17/19:

Yes. (Further comments may be forthcoming after requested changes have been made for BD and LD.)

**Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

**Coordination**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 11/4/2019:

Please discuss how the LDCF-supported activities/outcomes of Component 2 are coordinated with and additional to the GCF project that is supporting Climate Information Systems in Vanuatu.

FI, 10/17/19:

Please provide further information on how the proposed project will synergize/coordinate with other relevant existing or planned initiatives in Vanuatu.

### **Agency Response**

#### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

Please refer to expanded discussion in the relevant section of the PIF.

#### **UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Component 2 has been updated. Initiatives will be coordinated in the Vanuatu Meteorology & Geo-Hazard Department which will implement Component 2 and the GCF project.

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**



FI, 10/17/19:

Yes for CCA; the proposed project is aligned with Vanuatu's NAPA and its NAP.

## **Agency Response**

### **Knowledge Management**

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/4/2019:

Yes for PIF stage.

FI, 10/17/19:

Further information requested. While specifics of the KM approach may be provided at CEO Endorsement stage, and draw on lessons from VCAP I, preliminary information is needed at this stage on targeted beneficiaries of the KM, modes of knowledge sharing, and user-friendliness/access to the knowledge generated. It should not all be housed with one agency if that will make it difficult for external stakeholders to access and contribute to.

## **Agency Response**

### **UNDP Response, 1 November 2019**

These points are well noted and will be addressed during project design. Please refer to the expanded discussion in the relevant section of the PIF in the interim.

### **UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

Noted that this is cleared.

### **Part III – Country Endorsements**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Cleared.

11/4/2019:

Yes. However, please see comment on "GEF Resource Availability/STAR Allocation" in Part I, above.

10/17/19:

Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

**UNDP Response, 8 November 2019**

STAR allocation is clarified.

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

## **Agency Response**

### **GEFSEC DECISION**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

11/8/2019:

Yes.

FI, 11/4/2019:

Not yet. Please address the comments provided on 11/4.

FI, 10/25/19:

Not yet. Please address comments for CCA, BD and LD above. Further comments for several review categories will be provided once the requested changes/clarifications have been made regarding CCA components, and alignment with BD and LD focal area strategies.

### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/8/2019:

1. Please strive to increase meaningful co-finance in this vulnerable LDC SIDS that goes beyond in-kind support.
2. Please see PP stage comments for LD.
3. During project preparation, please consider how this project could support offshore marine conservation. Vanuatu is a major target for foreign fishing vessels, which if not well managed undermine the food security, economic development and biodiversity of the country.
4. Please provide details on consultations regarding project design with private sector actors and indigenous communities.
5. Please provide further information on long-term sustainability of project outcomes and activities, as well as on potential for scale-up.
6. Please provide further information on how this project has consulted with women, will engage them in implementation, and will address the particular vulnerabilities of women and empower them.
7. Re the KM plan, please seek to ensure that communities can also share and benefit from knowledge on adaptation measures.

### Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		