

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR LDCF/SCCF PROJECTS¹

(For both FSPs and MSPs)

Type of Fund: Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)

Country/Region: Kiribati

Project Title: Kiribati: Increasing Resilience to Climate Variability and Hazards

GEFSEC Project ID: **4068**

GEF Agency Project ID: 112615 (World Bank)

GEF Agency: World Bank

Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$0 GEF Project Allocation:\$3,000,000 Co-financing:\$3,300,000 Total Project Cost:\$6,300,000

PIF Approval Date: Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: October 31, 2009

Program Manager: xxProgramManagerPrimaryNamexx GEF Agency Contact Person: Jiang Ru

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion ²	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Kiribati is listed as LDC and completed its NAPA in January 2007.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	No letter of endorsement is attached to the submission. Recommended action: A signed letter of endorsement from the national GEF operational focal point must be provided. Update September 2009: A signed letter of endorsement has been provided.	
	3. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	Yes. The project's main focus is investment oriented, and the World Bank is defined as having a	

¹ Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

² Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

		comparative advantage for investment type projects. Also, the project draws on the WB's extensive local experience from implementing the KAP II program in Kiribati.	
Resource Availability	4. Is the proposed LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available in the LDCF/SCCF fund?	Yes. The PIF requests a total of \$3.3 million (incl. fees), which is consistent with the principle of equitable access.	
Project Design	5. Will the project deliver tangible adaptation benefits?	<p>Yes. Tangible adaptation benefits will be delivered through each of the three project components and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scaling up successful water collection and water conservation practices from KAP II pilots (rainwater harvesting and storage, leakage detection and repair, and water conservation education campaigns targeted to consumers) - Implementing collection of rainwater for groundwater recharge and carrying out feasibility studies on freshwater lens creation, which has not been targeted in the KAP II pilots. - Physical protection of selected public buildings and infrastructure from the impacts of sea level rise and coastal erosion. - Measures to increase the resilience of highly vulnerable coastal areas and ecosystems. - Increased capacity for managing climate and disaster risks. <p>The descriptive detail of the activities are satisfactory for the current stage of project development, but is expected to be further</p>	

		scoped during the PPG stage.	
	6. Is the adaptation benefit measurable?		
	7. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	<p>Yes. The project's objective is to 'strengthen the resilience of Kiribati to the impact of climate variability, climate change and climate related hazards by reducing the impact of storm surges and coastal erosion on the quality and availability of freshwater resources and the livelihoods of coastal communities'.</p> <p>With this objective the project builds directly on the ongoing 'Kiribati Adaptation Project' initiative, which envisioned a three staged approach to adaptation in the country. Stage 1, which was completed in 2006, started a process to mainstream adaptation into national economic planning and prepared a pilot adaptation project (stage 2) to demonstrate options for adapting to climate change in Kiribati. Stage 2, which was funded by the SPA and is currently under implementation with an expected closing date of December 2010, is implementing concrete pilot activities to test the most promising adaptation options in water and coastal management. Stage 3, which is proposed funded under this project in the LDCF, will upscale the most successful adaptation measures tested in stage 2, and will thus increase both the scale and the geographical scope of the interventions.</p> <p>The proposed project is fully consistent with this three-staged approach, as it will scale up selected adaptation measures in the water and coastal management sectors (see section 5 above) and expand the coverage to include the entire nation, including remote outer islands, which has previously not been included in the stage 2 pilots. Importantly, this approach of</p>	

		<p>upscaling within the existing adaptation process (as opposed to targeting new sectors such as health or agriculture) also have the added benefit of maintaining, and building on, already developed human capacity in the country. Lacking human capacity, is the key constraint facing any adaptation project in the country - in particular in the outerlying regions, so nurturing human capacity in a stabil long term adaptation program is a key factor in increasing Kiribati's long term resilience to climate change. Also, it should be noted that the NAPA has again identified water management and coastal erosion as the two key climate change risks facing the country, so it makes good sense to continue efforts in these sectors.</p> <p>The logic behind the project design is well presented in the PIF, and is accompanied by clear definitions of both outcomes and outputs.</p>	
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?	<p>Yes. The project builds directly on the two top priorities identified in the Kiribati NAPA: Priority 1: 'Water resource management'; and Priority 2: 'Coastal Zone Management and Resilience Enhancement'. Through component 3 of the project it will also contribute to Priority 3: ' Strengthening Environmental, Climate Change Information and Monitoring'; Priority 4: 'Project Management Institutional strengthening for NAPA'; and Priority 5: 'Upgrading of Meteorological Services.</p> <p>Furthermore, the project is aligned with the broader development priorities in Kiribati as defined e.g. in the following policies and programmes:</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Development Strategy 2004-2007 - Kiribati Development Plan 2008-2011 - The Climate Change Asaptation Policy and Strategy issued by the government in 2007 - Kiribati Natural Disaster Act of 1993 - The Environment Act of 1999. 	
	9. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes. Most importantly the project will be fully coordinated with the ongoing activities under KAP II (see above). With the same Implementing agency (WB) and the same national executing agencies implementing both projects, maximum consistency and synergy is secured. Also, the project will seek coordination (and co-financing) with the activities of Global Fund for Disaster Risk Reduction (GFDRR), which has recently completed a stocktaking excercise on national disaster risk management capacity.</p> <p>A full list of relevant development activities in the water and coastal zone management sectors, and how this project will be coordinated with them, should be provided by CEO endorsement.</p>	
	10.Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	Yes. By building on top NAPA priorities identified in the Kiribati NAPA, cost effectiveness is indirectly implied. More details will be provided by CEO endorsement	
	11.Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		
	12. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		
	13.Does the project take into account potential major risks and include sufficient risk mitigation measures?		
Justification for GEF Grant	14.Is the value-added of LDCF/SCCF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through additional cost reasoning?	Yes. A general additional cost argument is provided in section E and is satisfactory for the current stage of project development.	

	15.How would the proposed project outcomes and adaptation benefits be affected if LDCF/SCCF does not invest?		
	16.Is the LDCF/SCCF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	Yes. Management costs are below 10% of total LDCF grant and are matched by cofinancing at a pro-rata basis.	
	17.Is the LDCF/SCCF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		
	18.Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	Yes. Indicative co-financing is \$3.3 million or a little more than 1:1 compared to the LDCF contribution.	
	19.Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		
	20.Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP	N/A	
	Convention Secretariat	None received.	
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendations at PIF	21. Is PIF clearance being recommended?	<p>Not yet. This is a well presented PIF, clearly built on top NAPA priorities, and with a logical description of the problem and proposed solutions in terms of outputs and activities.</p> <p>No endorsement letter was provided with the submission, and this needs to be provided to assure that the proposal is fully consistent with national priorities.</p> <p>The PIF will be recommended for CEO</p>	

		clearance and Council approval, upon submission of signed letter of endorsement from the GEF Operational Focal Point. Update September 2009: A signed letter of endorsement has been submitted, and the project is thus recommended for CEO clearance and Council approval.	
	22. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.	Please refer to section 9 above.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	23. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
	3. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	
Recommendation	4. Is PPG being recommended?	
Other comments		