

Vaitupu Coastal Adaptation Project (VCAP)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12342
Countries
Tuvalu
Project Name
Vaitupu Coastal Adaptation Project (VCAP)
Agencies
UNDP
Date received by PM
5/18/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Tshewang Dorji
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments
5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

a). The project is sourcing and targeting BD fundings. Whereas the project is mainly targeting in its writing, outcomes for climate change adaptation, it can be aligned with the BD FA objective 1. It will address the significant issue in islands of protection of coastal areas, and conservation of important ecosystems and biodiversity

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

a) The need for greater emphasis in the narrative on BD focal area is well noted. Additional focus on BD has been infused throughout the narrative and outcomes.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared with remaining item, if any, will be addressed during the PPG stage

6/10/2026; GEFSEC:

Needs for precision in the summary of what kind of BD is targeted and the globally significance need to be justified. The GEBs need to be precisely mentioned.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes. However, please make the project objective more concise and straight forward.

Also, to be aligned with BD FA, the project needs to justify that the BD targeted by the project is of global significance. The project needs to demonstrate the global importance of the project's anticipated biodiversity benefits.

Agency's Comments

6/12/2026; UNDP:

Additional details have been added to the project summary on the specific BD being targeted under the project objective (para 2), as well as a note on the global significance of the atoll ecosystems. A specific note on the LMMA management and removal of drivers of biodiversity loss to the points listed summarizing the approach in the third paragraph, and finally the specific GEB category being targeted was noted in the final paragraph.

3 June 2026

The project objective statement has been revised to be more concise.

Details on the global biodiversity significance of Vaitupu and the project outcomes have been further integrated into the biodiversity baseline (A.1) and GEBs (B.3) sections of the PIF.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

- a). Please make the project objective more concise and straight forward
- b). Please clarify in the relevant section of the document that the project will not need to invest in creating a hazard map for the island. Instead, the component will use existing hazard maps for awareness and capacity building. If there are no existing hazard maps, we kindly suggest allocating a portion of project resources to generate these maps and use them for land-use planning to build resilience against the impacts of climate change.

Also, the average budget amount of the GEF funded part for the M&E component for projects up to USD 5 million is around 5.0% but for this project is 6.0%. Please request the agency to revise down.

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

a) The project objective have been simplified as follows: To reduce climate-induced storm-wave and coastal flooding risks on Vaitupu and enhance biodiversity by implementing sustainable adaptation investments, including hybrid Nature-based Solutions.

b) Hazard maps have been developed through the TCAP project, so it is not anticipated that additional hazard maps will be needed. This has been clarified in the proposal.

M&E component has been adjusted down to 5%, with additional budget instead directed to the core ecosystem service and coastal protection

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

As per GEF requirement to reflect gender perspectives throughout, please include the gender equality perspectives currently described in the section Gender Equality and Women Empowerment into the project description and in project components.

Please, also ensure to reflect, that the findings from the gender analysis informs the preparation of the Gender Action Plan and that key elements of the GAP are reflected in the project components during the PPG stage. Also, during the PPG stage, ensure that in the development of the project results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting; measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.); and make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments
3 June 2026

Gender perspectives have now been integrated throughout Section A and B.

Specific notes have been added on the PPG stage requirements listed for the GAP.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments
6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

PMC cost from co-financing has not been included. Kindly update this in accordance with the current policies and guidelines

Agency's Comments
3 June 2026

An equal proportion of co-finance (5%) has been assigned to PMC.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments
6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared with remaining item, if any, will be addressed during the PPG stage

6/10/2026; GEFSEC:

- Please include the description of the BD at the sites level as well. Currently it is included in the rationale at national level only

-As the project is targeting urban areas, the solutions proposed will benefit urban areas, which is usually not areas of high value of BD. Please describe further at landscape level how the project will impact the quality of the BD. In particular the maps should show not only the areas that will be protected, but also the areas where the BD will be improved, restored or managed with the project.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Please provide Information on the project area and the population that will benefit from it will be appreciated.

Also, on the BD aspects, please clarify the following:

- To be aligned with BD FA, the project needs to justify that the BD targeted by the project is of global significance. It needs to demonstrate the global importance of the project's anticipated biodiversity benefits. It typically requires justifying the project's contribution to the persistence of biodiversity components - genes, species, or ecosystems - in relation to their worldwide extent or population size. You may consider using the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) standard or other criteria used to identify areas for biodiversity conservation.
- Please provide information that can demonstrate that the landscapes targeted by the project (the scale of the project) are consistent with the needs for contribution to the persistence of the globally significant BD.

- Also, please provide better description of the drivers of BD loss, and how the project will address them, through NbS or other, including in its clarification in the ToC.

Agency's Comments

6/12/2026; UNDP:

Given the context of the small island, the biodiversity descriptions for the Vaitupu (See second paragraph of the BD baseline on Page 10 added in response to the previous comments) can be considered to represent that of the project sites. The biodiversity description under the baseline have been divided into more distinct paragraphs to more clearly indicate the Vaitupu-specific descriptions which includes discussion on ecologically and globally significant species. The description of the LMMA has been revised with a new figure to better explain that the LMMA covers the entire island and its coastal waters, and that the specific areas within the LMMA highlighted on the maps represent Special Protected Areas within the broader LMMA.

Regarding the second point on targeting urban areas: While much of the adaptation focus is indeed related to sites surrounding coastal infrastructure, these are not 'urban areas' in the conventional sense. The small size of the settlements means that they are considered to be closely integrated with the surrounding landscape. This is particularly true for the targeted public infrastructure outside the main settlement such as the school, clinic and agriculture station, which are positioned in more isolated areas of the island and set well within the fragile atoll ecosystem. The description of the project strategy has been revised to highlight this point and better frame the objective not only to protect community assets, but also to improve the resilience and ecological condition of the wider coastal landscape. At landscape level, the project will generate biodiversity benefits by strengthening the management, restoration, and stabilization of key coastal and nearshore habitats, including coastal vegetation zones, beach and berm systems, suitable lagoon-edge restoration areas, and adjacent reef-flat/lagoon areas that support ecosystem functions and local livelihoods. In particular, the management and conservation approaches will have a broader impact across the island through the focus on the LMMA. The LMMA map that has now been included in the submission provides a better

depiction of the all-encompassing nature of the conservation efforts. A note on site selection has also been added to component two, noting that it will consider not only the vulnerability of coastal infrastructure, but also the broader landscape benefits for addressing the drivers of degradation and biodiversity loss ? including erosion, sedimentation and invasive species.

During the PPG phase, additional consultation will be needed to further refine the specific improvements to the LMMA management approaches needed to safeguard biodiversity.

3 June 2026

Additional details on Vaitupu population dynamics have been added.

Additional BD baseline and discussion on global BD benefits has been added. There are no specific KBAs in Vaitupu, but addition narrative has been added in terms of the important role the ecosystems play on the global level, as well as for local ecosystems and ecosystem services. Details from the NBSAP prioritisation of BD drivers has also been added.

The component narratives and ToC have been revised to better depict the impact pathways for BD (see responses to review section 5.1 for more details)

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments
6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

c).Are there additional investments from GEF, LDCF, or other funds that could support this project? If so, please provide clarification.

Agency's Comments
3 June 2026

c). Details on complementary investments identified to date are presented in section B4, as well as in the co-finance partners listed in Annex A. In terms of GCF initiatives, the TCAP project is already listed and is at the end of the implementation period ? with lessons learned from that project already forming a central basis for the design. Similar opportunities will be sought to draw lessons from the regional GCF project focused on Climate Information and Knowledge Services ? while this project is not directly aligned, the interventions on the

generation and use of climate information in decision making could offer complementary lessons for risk-informed planning in Vaitupu ? this project has been added specifically to the PIF. Linkage to other GEF projects have also been added, including the ongoing ?Ecosystem based adaptation for improved livelihood in Tuvalu? project. Further engagements with these partners will be conducted through the PPG phase to better understand the potential synergies and agree on options for direct support.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared with remaining item, if any, will be addressed during the PPG stage

6/10/2026: GEFSEC:

Please address the previous comments relating to: The project targets improved management of a protected area (CI 1.2). Please describe this protected area in the rationale, the impacts of CC on its health, if it is managed through a management plan. Also, assess the impacts of the project on the quality of the BD in the protected area, in the buffer zone. In the narrative, please include the PA in the landscape approach.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

a). Please upload legible ToC (figure 10)

b). Please describe the project outputs under each outcome, extend possible, to provide clarity on the key aspects of "missing middle"

On BD aspects, please address the following:

Component 1:

- The GEF 8 BD FA strategy supports in its objective 1 conservation, sustainable use and restoration of BD and natural ecosystems through integrated landscape management approach. Restoration activities are supported if they demonstrate that they improve the status of BD. Please provide describe how the landscapes targeted have been selected, and not only from the Climate change adaptation and human needs, but from status of the landscape consistency and globally significant BD.

- An integrated landscape/seascape management approach to support the persistence of biodiversity will by necessity include a broader array of stakeholders and intervention strategies than when GEF supports protected area management, sustainable use, and biodiversity mainstreaming separately. This will also help foster a multi-sectoral approach across government ministries. GEF will support the contribution and engagement of IPLCs within the context of these integrated approaches. Please, describe the concertation and governance to be implemented, through stakeholders, ministries, and between sectors.

- The project targets improved management of a protected area (CI 1.2). Please describe this protected area in the rationale, the impacts of CC on its health, if it is managed through a management plan. Also, assess the impacts of the project on the quality of the BD in the protected area, in the buffer zone. In the narrative, please include the PA in the landscape approach.

Component 2:

- For NbS interventions funded by the Biodiversity (BD) Focal Area, the project's Theory of Change should articulate how NbS interventions will deliver benefits for biodiversity of global significance. NbS respond to societal problems, harnessing nature as part of the solution. For instance, for the problem of storm surges caused by sea-level rise and increasing storm intensity; a NBS solution may include the protection and restoration of mangroves and coral reefs. In this example, the GEF BD focal area could fund the incremental work needed to protect threatened, globally significant mangroves and coral reefs, which would have benefits in terms of storm surge protection.
- The project mentions that it will prevent degradation of ecosystems with IAS (or even during implementation as a risk): Clarify if the project through some targeted activities will intend also to address the management of IAS. This could be in the integrated approach description. This is indeed supported by programming directions in islands, through integrated landscape management. The focus is on ensuring the long-term effectiveness and sustainability of interventions.

Component 3:

- Please specify how the impacts on BD will be monitored and how the project will deliver improvement of the quality of the globally significant biodiversity.
- While monitoring of NbS results in ?numbers? (hectares, people) is expanding, understanding and evaluative evidence of what works, does not work and why, remains insufficient. GEF NbS projects are encouraged to embed impact evaluation, including Randomized Controlled Trials as relevant, in their design. This should include the evaluation of leakage or spillover, i.e. of the extent to which GEF investments in NbS in one geographic area merely displaces harmful activities to another area. This should also include evaluation of durability of the benefits provided and risks of reversal.
- For NbS to be considered on an equal footing alongside other solutions, a better knowledge base of the costs and benefits of NbS, both in the short and long term, is needed. Valuation of the benefits and co-benefits of NbS may be useful, including financial valuation. GEF projects are encouraged to carry out robust cost-benefit analyses, reporting the cost and benefits of NbS. Project Results Frameworks should include indicators capturing all targeted benefits and co-benefits

Agency's Comments

6/12/2026; UNDP:

Apologies for not explicitly responding to this comment in the previous round; the comment was considered in the overall approach taken in the revisions, but we recognize that the written response does not clearly explain what was done.

The specific protected area was introduced in the BD baseline under Section A.1., which includes a specific discussion on the CC impacts on the LMMA in the final paragraph of this section.

Details on the targeted management actions were then added to the Component 1 description under B.2. This includes a statement on the reasoning/outcomes of the improved management both in terms of the conservation of globally important biodiversity and the enhancement of ecosystem services. This is all discussed under the umbrella of the ICZM approach for Output 1.1.2. An additional note has been added to clarify the area of impact in relation to the LMMA and SPAs.

Under component 2, the approach has been further refined to further emphasise BD objectives for on-the-ground interventions, adding greater emphasis on integrating: BD considerations in the site-specific hybrid designs; community-centric activities within the LMMA; and BD across the atoll landscape in site selection.

3 June 2026

a) A higher-res version of the TOC has been generated as a stand-alone image. Reference to specific Outcomes has been added throughout all component descriptions.

b)

Component 1:

The approach has been revised to better integrate BD through the inclusion of integrated coastal zone management principles into the decision-making and ISP processes. The narrative has been expanded to describe some of the specific target landscapes, including the Vaitupu LLMA (for which an expanded baseline was added to Section A, including CC impacts on the LLMA).

Component 2:

The ToC Narrative has been revised to better integrate BD impact pathways.

It should be noted that base don expert opinion (base don hazard and landscape assessments), it was deemed that mangrove restoration was not a practical solution for Vaitupu as there are no suitable locations for such action. Instead, the focus for mangroves and corals is predominantly placed under the management approaches, while restoration efforts will target berms along the shorelines. In this sense, several of the elements discussed under component two recommendations are instead covered under component 1.

IAS has been added as a intervention strategy under the assisted natural regeneration approach/

Component 3:

Indicators for BD have been added to the monitoring framework

An impact evaluation and CBA have been added to the component. These elements will be integrated into the RMF at PPG phase.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments
5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments
5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments
6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared with thanks

6/10/2026: GEFSEC:

Please address thus comment

b). Agency execution support to be determined at the PPG stage, Once the Agency has sufficiently progressed in project preparation and if it anticipates a need for Agency execution. Accordingly, please indicate "to be determined" instead of "yes".

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

a). Additional information regarding the involvement of local communities would be appreciated during the PPG stage. In addition, the project states in the risk table section on stakeholder engagement that " Consultation gaps or insufficient inclusion of women, youth, persons with disabilities, or vulnerable groups may reduce ownership and generate grievances" and should elaborate on plans to engage and consult these in project development/PPG stage.

b). Agency execution support to be determined at the PPG stage, Once the Agency has sufficiently progressed in project preparation and if it anticipates a need for Agency execution. Accordingly, please indicate "to be determined" instead of "yes".

Agency's Comments
6/12/2026; UNDP:

Please see the initial response below on why 'yes' was selected. It is, however, noted that the COS-NIM approach should only be used for essential support services. Given that 'to be determined' is not an option on the PIF template of GEF portal, the approach has been adapted to still select 'yes' (given that discussions with the OFP to date and the experience in the country suggests such support will likely be necessary), but to revise the wording to clarify that further assessment will be conducted to confirm this need as project preparation progresses.

3 June 2026

a) The PPG phase will indeed involve more extensive engagements, which will include inclusive consultation formats that will specifically target vulnerable groups. The risk mitigation has been elaborated to clarify engagement plans for the PPG phase, as well as clarifying steps for the SEP for ongoing engagement. This has been further mentioned in the Stakeholder Engagement section.

b) The selection of 'yes' was based on ongoing precedents with UNDP engagement in Tuvalu. The Country Office Support to National Implementation Modality (COS-NIM) has been consistently applied in Tuvalu to balance strong country ownership with the practical constraints of small island contexts, particularly limited in-country capacity for complex procurement, financial management, and reporting to vertical funds. This has already been discussed and agreed with the government counterparts, and is not considered as something that is still to be determined.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

a). Please explore the ways to improve the project result figures for CCA core indicators

For Protected Areas, WDPA ID missing. The PIF reports 22 hectares under the "Vaitupu community PA" but does not provide a WDPA ID for this site. GEF-8 RMF guidelines require each protected area to be identified by name and WDPA ID. Please confirm whether the Vaitupu community PA is formally gazetted and registered in the WDPA, and provide the corresponding ID.

Marine habitat coverage appears modest relative to project scope. Only 5 hectares of marine habitat under improved practices is reported for a project centred on coastal/reef-related Nature-based Solutions. Please review

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

a) Details of the WDPS have been added; please note that according to the formal designation, it is listed as a marine area, not terrestrial, so the target has been shifted to the appropriate indicator.

Additional consideration has been given to the targets for CCA core indicators. While these targets are constrained by the very small size of the target island, changes made to enhance the biodiversity component of the project have increased the areas of improved management, with the biodiversity and CCA benefits of NbS working in tandem. In particular, the area of marine habitat has been expanded to include nearshore lagoon and reef-flat areas adjacent to the priority coastal stabilization sites, including the village and school foreshore areas. These areas will benefit from improved community-based coastal monitoring, erosion control, reduced sediment pressure, awareness raising, and strengthened local management practices. On this basis, a revised target of approximately 25?50 ha of nearshore coastal-marine area under improved management practices could be considered, subject to validation with local stakeholders and available spatial data. For PIF stage, an intermediate target of 35ha was selected.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Please review and update the alignment with GEF-8 Climate Change Adaptation Strategy

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

CCA alignment has been reworked to link to LDCF priority themes and levers for transformation. See changes to Section C.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Further clarity on how the project is contributing to the NAPs will be appreciated.

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

The specific NAP activities to which the project will contribute have been listed under section A.7.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Please provide details on which stakeholders have been consulted, including which local community groups and civil society organizations were consulted and how the results of these consultations have contributed to project components..

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

Additional details have been added to the paragraph under stakeholder engagement listing which stakeholders were included in the consultations. An additional note on how the results of the consultations shaped the design has also been added.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

There appears to be an inconsistency between the GEF financing table and the PPG table in the programming of funds under the CC STAR allocation, with one table showing CCM-1-4 and the other CCM-1-1. Please ammend

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

This may have been an inputting error, as the working folder shows consistently as 1-4. This will be checked in the portal on resubmission.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Please provide a clear map of the area targeted by the project including the protected areas

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

A new map has been added showing the location of key sites and PAs

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Cleared.

5/25/2026: GEFSEC

On Environmental and Social Safeguards, thanks for attaching Social and Environmental Screening Template. An overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate. To strengthen climate resilience in the Vaitupu's communities, it is critical to understand their needs and priorities, and to ensure active participation of local communities in the project and their capacity building. Therefore, please clarify:

- a. How Vaitupu's communities, particularly the most vulnerable communities, were engaged in stakeholder consultations on the 25th of March 2026 or others, and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project concept.
- b. Please ensure engagement with Vaitupu's communities, particularly the most vulnerable communities, especially Component 1 and 2, during the project design (PPG) and throughout project implementation and monitoring not only as beneficiaries but also as partners of the project including project steering committee.

c. Please consider respecting and integrating their customary land and fishing rights, and traditional and local knowledge in the project design, and ensuring capacity building for Indigenous communities and vulnerable communities during the PPG phase.

d. Please consider incorporating monitoring indicators related to integration of traditional and local governance, traditional and local knowledge and capacity building for Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the project during the PPG phase.

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

a) additional details of the stakeholder engagement have been added to the PIF. The stakeholder engagement report has been included as Annex F. This includes details on how considerations were integrated into the design.

b) We confirm the intention to engage vulnerable communities during PPG phase ? as noted above, this has now been specifically mentioned in the PIF

c) Customary practices will be a key consideration in management planning, and engagements through the Kaupule and Falekaupule?with focus on inclusive consultations?will help ensure that local needs are fully considered.

d) Monitoring indicators related to integration of traditional and local governance, traditional and local knowledge and capacity building for IPLCs will be considered as part of the RMF at PPG phase.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

6/13/2026; GEFSEC:

Recommended for technical clearance.

5/19/2026; GEFSEC:

Not yet. Also, please review and update the project meta data sheet.

Agency's Comments

3 June 2026

Please see the revisions as per the comments and requests above. In addition, the Meta Data has been updated in the indicator worksheets.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

5/25/2026

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/10/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		